

Analysis of the Experimental Sites Initiative: Final Report

GSA MOBIS CONTRACT NO. GS-23F-9777H

April 30, 2003

Revised: September 25, 2003

Submitted to:

Office of Federal Student Aid
U.S. Department of Education
830 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20202

Submitted by:

ORC Macro International Inc.

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Overview	3
Introduction.....	3
Outline	5
Section I. Description of the Experiments and Summarization of Results as Reported by Participating Institutions	7
A. Loan Proration for Graduating Borrowers.....	7
B. Overaward Tolerance and the Disbursement of Loan Funds	9
C. The Inclusion of Loan Fees in the Cost of Attendance	11
D. Credit of Title IV Funds to Otherwise Nonallowable Institutional Charges...	14
E. Credit of Title IV Funds to Prior Term Charges	16
F. Waiver of Multiple Disbursements for Single-term Loans	18
G. Waiver of the 30-Day Delay for the Disbursement of Loans to First-Year, First-Time Borrowers	20
H. Alternative Entrance Loan Counseling Procedures.....	21
I. Alternative Exit Loan Counseling Procedures	23
J. Ability to Benefit Examinations and the Award of Title IV Aid	25
Section II. Comparative Analyses of the Experiments	27
A. Loan Proration for Graduating Borrowers Experiment.....	27
B. Overaward Tolerance and the Disbursement of Loan Funds	28
C. The Inclusion of Loan Fees in the Cost of Attendance	29
D. Credit of Title IV Funds to Otherwise Nonallowable Institutional Charges .	30
E. Credit of Title IV Funds to Prior-term Charges	30
F. Waiver of Multiple Disbursements for Single-term Loans	31
G. Waiver of the 30-Day Delay for the Disbursement of Loans to First-Year, First-Time Borrowers	32
H. Alternative Entrance Loan Counseling Procedures.....	32
I. Alternative Exit Loan Counseling Procedures	33
Conclusions.....	33

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Comparison of Institutional Characteristics within Data Sets	4
Table 2. Loan Proration for Graduating Borrowers Experiment Participants' Self-reported Values	8
Table 3. Overaward Tolerance and the Disbursement of Loan Funds Experiment Participants' Self-reported Values	10
Table 4. The Inclusion of Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance Experiment Participants' Self-reported Values	14
Table 5. Credit of Title IV Funds to Otherwise Nonallowable Institutional Charges Experiment Participants' Self-reported Values	15
Table 6. Credit of Title IV Funds to Prior Term Charges Experiment Participants' Self-reported Values	17
Table 7. Waiver of Multiple Disbursements of Single-term Loans Experiment Participants' Self-reported Values	19
Table 8. Waiver of the 30-Day Delay for the Disbursement of Loans to First-time, First-Year Borrowers Experiment Participants' Self-reported Values	21
Table 9. Alternative Entrance Loan Counseling Procedures Experiment Participants' Self-reported Values	23
Table 10. Alternative Exit Loan Counseling Procedures Experiment Participants' Self-reported Values	25
Table 11. Ability to Benefit Experiment Participants' Self-reported Values	26

LIST OF TABLES

..... Page

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Experimental Sites Initiative was authorized by Congress under section 487A(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended. Since 1996, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) has overseen the Initiative. This Initiative—or “experiments,” as they are frequently hereafter called—provides FSA with 120 laboratories within which to test the effects of statutory and regulatory flexibility for institutions participating in Title IV student aid programs. Each of these laboratories is a postsecondary institution, or consortium of institutions, granted special permission to waive specific statute and the implementing regulations. The Initiative grew from concerns that Federal requirements placed unnecessary burdens on postsecondary students and institutions and that the outcomes of some of these requirements could run counter to the goals of the Higher Education Act.

As a condition for participation, institutions in the Experimental Sites Initiative submit to FSA data concerning the outcomes of the experiments in which they participate. This report reviews performance outcomes with respect to all 10 of the experiments currently being conducted. These experiments involve:

- Loan proration practices for graduating borrowers
- Overaward tolerance and the disbursement of loan funds
- Inclusion of loan fees in the calculation of student cost of attendance
- Credit of Title IV funds to otherwise nonallowable institutional charges
- Credit of Title IV funds to prior term charges
- Waiver of multiple disbursements for single-term loans
- Waiver of the 30-day delay for disbursements of loans to first-time, first-year borrowers
- Alternative entrance loan counseling procedures
- Alternative exit loan counseling procedures
- Award of Title IV aid to students not passing an “Ability to Benefit” test.

FSA has examined the performance data submitted by institutions participating in the experiments in previous academic years and has found their support for the Initiative to be overwhelmingly positive. Participating institutions cited benefits for both themselves and their students. This report examines the data and comments submitted by institutions participating in the Initiative for academic year 2001–2002 (AY01–02). Participating institutions are enthusiastically supportive and recommend the broader application of the administrative flexibility these experiments provide.

This report differs from previous efforts in that it attempts comparative analyses over outcomes between institutions that do, and do not, participate in the Experimental Sites Initiative. To do so, measures of graduation, retention, withdrawal, and default were developed for sets of students. These measures are referred to as experimental default measures (EDM), experimental graduation rates (EGR), experimental retention rates, etc. This nomenclature is designed to

remind the reader that the outcomes under study are frequently not officially reported rates. This is because official rates are not contemporaneous to the performance data submitted by participating institutions in AY01–02. For example, the most current officially published cohort default rates (CDR) are for fiscal year 2000. CDR for students entering college in AY01–02 will not be available until fiscal year 2008.

The experimental measures of outcomes used in the comparative analyses were derived through careful and extensive query of the National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS). We do not contend that these measures are as accurate a representation as officially reported values will be, once they become available. We do suggest that these measures are reasonable barometers for the outcomes they intend to describe. Because the outcomes queried in the comparative analyses are not as refined as the officially reported rates, the reader is strongly cautioned against putting too much stock in the magnitude of reported coefficients. The models developed in the comparative analyses are solid, associative ones. That is, they provide evidence for both the extent of association between factors (statistical significance) and the nature of the relationships (coefficient signs and odds ratios). The reader must not make the mistake of believing, for example, that by plugging in a few numbers, he or she can derive a firm prediction of the institutional default rate. The reader, though, can examine the models and conjecture what institutional characteristics influence outcomes, as well as the direction of that influence (e.g., Does the characteristic increase or decrease probabilities?).

OVERVIEW

Introduction

In 1965, Congress passed the Higher Education Act (HEA). President Lyndon B. Johnson signed it into law. The HEA deals comprehensively with postsecondary education, but one of its foremost goals is to ensure that postsecondary education is accessible to all. For fiscal year 2003, the Bush Administration projected that over eight million postsecondary students will share more than \$67 billion generated by the various student aid programs authorized under HEA's Title IV.¹

While the benefits of the programs are incalculable, their costs to the Federal government are considerable. The total budget authority for student aid is almost \$16.3 billion in FY 2003. Congress and the U.S. Department of Education (ED) through its Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) and the Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) have a justifiable interest, therefore, in protecting the integrity of the student aid programs. To this end, statutory and regulatory requirements have evolved, yet some have argued that these requirements may occasionally undermine the intent of the HEA. For example, the proration of loan funds to graduating borrowers may protect the interests of the taxpayer by lowering their exposure to the potential for default. In doing so, however, the ability of the student borrower to complete his or her course of studies and graduate on time may be impaired. In extreme circumstances, the ability of the student to graduate at all may be threatened.

The Experimental Sites Initiative, under section 478A (b) of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, seeks to assess the extent to which select statute and regulations function to burden the student and the postsecondary institution without enhancing the integrity of the financial aid programs. Congress initially granted ED the authority to conduct these inquiries in 1992, but the Experimental Sites Initiative did not really get under way until 1996. The results of these earliest efforts led to the relaxation of the 30-day delay requirement for the disbursement of funds to first-year, first-time borrowers, as well as the easing of the requirement that single-term loans be disbursed in multiple installments. The Higher Education Amendments of 1998 provided relief from the disbursement provisions for institutions with a weighted 3-year default rate of 10 percent or less. The authorization for this relief expired on September 30, 2002.

¹ FY 2003 Budget Summary—February 4, 2002.

Table 1. Comparison of Institutional Characteristics within Data Sets

Data Comparison			
	College Board's Common Data Set	Experimental Sites Initiative Data Set for Comparative Analysis	Participating Experimental Sites Only
Total number of Institutions	3,698	2,520	120
Number of Institutions by Type			
One-year or less	9	0	0
Two-year, lower	1,680	956	19
Two-year, upper	54	43	1
Three-year	43	2	0
Four-year	1,886	1,499	100
Five-year	22	17	0
Six-year	4	3	0
Number of Institutions by Control			
Public	1,630	1,375	102
Private	1,368	1,145	18
Proprietary	700	0	0
Geographic Region			
New England	231	201	4
Mid-Atlantic	676	427	11
Southern	800	535	12
Midwest	980	692	45
Southwest	303	226	5
Western	668	439	43
Foreign	36	0	0
Average Enrollment	3,184	3,980	13,152

Table 1 presents a comparison of the 120 institutions participating in the Experimental Sites Initiative with institutions represented in the College Board’s common data set² (CDS) and the final, base set of institutions used in the comparative analyses of Section 3. Particularly compared with institutions contained in the CDS, institutions participating in the Experimental

² The CDS, or more explicitly “the Annual Survey of Colleges of the College Board and Data Base,” is an important source of information in the comparative analyses. It is described in greater detail in the Technical Appendix to this report.

Sites Initiative are a homogeneous group.³ The vast majority of experimental sites are public (83%), 4-year institutions (95%). On average, they are four times the size of the average institution in the CDS, and they are clustered in the Midwest and West (70%). For the purposes of comparison, note that 44 percent of the institutions in the CDS are under public control, 51 percent are 4-year institutions, and 45 percent are in the Midwest or West. Institutions participating in the Experimental Sites Initiative are not broadly representative of U.S. postsecondary institutions.

As a condition to their participation, all experimental sites institutions are required to report on the outcomes of the experiments in which they participate. Reports are submitted to FSA through the use of OMB approved experiment-specific templates created in Microsoft Excel that relay quantitative data and qualitative comments. Participating institutions were not required to use the templates to report in academic year 2000–2001, though the vast majority did. Institutions did not report consistent quantitative data before 2000–2001 because of a lack of formal reporting standards.

Previous analyses of the Experimental Sites Initiative relayed the results of the experiments as reported by participating institutions through the reporting templates. This analysis will also characterize the data and comments provided by participating institutions. It will, however, take previous efforts one step further. It will provide a comparison of outcomes as a function of participation in the Experimental Sites Initiative. Outcomes of interest include the propensity of students at experimental and nonexperimental institutions for default and the degree to which students' academic progress may be helped or hindered by the Initiative.

Outline

Section I of this report will describe each experiment. Data reported by participating institutions will be summarized, as will the open-ended comments provided by participants. Additionally, the comments of participants in the Experimental Sites Initiative, Spring Conference focus group, will be incorporated as their comments apply to each experiment. Generally, participants support the experiments in which they participate and argue for broader application.

Section II discusses the results of the comparative analyses. Here we ask questions such as, "Can the relaxation of exit counseling requirements be associated with the probability of default?" "Is the disbursement of loan funds for 30-days to first-time, first-year borrowers correlated with higher freshman withdrawal rates?" We ask these questions in a comparative context. Because the ability to benefit initiative is a self-contained experiment with well-defined experimental and control groups within participating institutions, a comparison with nonparticipating institutions is not required.

³ 4,492 private, for-profit institutions are identified in the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS). The Postsecondary Education Participants System identifies 1,912 proprietary schools in addition to 495 foreign schools. The institutions in IPEDS are not necessarily Title IV eligible.

The source of data for the CDS is *The Annual Survey of Colleges of the College Board and Data Base, 2002-03*. Copyright 2002 College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved. The CDS contains a wealth of information concerning the characteristics of postsecondary institutions and was an important source of data for these analyses.

A technical appendix accompanies this report. The reader is referred to this appendix as a source of greater detail concerning the data, the variables, and the methodologies used in the comparative analyses. Section II of this report will contain explicit reference to the appendix tables that are relevant to each discussion.

SECTION I. DESCRIPTION OF THE EXPERIMENTS AND SUMMARIZATION OF RESULTS AS REPORTED BY PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

A. LOAN PRORATION FOR GRADUATING BORROWERS

An undergraduate may borrow up to the annual limit for the student's year in school subject to an estimation of the student's need. Under 34 CFR 682.204(a), (d) for the FFELP, and 34 CFR 682.203(a), (c) for the Direct Loan program, however, loans must be prorated if the borrower has a remaining period of study that is shorter than a full academic year. The loan amount is prorated by multiplying the student's annual limit by a coefficient equal to the number of hours (or weeks) for which the student is registered divided by the total number of hours (or weeks) in the academic year. Graduating students at institutions participating in the Experimental Sites Initiative loan proration experiment are not subject to this limitation. However, Title IV funds are not available to defray certain costs that graduating students may incur.

Loan proration was designed to limit the Federal Government's exposure to default. It carries the additional benefit that it decreases the student's loan principal. Many have argued, however, that prorating loans, especially for soon-to-be graduating students, can have an adverse affect on their prospects for graduation. Although a student's direct expenses, such as tuition and books, may decrease in proportion to the number of hours for which they are registered, their indirect expenses, such as room and board, do not. Because of a lack of funds, students may have to delay their graduation or, in extreme cases, drop out.

Overwhelmingly, participating institutions do not believe that loan proration has any affect on a student's probable date of graduation. Seniors, noted the University of California at Riverside, simply do not withdraw when they are close to graduation. Holy Cross College added that, if a student were to withdraw close to graduation, it would most likely be because of an unavoidable circumstance, such as a health concern. Of course, if loan proration did negatively impact graduation rates or delay graduation, it would not be in the interest of the Federal government. As Colorado State University wrote, a "degreed" student is far less likely to default than one who has not graduated. Additionally, the sooner students graduate, the sooner they can begin repayment.

Colleges and universities participating in the experiment cited other problems they felt were more prevalent. Specifically, if a student's source for subsidized loans is cut off, he or she may have to resort to other, more expensive alternatives. These may include unsubsidized State and Federal loans, loans from private sources, or even credit cards. Regardless of the source of alternate funds, the student's debt burden is increased. Concordantly, the student's probability of default rises as payments on Federally subsidized loans are ignored in favor of payments for the more expensive, more aggressively collected, alternative loans.

Indirect expenses associated with attending a postsecondary institution do not necessarily diminish with a student's course load. Institutions participating in this experiment note that, for the case of students on the cusp of graduation, indirect expenses may actually rise. Students may begin to incur job search expenses. They may need help with resume preparation or may need to pay for examinations that qualify them for graduate school. Although the student loan programs

were designed to help a student meet his or her educational expenses, it is hard to argue with the proposition that the smoother a student’s transition to the workforce is, the more likely it is that he or she will quickly begin repayment.

Experimental sites participants also declare that not having to prorate loans benefits the institution as well as the student. San Diego State University described “the time, effort and administrative cost committed to prorating loans” as an ineffective use of resources that could be better applied to customer service. Some see loan proration as something of a futile exercise. This is because, as Indiana University at Bloomington writes, for example, “there is almost no correlation between the student’s anticipated graduation date at the time of admission and the student’s actual graduation date at the time the degree is granted.” Students may, or may not, declare their intent to graduate in a timely fashion, and as frequently as not, the student’s estimation of the date is in error. In short, identifying graduating students who might be subject to loan proration is not an easy task.

Members of the Experimental Sites Initiative Spring Conference focus group echoed the sentiments of Indiana University at Bloomington. They related that their institutions have a difficult time determining who is eligible for graduation because it is largely a self-declared process. Even if students do declare themselves ready for graduation, this does not necessarily mean that they will do so.

Participants in this experiment are predominantly 4-year, public institutions. Table 2 indicates that, of the 11,472 students who received nonprorated loans, only 1.26 percent (144) withdrew before the end of the term. Almost 88 percent (10,061) graduated as scheduled. This compares favorably with the percentage of students receiving prorated loans who graduated. A total of 6,357 students received prorated loans, with 5,031 graduating as scheduled (79%).

Table 2. Loan Proration Experiment Participants’ Self-reported Values

Loan Proration–Institution Self-reported Values			
	Sum	Mean	Percentage
Enrollment (from CDS)	848,994	14,637.8	
Number of Title IV recipients*	577,953	10,139.5	
Total FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan volume*	\$3,165,566,036	\$54,578,725	
Total Federal Pell volume*	\$472,146,459	\$8,584,481	
Total campus-based volume*	\$383,357,475	\$7,099,213	
Most recent self-reported default rate*	NA	1.6	
2) Number of graduating students with FFEL/Direct loan funds	83,780	1,074.1	
3) Number of students in (2) whose loans would have been subject to loan proration in their graduating term	20,792	263.2	
3a) Number of students in (3) who actually received nonprorated loans	11,472	208.6	
3b) Number of students in (3a) who graduated	10,061	182.9	
3c) Number of students in (3a) who withdrew before end of term	144	1.8	

Loan Proration–Institution Self-reported Values			
	Sum	Mean	Percentage
3d) Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (3c) who withdrew before the end of the term	\$122,753	\$1,594	
3e) Number of students in (3a) who completed term (not necessarily graduated)	12,172	156.1	
4) Number of students in (2) who received prorated loans in their graduating term	6,357	80.5	
4a) Number of students in (4) who graduated	5,031	65.3	
4b) Number of students who withdrew before end of term	45	0.6	
4c) Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (4b) who withdrew before the end of the term	\$52,359	\$671	
4d) Number of students in (4) who completed term (not necessarily graduated)	4,724	62.2	
O1) Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower [14 institutions reporting]	19.7	1.4	
O2) Estimated savings in administrative costs per borrower [13 institutions reporting]	\$234	\$18	
Students receiving non-prorated loans who withdrew			1.26 %
Students receiving non-prorated loans who graduated			87.7 %
Students receiving prorated loans who withdrew			.007 %
Students receiving prorated loans who graduated			79 %

*These figures are taken from the demographic reporting template and do not necessarily correspond to experiment-specific entries.

A comparative analysis between participating schools and non-participating schools of default and graduation rates regarding the loan proration waiver can be found on pages 27-28, Section II-A.

B. Overaward Tolerance and the Disbursement of Loan Funds

The regulation regarding overawards states that schools must correct any overawards that occur prior to the full disbursement of a loan. The FFEL/DL loan programs have a provision that allows a \$300 tolerance if a student has Federal Work Study (FWS). If there is no FWS in the student’s aid package, an overaward threshold is not allowed under FFEL/DL. The regulatory relief in the experiment, however, exempts the correction of overawards for FFEL and DL of \$300 or less that arise before the loan is fully disbursed.

Institutions participating in the overaward tolerance experiment overwhelmingly endorse it. They see the benefits of overaward tolerance as primarily accruing to themselves, but also suggest that students benefit. Students are able to budget their resources earlier and more accurately, incur less paperwork, and avoid frustrations from what they perceive as needless bureaucratic regulation. In some instances, they avoid the additional expense of late charges (University of North Carolina, Wilmington).

Participating institutions argue that overaward tolerance greatly reduces their administrative burden. A comment from the State University of New York College at Brockport is typical.

Each overaward takes an average of five minutes. This represents a saving of 25.75 hours in the Financial Aid office. It is also a saving in the Bursar’s Office. Each

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVE

such adjustment requires a total of 27 minutes and \$3.00 in resources (billing, postage, supplies, etc.) between the Financial Aid and Bursar’s Offices. This represents a total saving of 164.80 staff hours and \$927.00 in other resources. Using an average of \$29.05 per hour, this represents a total savings of \$5,714.44.

As reported by participating institutions, the occurrence of overawards of \$300 or less is relatively rare. From Table 3 it can be calculated that only 2 percent of all students with FFEL/Direct Stafford loans had overawards. The total amount of these overawards amounted to only .07 percent of all FFEL/Direct Stafford loan funds.

In contrast, and in addition to potential cost savings, the flexibility of overaward tolerance has considerable utility. A focus group participant provided an example. In one year, State grants were late. Nonetheless, financial aid administrators at the participant’s institution were able to process awards on time because they could estimate need based on previous year’s state aid. Knowing that they could take advantage of the overaward tolerance gave them the leeway they needed to make awards to students without having to recalculate once student state aid was received. This was a great benefit, not only to the financial aid office but also to students. Another commentator from the same State whose institution does not participate in the overaward tolerance experiment related that they experienced this same delay in the award of state grant aid. As a result, they had to repackage awards. “It just messed up everything.” And the perception on the part of students, added another participant, is that repackaging means they will have their aid decreased. Another commentator whose institution does not participate in the experiment stated that large tuition increases in New York were likely to have an unknown affect on student awards. They would very much like to have the flexibility to proceed with aid packaging knowing that, with overaward tolerance, the probability that they might have to reinitiate the process would be diminished.

Overawards of \$300 or less are usually the result of the “tweaking” of awards by outside agencies (Minnesota State University, Moorhead). They may also be the result of adjustments in State and scholastic departmental awards. Whatever the source, institutions in the overawards experiment do not believe that they, or their students, should bear the cost of these adjustments.

Table 3. Overaward Tolerance Experiment Participants’ Self-reported Values

Overaward Tolerance–Institution Self-reported Values			
	Sum	Mean	Percentage
Enrollment (from CDS)	564,103	14,102.6	
Number of Title IV recipients*	380,732	10,019.3	
Total FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan volume*	\$1,887,623,592	\$47,190,590	
Total Federal Pell volume*	\$361,185,062	\$9,261,155	
Total campus-based volume*	\$188,719,758	\$4,966,309	
Most recent self-reported default rate*	NA	1.9	
2) Total number of students who received FFEL/Direct Stafford loans	337,872	8,446.8	
3) Total dollar amount for students receiving FFEL/Direct Stafford loan funds	\$1,829,048,867	\$45,726,222	
4) Total number of students with loan funds overawarded by \$300 or less	6,843	175.5	
5) Total amount of overawards for students overawarded by \$300 or less	\$1,210,378	\$31,035	

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVE

Overaward Tolerance—Institution Self-reported Values			
	Sum	Mean	Percentage
6) Number of students with loan fund with overawards of \$100 or less	2,220	56.9	
7) Number of students with loan funds with overawards \$100–\$200	1,456	37.3	
8) Number of students with loan funds with overawards \$200.01–\$300	3,251	83.4	
9) Average amount of overaward for those with overawards of \$300 or less	\$5,760	\$148	
O1) Average cost of attendance for FFEL/Direct Stafford loan population [12 institutions reporting]	\$202,442	\$16,870	
O2) Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower [5 institutions reporting]	2.6	0.5	
O3) Estimated savings in administrative costs per borrower [5 institutions reporting]	\$39.7	\$7.9	
O4) Change in percent of borrowers who received overawards [4 institutions reporting]	NA	20.0	
Students with FFEL/DL that had overawards			2 %
FFEL/DL funds that were overawarded by \$300 or less			.07 %

*These figures are taken from the demographic reporting template and do not necessarily correspond to experiment-specific entries.

A comparative analysis between participating schools and non-participating schools of default and retention rates regarding the overaward tolerance waiver can be found on pages 28-29, Section II-B.

C. THE INCLUSION OF LOAN FEES IN THE COST OF ATTENDANCE

Financial aid administrators are required by statute to include loan fees in the calculation of a student’s cost of attendance (COA). Institutions participating in this experiment are given the option of including loan fees in the calculation of student need in special circumstances or at the borrower’s request. Not including loan fees in the COA calculation allows for a quasi-customized adjustment of aid levels, potential reduction of student loan principal, and possible easing of the administrative burden associated with the calculation of COA.

Institutions participating in the loan fees in COA initiative generally agree that it has the potential for reducing student indebtedness. Colorado State University reports that by not including loan fees in the calculation of COA, student indebtedness was reduced by \$2 million. The inclusion of loan fees would have distributed unnecessary funds to over 90 percent of its students. The University of California, Santa Cruz, concurred, adding that it “believes that including loan fees in the cost of attendance only increases student indebtedness. Students are generally able to absorb the loan origination cost without difficulty.” In fact, when offered the opportunity, only a small percentage of students elected to include loan fees in the estimation of their COA. The University of California, Riverside, relates that only 295 out of 7,637 borrowers (3.9%) requested that loan fees be included. Overall, only 15.6 percent of FFEL/DL borrowers at participating institutions had loan fees included in their COA calculation (Table 4).

Aside from financial prudence, one reason most students refrain from adding loan fees to their COA calculation, institutions report, is that doing so has a minimal impact on their loan funds eligibility. In the majority of cases, students are already near, or at, maximum award levels so increasing the estimate of their cost of attendance will have little to no effect on their final award. Another institution states that it adds loan fees to the COA calculation only when students request that their eligibility be increased to the maximum. Only 10 percent of its student borrowers could benefit in this way in AY01–02. Generally, costs are rising at postsecondary institutions so quickly that the inclusion of loan fees to the calculation of student need is usually unnecessary for students to qualify for the maximum award, according to participating institutions.

Focus group participants concurred. The reality is, stated one commentator, that loan fees have almost no impact on COA calculations today. Ten years ago, loan fees could be as much as 7 or 8 percent, he related. In his home State of Pennsylvania, for the last 2 years, loan fees sum to 0 percent of loan principle. In North Carolina, the majority lender, the College Foundation, is also at zero fees. Ninety to 92 percent of a North Carolina commentator’s students use the services of the College Foundation so, for all students, the added cost is a very small percentage of total loan funds—certainly not enough to justify the effort.

Institutions largely report favorable results concerning the influence of this experiment on the operations of their student financial aid offices. Table 4 displays that, for the eight institutions reporting, participating in the loan fees in COA experiment resulted in a savings of slightly less than .4 of a work hour and almost \$75 per borrower. For Holy Cross College, “Not having to calculate loan fees into the cost of attendance simplifies the overall loan processing system and allows for the use of standardized budgets for all students within a given residential category.” The University of California, Riverside, adds that participation in the experiment resulted in a significant reduction in workload for its counselors who would otherwise have to “review, edit, recalculate, and revise awards to reflect the final correct loan fees for students who elect not to borrow or choose to borrow less than the amount they are initially offered.” The inference is that by removing loan fees from the COA, award amounts can be reduced without requiring a complete recalculation of student need.

Other institutions also related a perception of increased flexibility. Specifically, they stated that the option of including loan fees presented them with an opportunity to correct overawards in a reasonably simple fashion, avoiding any negative impact on student loan fund eligibility that the overaward may otherwise have created. Oklahoma State University describes a result of the experiment as an increased opportunity for students to attend school: “By not including the fees as part of the original financial aid package, it allows us the flexibility to eliminate overawards, thus increasing the opportunities for some students to remain in school.”

Not all participating institutions believe that the experiment has reduced their administrative costs and workload. At Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, students electing to have loan fees included in their COA estimate must have their aid request reviewed and packaged individually, thus increasing the workload for financial aid counselors.

Institutions that suggested that the experiment reduced their burden and increased their flexibility frequently added that they were able to transfer these benefits to their students in the form of increased individual service and attention.

Table 4. Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance Experiment Participants’ Self-reported Values

Loan Fees–Institution Self-reported Values			
	Sum	Mean	Percentage/Amount
Enrollment (from CDS)	647,569	14,390.4	
Number of Title IV recipients*	\$455,882	\$10,602	
Total FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan volume*	\$2,546,417,092	\$56,587,046	
Total Federal Pell volume*	\$389,771,933	\$9,064,464	
Total campus-based volume*	\$339,577,244	\$8,085,172	
Most recent self-reported default rate*	NA	1.5	
2) Total number of students received FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan funds	504,610	9,174.7	
3) Total loan fund for all students receiving FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan funds	\$3,031,073,906	\$55,110,435	
4) Total number of students for whom loan fees included as part of COA	78,693	1,430.8	
5) Total amount of loans for students in (4) who have loan fees included	\$650,957,177	\$11,835,585	
6) Total amount of loan fees included in COA for students in (4)	\$18,924,807	\$344,087	
7) Number of students for whom loan fees were NOT included in COA	426,444	7,753.5	
8) Total number of students who did NOT have loan fees included in their COA, who received the maximum annual loan limit for the award year	228,282	4,390.0	
9) Total number of students who could have had the loan fees included in their cost of attendance	309,479	5,951.5	
O1) Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower [8 institutions reporting]	NA	0.39	
O2) Estimated savings in administrative costs per borrower (Q4_O2) [8 institutions reporting]	\$598.9	\$74.9	
Borrowers who had loan fees included in COA			15 %
Borrowers who did not have loan fees included in COA			85 %
Average amount for whom loan fees were included in COA			\$240

*These figures are taken from the demographic reporting template and do not necessarily correspond to experiment-specific entries.

A comparative analysis between participating schools and non-participating schools of default and retention rates regarding the loan fees in COA waiver can be found on page 29, Section II-C.

D. CREDIT OF TITLE IV FUNDS TO OTHERWISE NONALLOWABLE INSTITUTIONAL CHARGES

Under current regulations, institutions must attain written authorization from a student or parent to apply Title IV funds to otherwise nonallowable institutional charges. The intent of these regulations is to ensure that institutions apply Title IV funds exclusively to educational costs. The experiment allows participating institutions exemption from this requirement, providing

administrative relief and flexibility for institutions. Institutions no longer have to spend valuable administrative work hours acquiring authorization from students or parents when they wish to apply Title IV funds to other student expenses such as payment of library charges, parking fees, student health charges, etc. In all cases, however, students must be made aware of the policy and procedures for applying current aid to otherwise nonallowable institutional charges.

The experiment requires that participating institutions report on those students who declined automatic crediting of their accounts, with the presumption that students might object to the use of Title IV funds in this manner. The results of the experiment indicate that this does not appear to be the case. According to Table 5, about one-tenth of 1 percent of all Title IV recipients declined automatic crediting of their accounts for otherwise nonallowable institutional charges. Individually, participating institutions indicate that most students are satisfied with this procedure. The University of Illinois at Chicago, for instance, notes that “the overwhelming majority of students prefer to have their aid pay their costs, including library and lab fees, etc.” It goes on to note that “[students] do not distinguish between allowable and nonallowable costs.” Most other institutions indicate that students are quite comfortable with the procedure and report that often no students decline the automatic crediting.

The practical effect of allowing institutions to automatically credit student accounts is illustrated by comments made by administrators at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

Students are not allowed to maintain registration for classes unless the appropriate portion of full semester charges is paid by the student. The automatic crediting is viewed as a valuable service for students, by both the Financial Aid Office and the students themselves, since it helps prevent the problem of class cancellation and subsequent re-registration when available aid is sufficient to cover institutional charges.

When it comes to the relief of administrative burden, most participating institutions appeared enthusiastic about the experiment. Colorado State University indicates that its financial aid office saves time because it does not have to explain to each student why a refund was issued and when there was a balance due. Similarly, at Michigan State University, “office staff were relieved of the burden of mailing out, collecting and tracking the authorization form.”

Participating institutions also stress the fact that the amount of Title IV funds credited to traditionally nonallowable institutional charges represent a very small percentage of all Title IV funds disbursed at these institutions. As indicated in Table 5, only 4 percent of Title IV funds at institutions participating in this initiative went to traditionally nonallowable institutional charges.

**Table 5. Credit of Title IV Aid to Nonallowable Institutional Charges Experiment
Participants’ Self-reported Values**

Institutional Charges - Institution Self-reported Values			
	Sum	Mean	Percentage
Enrollment (from CDS)	459,751	14,830.7	
Number of Title IV recipients*	303,270	9,782.9	
Total FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan volume*	\$1,684,082,464	\$54,325,241	
Total Federal Pell volume*	\$241,836,107	\$8,061,204	
Total campus-based volume*	\$383,047,925	\$13,208,549	
Most recent self-reported default rate*	NA	1.4	

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVE

Institutional Charges - Institution Self-reported Values			
	Sum	Mean	Percentage
3) Total Number of Title IV aid recipients	300,563	9,695.6	
4) Total dollar amount of Title IV funds for Title IV aid recipients	\$2,183,440,249	\$70,433,556	
5) Total amount of Title IV aid credited to nonallowable institutional charges	\$86,673,025	\$3,466,921	
6) Percentage of students declining automatic credit to nonallowable institutional charges	NA	4.9	
7) Number of students declining automatic credit of Title IV aid to nonallowable institutional charges	447	14.4	
8) Number for whom Title IV aid was credited to nonallowable institutional charges	118,588	4,561.1	
9) Number of students who used some of their 2001–2002 aid for credit to nonallowable institutional charges, who either graduated or were able to continue their enrollment into the following semester	77,706	3532.1	
10) Number of students who take advantage of the crediting to nonallowable charges provision for multiple semesters	50,128	2,506.4	
O1) Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower (Q5_O1) [2 institutions reporting]	0.33	0.17	
O2) Estimated savings in administrative costs per borrower [2 institutions reporting]	\$5.67	\$2.84	
Title IV funds credited to non-allowable institutional charges			4 %
Students for whom Title IV aid was credited to non-allowable charges			39 %

*These figures are taken from the demographic reporting template and do not necessarily correspond to experiment-specific entries.

A comparative analysis between participating schools and non-participating schools of default and retention rates regarding the crediting Title IV aid to nonallowable charges waiver can be found on page 30, Section II-D.

E. CREDIT OF TITLE IV AID TO PRIOR TERM CHARGES

Student permission is normally required of institutions before crediting charges from a prior term, in a previous academic year, with funds from Title IV disbursements. This experiment eliminates the requirement and allows the institution to apply Title IV funds to charges for which they were not originally intended (for example, outstanding charges from a prior term and not a current term) to evaluate the effect, if any, on student retention. As in the application of Title IV aid to traditionally nonallowable institutional charges, students must be made aware of the policy and procedures for applying current aid to prior term charges.

Several participating institutions specifically mentioned that no student declined the option of automatic crediting of prior term charges with Title IV funds. Kent State University mentions, “many students ... expect this option.” Because most charges amounted to less than \$500, the setback did not necessarily cause hardships for the students. “Over 80 percent of the students owed less than \$250. Students were able to make up that money by working a little more or reducing their expenses,” reports Colorado State University. At Southwest Missouri State University, the average amount affected was \$190: “... students do not experience difficulty in receiving less money for the semester.”

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVE

In addition, the experimental conditions led to positive benefits, such as a decrease in administrative work and an increase in retention. Michigan State University cites a decrease in the issuance of short-term emergency loans, which would have covered outstanding charges prohibiting a student from attending class. As institutions were spared the work that would have gone into contacting students and parents for the necessary permission, Iowa State reports that “participation in this experiment has resulted in superior customer service for our students.” In addition, Montana State University in Bozeman reported that foregoing written permission had “improve[d] student services and ease[d] administrative burden.” According to Kent State University, “Exemption from this regulation has saved over 23,000 pieces of paper that would have had to have been printed, mailed, collected, tabulated and entered into our mainframe.”

Also as a result of this experiment, many students were allowed continued attendance that may have been otherwise withheld from them. Southwest Missouri State University reports that “the removal of this obstacle has facilitated students’ continued enrollment, increasing retention,” partly because “students who owe ‘back’ charges become encumbered, causing them to be dropped from classes and have the services of many offices limited or terminated.” At the University of Illinois in Chicago, 22 students “would have had no other recourse except to withdraw from school” had it not been for this provision. The conditions of this experiment “eliminate[d] the problem of class cancellation and subsequent late re-registration for a large number of students” at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale. This experiment has “resulted in fewer collection issues for the Business Office and more on-time paid accounts” at the Iowa State University of Science and Technology.

**Table 6. Credit of Title IV Funds to Prior Term Charges Experiment
Participants’ Self-reported Values**

Prior Term–Institution Self-reported Values			
	Sum	Mean	Average Amt.
Enrollment (from CDS)	378,372	16,451.0	
Number of Title IV recipients*	251,920	10,953.0	
Total FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan volume*	\$1,414,803,663	\$61,513,203	
Total Federal Pell volume*	\$202,509,524	\$9,204,978	
Total campus-based volume*	\$354,986,091	\$16,904,100	
Most recent self-reported default rate*	NA	1.9	
3) Total number of students who had Title IV aid credited to prior term charges	28,847	1,254.2	
4) Total amount of Title IV aid credited to prior term charges for a prior year	\$10,790,323	\$490,469	
5) Number of students declining automatic crediting of Title IV aid to prior term charges for a prior award year.	0	0	
6) Percentage of students declining automatic credit to prior term charges for a prior award year	NA	0	
7) Number of students who used some of their 2001–2002 aid to pay 2000–2001 prior term charges, who either graduated or were able to continue their enrollment into the following semester	15,743	1,112	
8) Number of students who take advantage of the crediting to nonallowable charges provision for multiple semesters	17,216	1,324	

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVE

O1) Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower [3 institutions reporting]	NA	0.61	
O2) Estimated savings in administrative costs per borrower [3 institutions reporting]	NA	\$1,756	
Average amount of Title IV aid credited to prior term charges			\$374

*These figures are taken from the demographic reporting template and do not necessarily correspond to experiment-specific entries.

A comparative analysis between participating schools and non-participating schools of default and retention rates regarding the crediting Title IV aid to prior term charges waiver can be found on pages 30-31, Section II-E.

F. WAIVER OF MULTIPLE DISBURSEMENTS FOR SINGLE-TERM LOANS

Regulations require that institutions disburse single-term loans in two separate installments. Students receive half the loan at the beginning of the term and the other half at the midpoint. It is hypothesized that because the bulk of a student’s expenses are incurred at the beginning of a term, disbursing only a portion of his or her loan at that time can create hardships. Frequently, students must turn to their institutions for help in granting fee deferments, emergency loans, and other stop-gap measures. This, in turn, creates additional administrative burdens and costs for the institution’s financial aid office.

Under the conditions of this experiment, participating institutions can disburse the entire loan at the beginning of the term. Students benefit academically from this experiment because the disbursement of the entire loan at the beginning of the semester enables them to immediately fund course-related expenses and increasingly costly living expenses. Institutions report a benefit through a reduction in work hours and costs associated with disbursing a loan two times during the same semester. Furthermore, institutions state that they often have to provide emergency short-term loans to fill the gap in student expenses created by multiple disbursements, leading to an even greater administrative burden and stress to students.

Risks associated with disbursing single-term loans in one installment include the possibility that students may withdraw at mid-term after they receive their loan funds and eventually may default on a larger loan principal. At institutions participating in this experiment, this does not appear to be the case. As indicated in Table 7, the most recent self-reported default rate for participating institutions is 1.8 percent; only 1.3 percent of students receiving single-term loans withdrew before the midpoint of the term. Withdrawal and default rates among students, especially upper level students, do not appear to be adversely affected by a single disbursement. In some cases, the potential for withdrawal and default may be overstated. As administrators at Kansas State University indicate, “Since students who borrow for a single term are (often) upper-level students, the risk of withdrawing before the end of the term is very low. A single disbursement allows students to meet their financial obligations and devote more energy to their academic goals.” Table 7 also demonstrates that \$2,581,722 in Title IV loan funds was returned by students withdrawing before the mid-point of the term. This represents about one-half of 1 percent of all loan funds distributed to students at participating institutions with single-term loans.

Most participating institutions indicate that relief from multiple disbursements leads to a considerable reduction in administrative costs and work hours. Table 7 indicates that, on average, participating institutions that responded to these queries saved almost 1 hour per borrower in administrative work hours. At Holy Cross College, for instance, administrators indicate that the experiment relieves the business office of duplicate postings to student accounts, as well as the mailing costs associated with sending a second receipt to students. The University of California at Santa Cruz notes that “disbursing loans twice in a term is a labor-intensive process that does not serve our students well.”

One Spring Conference focus group participant felt that the experiences of her institution served as a case study on the benefits of disbursing single-term loans in one installment. Until September 30, 2002, her institution was subject to statutory exemption. That is, because her institution’s default rate was less than 10 percent, she was not required to distribute single-term loans in multiple disbursements. Now that this exemption has expired, her students and financial aid office are experiencing problems. Students are now relying increasingly on relatively expensive short-term loans. As a result, her financial aid office is working harder to provide students with enough money “up front.” Providing students with short-term, bridge loans, she declared, defeats the purpose of multiple disbursements.

**Table 7. Waiver of Multiple Disbursements of Single-term Loans Experiment
Participants’ Self-reported Values**

Multiple Disbursements–Institution Self-reported Values			
	Sum	Mean	Percentage
Enrollment (CDS)	1,131,113	13,627.9	
Number of Title IV recipients*	783,704	9,442.2	
Total FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan volume*	\$3,982,229,123	\$47,978,664.1	
Total Federal Pell volume*	\$678,134,231	\$8,806,938.1	
Total campus-based volume*	\$619,078,643	\$8,145,771.6	
Most recent self-reported default rate*	NA	1.8	
2) Number of students with single-term loans	146,672	1,767.1	
3) Total amount of loan funds for students in (2)	\$508,430,564	\$6,200,373	
4) Number of students withdrawing before midpoint of term	1,871	22.8	
5) Total amount of Title IV loan funds returned to Title IV for students withdrawing before the midpoint of the term	\$2,581,722	\$32,272	
6) Number of students completing the term	134,961	1,645.9	
O1) Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower [15 institutions reporting]	NA	0.8	
O2) Estimated savings in administrative costs [14 institutions reporting]	\$191,091	\$13,649	
Students withdrawing before midpoint of term			1.3 %
Loan funds returned by students withdrawing before midpoint of term			.005 %
Students completing with single term loans			92 %

*These figures are taken from the demographic reporting template and do not necessarily correspond to experiment-specific entries.

A comparative analysis between participating schools and non-participating schools of default, retention and graduation rates regarding the multiple disbursement waiver can be found on page 31, Section II-F.

G. WAIVER OF THE 30-DAY DELAY FOR THE DISBURSEMENT OF LOANS TO FIRST-YEAR, FIRST-TIME BORROWERS

To protect the interests of the Federal Government, the statute and the implementing regulations stipulate that loan funds for first-time, first-year borrowers not be disbursed until 30 days after the first day of classes. This proscription was instituted because of the relatively high probability of new students withdrawing from the institution within their first term. It has been suggested, however, that this restraint may lead to hardships for students because start-up costs are very high: access to funds is crucial during the first weeks of classes because housing costs usually involve an additional month's rent (security deposit); living spaces need to be furnished; and supplies, such as textbooks and other items essential to study, need to be purchased. Participants in this experiment were exempted from this 30-day delay requirement in an effort to assess the effects of this exemption on withdrawal rates.

At nearly every institution that provided commentary, less than 5 percent of first-time, first-year borrowers withdrew before 30 days into the term. Most reporting institutions reported figures of less than 2 percent. Oklahoma State University reported that two students withdrew within the 30-day time frame: "These two students represent less than 1/10 percent of the first-time freshman population." Generally, the number of students who did withdraw within the first 30 days was negligible in relation to the total number of students who accepted loans, according to participating institutions. Table 8 relates that of the 100,152 first-time, first-year borrowers at institutions participating in the experiment, only 612 (0.6%) withdrew within 30 days. On average, students who did withdraw returned \$1,032 of the Title IV loan funds distributed to them. At a few institutions, the number of students withdrawing within 30 days was zero. As a result, many reported that the delay was unnecessary.

A major advantage of the exemption to the 30-day delay requirement includes a reduction in stress on students as they attempt to finance their first month of classes. Pennsylvania State University reports: "These first-time college students can now focus on their studies and adapting to their new surroundings, thus adding to their chance of success." Furthermore, with the 30-day delay in place, many students might resort to emergency short-term loans from the institution or even credit cards to bridge the gap while waiting for the first loan checks to be disbursed. Both Michigan State University and Northern Arizona State University mentioned a decrease in the issuance of institutional emergency loans. Michigan State University further mentioned the savings in the administrative costs associated with not having to administer those emergency loans.

Additional merits of this experiment include immediately available funds for food, housing, and start-up supplies, such as textbooks, equipment, furnishings, and especially security deposits. Clemson University reported that "[t]he ability of these students to use any excess funds generated by Stafford Loans to purchase books and to pay for other noninstitutional charges relieves untold amounts of pressure on families and financial aid staff alike." Indiana University

Northwest cited “a potential continued lowering of the FFELP default rate which is now at 4.9%” and “a higher overall institutional retention rate,” which is echoed by the comments from many other participants.

Table 8. Exemption from the 30-Day Delay Experiment Participants’ Self-reported Values

Thirty-Day Delay–Institution Self-reported Values			
	Sum	Mean	Percentage/Amount
Enrollment (from CDS)	1,075,318	14,337.6	
Number of Title IV Recipients*	730,528	9,872.0	
Total FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan volume*	\$3,757,768,038	\$50,103,574	
Total Federal Pell volume*	\$621,213,483	\$9,003,094	
Total campus-based volume*	\$588,075,894	\$8,648,175	
Most recent self-reported default rate*	NA	1.7	
2) Number of first-time, first-year borrowers	100,152	1,335.4	
3) Total amount of Title IV loans for students in (2)	\$277,817,805	\$3,704,237	
4) Number of first-time, first-year students withdrawing within 30 days of enrollment	612	8.16	
5) Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (4)	\$631,349	\$8,649	
O1) Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower [12 institutions reporting]	14	1.1	
O2) Estimated savings in administrative costs [11 institutions reporting]	\$124,669	\$11,334	
First-time, first-year students withdrawing within 30 days of enrollment			0.6 %
Average amount of Title IV funds returned by students withdrawing within 30 days of enrollment			\$1,032
Average loan amount for first-time, first-year students			\$2,774

* These figures are taken from the demographic reporting template and do not necessarily correspond to experiment-specific entries.

A comparative analysis between participating schools and non-participating schools of default retention and withdrawal rates regarding the 30 day delay waiver can be found on page 32, Section II-G.

H. ALTERNATIVE ENTRANCE LOAN COUNSELING PROCEDURES

To decrease institutional default rates, regulations require that all institutions provide entrance counseling to students before disbursing Perkins, Direct, or FFELP loans. The regulations are intended to provide first-time borrowers information regarding their rights and responsibilities, especially when it comes to repayment of loans. Although there is some variation, depending on the type of loan, regulations generally require that institutions conduct and document this initial counseling to all first-time borrowers. The amendment to the HEA in 1998 eased the restrictions contained in these regulations by allowing counseling to be in person, by audiovisual presentation, or by interactive electronic means. Before the amendment, in-person counseling was required.

Although many institutions have taken advantage of the 1998 amendments to the HEA by employing less burdensome means of counseling, the Experimental Sites Initiative entrance loan counseling experiment allows even greater latitude for participating institutions. Participants use their experimental exemption to release loan funds immediately in the academic term, and conduct some type of counseling at a later date. In addition, participants are free from the cumbersome “entrance counseling certification” to maintain documentation in each student file to verify the entrance counseling performed. By further easing the restrictions on when and in what form entrance loan counseling may occur, institutional financial aid offices may benefit from savings in administrative costs and workload. It is hypothesized, however, that a relaxation in counseling requirements brings a higher potential for cost to the Federal Government through rising default rates. On the other hand, these regulations often create log jams at financial aid offices, increasing the likelihood that loans will not be disbursed to freshman students in need of loan funds for beginning-of-semester expenses, such as books and housing.

Most participating institutions responded positively to the easing of requirements concerning entrance loan counseling. Institutions took advantage of the choices and flexibility open to them under the experiment by employing alternative and creative means through which to accomplish counseling. Use of the Internet appears to be the most popular option. At Portland State University, for instance, links to its financial aid Web site direct students to entrance interview sites. Other institutions, such as Ohio State University, direct all borrowers to complete entrance loan counseling on the Department of Education’s Web site. Most institutions have found that the convenience and widespread use of the Internet among students results in far greater exposure to vital loan information than is the case under more traditional, in-person counseling sessions.

According to participating institutions, the easing of requirements appears to have had a number of positive results. First, most institutions indicated a reduction in administrative and financial costs associated with counseling. As Table 9 indicates, under these experimental conditions, institutions save an average of 1.3 administrative work hours and about \$29 in administrative costs per borrower. Clemson University writes, “Alternative entrance counseling practices, the integration of phone, Web and other computer-based technology, has allowed us to streamline the registration and payment process.”

In addition to reducing administrative costs, participating institutions also stress the importance of having the ability to redirect counseling to sources of information most relevant to individual borrowers. Indiana University at Bloomington, for instance, monitors most closely their highest risk borrowers (those who are having academic difficulty), while the University of Kansas also targets groups it feels may be most prone to default. In particular, the University of Kansas targets students who borrow up to their maximum allowable loan limit.

In all cases, participating institutions do not believe that their alternative means of entrance loan counseling threatens the integrity of the student loan programs through higher default rates. In most cases, they indicate that default rates have declined since the experimental procedures were implemented. Table 9 displays a default rate of 1.2 percent for the institutions—predominantly 4-year, public institutions—participating in this experiment.

**Table 9. Alternative Entrance Loan Counseling Procedures Experiment
Participants’ Self-reported Values**

Entrance Loan Counseling–Institution Self-reported Values			
	Sum	Mean	Average Amount
Enrollment (from CDS)	753,788	13,959.0	
Number of Title IV recipients*	535,530	10,298.7	
Total FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan volume*	\$2,935,992,832	\$54,370,238	
Total Federal Pell volume*	\$459,133,826	\$8,829,497	
Total campus-based volume*	\$372,591,654	\$7,305,719	
Most recent self-reported default rate*	NA	1.2	
2) Number of first-time borrowers	127,975	2,369.9	
3) Total loan funds for students in (2)	\$537,047,573	\$9,945,325	
4) Has the institution exempted certain groups?	YES: 13 NO: 42	NA	
O1) Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower [12 institutions reporting]	NA	1.30	
O2) Estimated savings in administrative costs per borrower [10 institutions reporting]	NA	\$29	
Average loan amount for first-time borrowers			\$4,197

*These figures are taken from the demographic reporting template and do not necessarily correspond to experiment-specific entries.

A comparative analysis between participating schools and non-participating schools of default and withdrawal rates regarding the entrance loan counseling waiver can be found on pages 32-33, Section II-H.

I. ALTERNATIVE EXIT LOAN COUNSELING PROCEDURES

Under current Federal statute and the implementing regulations, institutions are required to conduct in-person exit loan counseling, sometimes before issuing transcripts or even permission to graduate. The rationale lies within the value of having the institution explicitly remind the student of his or her financial responsibilities and to confirm the student’s understanding thereof. Because of the large number of borrowers, this often becomes a time-consuming and paperwork-intensive task. Under this experiment, participating institutions were released from the requirement of personal interaction and were permitted the flexibility to investigate other means of reminding borrowers of their responsibilities, including the use of the postal service and electronic communication. Additionally, they were not required to document the participation of each borrower.

Overwhelmingly, participating institutions expressed their pleasure with the extent of administrative and workload relief provided through the experiment. As seen in Table 10, 10 institutions reported an average savings in work hours per borrower of about 1 hour and 20 minutes. Nine institutions related that their average total savings in administrative cost was almost \$8,000. Their relief was the result of the flexibility the experiment provided in allowing them alternate means of communicating with their graduating students that are faster and more efficient.

Predominant among these alternate means of communication were Web-based methods. “The use of the online process has facilitated easier access to borrowers that have dropped out or graduated and have already left the area. It has also made the exit counseling information available to borrowers throughout their entire tenure rather than just at the time they are leaving school with established loan debt,” writes George Mason University. As in the entrance loan counseling experiment, several institutions opted to take advantage of existing online sources of information. Purdue University and Marian College advise their graduating students to take advantage of a Web-based program developed by Sallie Mae. Iowa State University advises its students to visit the Direct Loan Servicing Center’s Exit Interview site, while Arizona State uses Web sites developed by the Department of Education and the United Student Aid Group. Other reported forms of communication included special group sessions and telephone interviews. Many participating institutions were able to offer their graduating students, at their preference, the full range of these options, including in-person, one-to-one counseling. Several commenting institutions relayed that having a range of options was not only convenient for their student aid offices but was also well received by their student bodies. The University of Michigan states that since its migration to a Web-based form of counseling, student participation in exit counseling activities has increased by 10 percent. Table 10, however, shows that almost 10 percent of all final-term borrowers at experimental sites schools continued to receive in-person counseling.

Table 10 also relates that default rates at institutions participating in this experiment are relatively low. Georgia Southern University states that the relaxation of the in-person counseling requirement removes an obstacle to a student’s graduation, thus decreasing his or her probability of default. Many institutions concur with Georgia Southern University, including the Pennsylvania State University, who wrote: “Exit counseling does not appear to have an impact on the default rate ... graduation is the best way to prevent default.”

Table 10. Alternative Exit Loan Counseling Procedures Experiment Participants’ Self-reported Values

Exit Loan Counseling–Institution Self-reported Values		
	Sum	Mean
Enrollment (from CDS)	647,569	14,390.4
Number of Title IV recipients*	455,882	10,601.9
Total FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan volume*	\$2,546,417,092	\$56,587,046
Total Federal Pell volume*	\$389,771,933	\$9,064,464
Total campus-based volume*	\$339,577,244	\$8,085,172
Most recent self-reported default rate*	NA	1.5
2) Number of final-term borrowers	102,489	2329.30
3) Total amount of Title IV loans for students in (2)	\$1,151,298,075	\$26,774,374
4) Number of students in (2) attending in-person counseling sessions	9,965	232
O1) Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower [10 institutions reporting]	NA	1.34
O2) Estimated savings in administrative costs [9 institutions reporting]	\$71,421	\$7,936

*These figures are taken from the demographic reporting template and do not necessarily correspond to experiment-specific entries.

A comparative analysis between participating schools and non-participating schools of default and graduation rates regarding the exit loan counseling waiver can be found on page 33, Section II-I.

J. ABILITY TO BENEFIT EXAMINATIONS AND THE AWARD OF TITLE IV AID

To qualify for Title IV financial aid, a student must possess a high school diploma, a general equivalency diploma, or pass an independently administered ability to benefit (ATB) test. Institutions participating in this experiment, however, may waive this requirement and offer financial aid to those students who have successfully completed at least six credit hours of college level classes with a cumulative grade point average (g.p.a.) of “C” or better, without the benefit of federal student aid.

Participating institutions argue that this exemption provides an incentive for students who cannot demonstrate their ATB through traditional requirements to stay in school and that these students

perform at least as well academically as their counterparts. The consortium of 15⁴ 2-year colleges participating in this experiment overwhelmingly endorses it. Those providing comments find that students failing the ATB exams—usually the Wonderlic, CELSA, or TABE exams—actually perform satisfactorily on the math portion. The English-language portion of the tests is their downfall. Some students are able to overcome this language barrier and successfully complete at least six credit hours. Those who have completed the six credits continue to perform at least as well academically as students who passed the exam.

Table 11 reveals that, on average, students who failed the ATB exam, but completed at least six credit hours, attempted and completed more hours than the student body as a whole. Also, their grade point averages were higher. Compared to a random sample of financial aid recipients with high school diplomas, students who failed the ATB exam attempted and completed slightly fewer credit hours. Grade point averages are comparable. Students in the ATB experiment also compare favorably with the population of all students taking an ATB exam, the subsets of all students who failed the ATB exam, and those who passed.

In all cases, though, the differences in performance do not reach statistically significant levels [see tables AI.10.2 through AI.10.6 of the Technical Appendix]. These results support the conclusions of participating institutions that students failing an ATB exam, but completing six or more credit hours with a cumulative grade point average (g.p.a.) of “C” or better, perform at least as well academically as any other group of students at these institutions. In sum, the use of ATB exams to predict student success at these institutions and, thus, student ability to benefit from financial aid relative to other students is in question. Further, when one compares credits attempted and completed, as well as the overall grade point average of students passing or failing a departmentally approved ATB exam to the grade point average of regular students with high school diplomas, the students in the experiment fare as well as other matriculating students. The use of ATB exams as the only acceptable predictor of academic success does not appear to hold up. Since all aid recipients are subject to SAP standards, perhaps the ATB requirement poses an unnecessary initial obstacle to a small group of students.

Table 11. Ability to Benefit Experiment Participants’ Self-reported Values

Group	Avg. # Units Attempted	Avg. # Units Completed	Average Cum. GPA
Students enrolled in degree or certificate applicable classes	12.96	11.10	2.56
Random sample of FA recipients with HS diplomas/OR total # of FA recipients with HS diplomas	19.91	17.35	2.56
All Students required to take ATB test	14.10	11.67	2.36
All students who failed ATB test	12.61	8.65	2.15
All Students who passed ATB test	15.32	13.00	2.53
Students who failed ATB test but successfully completed 6 college units	19.13	15.77	2.61

⁴ Note that one institution did not have any students who would have qualified for participation. This reduces the effective number of participants to 14.

SECTION II. COMPARATIVE ANALYSES OF PARTICIPATING AND NON-PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

The overarching theme that emerges from the previous section is that institutions participating in the various experiments enthusiastically support them. In most cases, they relate that relief from requirements in the statute or regulations allows them to provide students with better service and streamline procedures within their financial aid offices. They also argue that the academic progress of their students is enhanced with little or no risk to the integrity of the student loan programs.

Recall that participating institutions are largely self-selected. They choose to participate in only those experiments that they perceive as having the potential to benefit their institutions and students. In light of the fact that few withdraw, it is safe to assume that the experiments are working for these institutions. Yet, should it be concluded from their data reports that a particular experiment can be broadly extended to all Title IV participating institutions, with the same benefits accruing to institutions and students and with minimal risk to the integrity of the programs?

Table 1 demonstrated that the institutions participating in the Experimental Sites Initiative are a rather homogeneous group. It is possible that the positive results accruing to participating institutions are as much a function of the characteristics of the institutions as they are of the experiments within which they participate. To examine this possibility, in the next section, comparative analyses between institutions participating in each experiment and those that do not are conducted.

In the beginning of the data collection efforts for the experiments, even though some of the waivers were not linked to default rates, institutions always included them. Since the information was readily available on the FY2000CDR, it was used in the comparative analysis.

A. LOAN PRORATION FOR GRADUATING BORROWERS EXPERIMENT

To examine outcomes under the loan proration for graduating borrowers experiment, four tests of association were conducted.

First, a logistic regression was run on an experimental graduation rate (EGR) drawn from the National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS). This EGR is discussed in greater detail in the Technical Appendix to this report. Briefly, it is calculated by dividing the number of students at, or near, their final year before graduation in AY01–02 who were recorded as graduated in June of 2002, by the total number of student borrowers at, or near, their final year before graduation in the same year. Technical Appendix Table AI.1.19 suggests, interestingly, that by *not* attending an institution that participates in the loan proration for graduating borrowers experiment, students increase their probability of graduation, as measured by the EGR. However, it should be underscored that loan proration applies to borrowers who have a remaining period of study

that is shorter than a full academic year. Students used to calculate this EGR may, or may not, qualify for prorated loans.

Technical Appendix Table AI.1.21 displays the results of a similar test where the population of interest is limited to borrowers in AY01–02 who attended part-time. That is, they were registered for more than half-time, but less than full-time credit hours. This is a population of particular interest in the loan proration for graduating borrowers experiment because it more closely approximates the group of students most likely to be affected. Unfortunately, there were not enough students in this rather specific population to produce an adequate model. As pointed out by the Spring Conference focus group, it is difficult to identify students on the verge of graduation. It may be even more difficult to identify, from existing data sources such as the NSLDS, part-time students nearing graduation. Focus group attendees affirmed that this is a difficult experiment to assess because it is always unclear who and what to measure.

Wilcoxon nonparametric comparisons are displayed in Technical Appendix Tables AI.1.23 through AI.1.26. These comparisons rank institutions on an outcome of interest. The institution with the lowest value for an outcome—for example, default—is given a rank of one, the institution with the next lowest value is given a rank of two, etc. Institutions are then grouped by whether they participate in an experiment. The groups are then compared to determine if one or the other is likely to contain more than a random share of institutions with a high or low rank. In agreement with the logistic regression on the EGR, the mean rank score is lower for institutions participating in the loan proration experiment, indicating a lower probability of graduation as measured by the EGR. However, the relationship is not statistically significant.

The final test for the loan proration is a logistical regression on the FY2000 Cohort Default Rate (Technical Appendix Table AI.1.17). The test indicates no statistically significant relationship between participation in the loan proration experiment and the probability of default.

In sum, there is some evidence from the logistic regression on the EGR that graduation rates are actually negatively impacted by the loan proration experiment. However, the EGR as calculated for this experiment may be inappropriate, and given that institutions find it difficult to identify students eligible for loan proration, it is possible that an appropriate measure cannot be developed. The Wilcoxon comparisons suggest that there is no relationship between experiment participation and graduation rates. Using the FY2000 CDR as a measure of default in AY01–02, there is no evidence to suggest that the experiment influences default rates either negatively or positively.

B. OVERAWARD TOLERANCE AND THE DISBURSEMENT OF LOAN FUNDS

Four tests were conducted to assess the risk to the Federal Government of continuing or expanding overaward tolerance. Technical Appendix Table AI.2.13, displays a logistic regression on the FY2000 CDR. Not one of the reporting variables for institutions participating in the overaward tolerance experiment reaches statistical significance. The table indicates that students at institutions not participating in any of the experiments have a slightly greater probability of default, but the experiment-specific indicator has no influence.

Technical Appendix table AI.2.17 relays the results of a logistic regression comparing an experimental retention rate (ERR) derived from NSLDS queries. It suggests that students at institutions not participating in the overawards experiment display a slightly lower, but statistically significant probability of not graduating or continuing their studies as measured from the fall of 2001 to the spring of 2002.

Technical Appendix tables AI.2.19 through AI.2.21 relay the Wilcoxon rank scores for the examination of the FY2000 CDR, the EDM, and the ERR. In the cases of the CDR and the EDM, the average rank is lower for institutions participating in the experiment than it is for those that do not. The differences are statistically significant and indicate that lower default rates are associated with institutions participating in the experiment. The rank comparison for the ERR indicates a statistically significant, higher average rank for institutions participating in the overaward experiment. This would associate institutions that participate in the experiment with higher student retention (or, conversely, lower withdrawal rates).

Together, the above described tests offer little evidence that the integrity of the student loan programs is threatened by allowing institutions discretion in revising student overawards of \$300 or less. If anything, the propensity to default at institutions participating in the experiment is likely lower than it is at nonparticipating institutions. This is probably because of the care given to the selection of institutions for participation. Additionally, the probability that a student will continue his or her studies if he or she attends an institution participating in the experiment is higher than if they do not.

C. THE INCLUSION OF LOAN FEES IN THE COST OF ATTENDANCE

Six tests were performed to assess the effects of the inclusion of loan fees in the COA experiment. Technical Appendix tables AI.3.12 and AI.3.14 present the result of the logistic regressions on the FY2000 CDR and the EDM. In the case of the CDR, students at institutions not participating in any experiment show a slightly greater propensity for default. However, students at institutions not participating in the loan fees in the COA experiment display lower odds of default. In the more contemporaneous EDM regression, the experiment-specific indicator variable becomes insignificant.

Technical Appendix table AI.3.16 displays the results of a logistic regression on the ERR. No statistically significant relationship emerges between experiment participation and retention rate in this regression.

The Wilcoxon comparisons for the FY2000 CDR and the EDM are presented in Technical Appendix tables AI.3.18 and AI.3.19, respectively. In both comparisons, default rates are significantly lower at institutions participating in the experiment than they are at institutions that do not participate. Table AI.3.20 presents a similar comparison for the ERR. Institutions participating in the loan fees in the COA experiment display significantly higher retention rates than those who do not.

Taken together, these six tests would indicate that there is no relationship, positive or negative, between default rates, retention rates, and participation in the loan fees in COA experiment.

D. CREDIT OF TITLE IV FUNDS TO OTHERWISE NONALLOWABLE INSTITUTIONAL CHARGES

Technical Appendix table AI.4.13 presents the results of the logistic regression on the FY2000 CDR. No variables derived from the nonallowable institutional charges reporting template reach statistical significance of a magnitude of influence equal to or greater than 5 percent. However, the model indicates that students in the FY2000 CDR, at institutions participating in the institutional charges experiment in AY01–02, were 25 percent more likely to default. Using the more contemporaneous EDM, this relationship is reversed (Technical Appendix table AI.4.15). Students at institutions not participating in the experiment were more than 12 times as likely to default.

The logistic regression on the ERR is displayed in Technical Appendix table AI.4.17. Interestingly, students attending institutions not participating in the experiment-show a somewhat higher probability of continuing their studies than do those who attend an institution that does participate. From the experiment-specific reporting template, though, for institutions providing answers to both questions, 77,706 students who used some of their 2001–2002 aid for crediting of their accounts nonallowable institutional charges, out of a total of 85,686 (90.7%), either graduated or were able to continue their enrollment into the following semester.

The Wilcoxon comparisons, in Technical Appendix tables AI.4.19 and AI.4.20, suggest that by either the measure of the FY2000 CDR or the EDM, institutions participating in the nonallowable institutional charges experiment had a statistically significant, lower default rate. Technical Appendix table AI.4.21 indicates that higher retention rates may be associated with institutions that participate in the experiment. This is in direct contradiction with the results of the logistic regression for the ERR.

E. CREDIT OF TITLE IV FUNDS TO PRIOR-TERM CHARGES

Six tests were conducted to gauge the impact of allowing the crediting of Title IV funds to prior-term charges. Technical Appendix table AI.5.11 presents the results of the logistic regression on the FY2000 CDR, and table AI.5.13 displays the results for the EDM. The regression on the EDM relates that students at institutions not participating in any experiment are somewhat more likely to default than those at experimental institutions. The regression on the FY2000 CDR supports this outcome at a slightly higher level—a 13 percent increase in the relative odds of default for students not attending participating institutions. The EDM regression suggests that students are more likely to default if they attend an institution that does not participate in the prior-term charges experiment.

Technical Appendix table AI.5.15 relays the output of the logistic regression for the ERR. It establishes no statistically significant relationship between retention rates and participation in the prior-term charges experiment.

Technical Appendix tables AI.5.17, AI.5.18 and AI.5.19 present the Wilcoxon comparisons for the FY2000 CDR, the EDM, and the ERR. Both tests of default measures indicate that institutions that participated in this experiment had lower default rates than did those who did

not. A statistically significant relationship is established in the case of the EDM only. The comparison for the ERR suggests that institutions participating in this experiment had statistically significant, higher retention rates.

F. WAIVER OF MULTIPLE DISBURSEMENTS FOR SINGLE-TERM LOANS

To test the effects of suspending the requirement that single-term loans be disbursed in multiple installments, the usual complement of logistic regressions was run. Appendix table AI.6.10 presents the results for the FY2000 CDR and table AI.6.12 shows those for the EDM. Both report higher default rates for students at institutions that did not participate in the multiple disbursements experiment, as well as higher rates for those whose institutions did not participate in any of the Experimental Sites Initiative experiments.

Single-term loans are often awarded to students in their final term before graduation. To examine the effects of the experiment on the graduation rate of such students, the population under study was further subset. In particular, the number of students with single-term loans in spring 2002 was drawn from the NSLDS. We then queried the NSLDS to determine how many of these students had graduated as of June 30, 2002. From these two variables, we formed a graduation rate for single-term borrowers in spring 2002. The results of the logistic regression are presented in Technical Appendix table AI.6.14. What is remarkable in this regression is that—while controlling for other institutional characteristics—the odds of graduation for this particular subset of students are about 30 percent higher if they attend an institution that did not participate in this experiment.⁵ A regression was also run for the ERR, though the population was not subset to students with single-term loans. This regression (Appendix table AI.6.16) suggests that students attending institutions that do not participate in this experiment are somewhat more likely to graduate, or continue their studies, than are students who do attend such institutions.

Appendix table AI.6.18 displays the Wilcoxon comparison for the FY2000 CDR and table AI.6.19 portrays the identical test for the EDM. In both cases, there is statistically significant evidence to argue that default rates are lower at participating institutions than they are at institutions that do not participate in this experiment. Table AI.6.20 displays the results of the rank sum comparison for the single-term borrower EGR. Institutions that participate in this experiment rank lower than those who do not, in terms of this EGR, to a statistically significant extent. Note, however, that retention rates (AI.6.21) are higher for institutions that participate in the multiple disbursement of single-term loans experiment.

⁵ Of students with single-term loans in the Spring of 2002, the NSLDS records zero graduates for 53 of the institutions participating in this experiment. This translates to an EGR of zero for almost 69% of participating institutions included in the logistic regressions, and does not compare favorably with institutions not participating in the experiment (48%). The reader should note that this discrepancy seems too large to be accounted for by experiment participation and is, most likely, due to a differential in the speed with which student status is recorded within the NSLDS. A differential in the time it takes institutions to report student status will similarly effect retention rate calculations.

G. WAIVER OF THE 30-DAY DELAY FOR THE DISBURSEMENT OF LOANS TO FIRST-YEAR, FIRST-TIME BORROWERS

Logistic regressions were run on the FY2000 CDR and the EDM to assess the extent to which program integrity might be threatened by suspending the statute/regulations requiring that disbursement of loans to first-year, first-time borrowers be delayed for 30 days. Appendix table AI.7.9 displays the regression for the FY2000 CDR. The regression relates that there is no statistically significant relationship for students not attending an institution participating in the experiment with regard to default as measured by the FY2000 CDR. The regression on the EDM (Technical Appendix table AI.7.11) states that students at institutions not participating in the experiment display a slightly higher propensity for default, though the magnitude of influence (17%) is not great.

As an additional check, an analysis of the withdrawal rates for first-year, first-time borrowers was conducted. Appendix table AI.7.13 presents the results of the logistic regression. It indicates that first-year, first-time borrowers not attending an institution participating in the 30-day delay experiment are significantly more likely to withdraw than are students at institutions participating in the experiment. A regression for the ERR not subset to first-year, first-time borrowers suggests only that students at institutions not participating in this experiment are somewhat less likely to remain in school than are those who do attend a participating institution (Technical Appendix table AI.7.15).

Technical Appendix tables AI.7.17, AI.7.18, AI.7.19, and AI.7.20 provide the Wilcoxon comparisons for the FY2000 CDR, the EDM, the freshman withdrawal rate, and the ERR as calculated from the NSLDS. In all comparisons, the rate at institutions participating in the 30-day delay experiment is significantly more favorable than at institutions that do not participate.

H. ALTERNATIVE ENTRANCE LOAN COUNSELING PROCEDURES

The examination of alternative methods of conducting entrance loan counseling for borrowers includes four logistic regressions. Technical Appendix table AI.8.8 shows the results of the regression on the FY2000 CDR and table AI.8.10 displays those for the EDM. Technical Appendix table AI.8.12 looks at withdrawal rates for first-time, first-year borrowers in AY01–02, while table AI.8.14 examines the retention rate for all borrowers.

Appendix tables AI.8.8 and AI.8.9 provide no evidence that default rates are higher at institutions participating in this experiment. On the contrary, the regression on the EDM suggests that the odds of default for students not attending an institution participating in the entrance loan counseling experiment are about 30 percent higher than they would be otherwise.

The regression on withdrawal rates for first-time, first-year borrowers states that for students not attending an institution participating in the experiment, the odds of withdrawal are approximately 15 percent higher than for students attending an institution participating in the experiment. Students attending institutions not participating in the experiment would seem to show slightly greater propensities for retention, though the effect is very slight (about 6 percent).

Technical Appendix table AI.8.16 provides the Wilcoxon rank-sum over the FY2000 CDR. Appendix table AI.8.17 shows the same test for the EDM. In both instances, mean scores are significantly lower, indicating that default rates at institutions participating in this experiment are generally lower than at other institutions. Appendix table AI.8.18 shows the same test for a comparison of the withdrawal rates for first-year, first-time borrowers. Again, withdrawal rates are generally higher at institutions that do not participate in this experiment. The retention comparison, Technical Appendix table AI.8.19, suggests that students at institutions participating in the entrance loan counseling experiment are more likely to graduate, or continue their studies, than are students at other institutions.

I. ALTERNATIVE EXIT LOAN COUNSELING PROCEDURES

Comparisons of default outcomes through logistic regression are presented in Technical Appendix tables AI.9.8 and AI.9.9. For the regression on the FY2000 CDR (Table AI.9.8), there is weak indication that default rates are higher at institutions that do participate in the exit loan counseling experiment. It suggests that students at institutions not participating in any experiments have about 12 percent greater odds of default. The regression on the EDM (Table AI.9.8) confirms this relationship, proposing that the odds of default are 14 percent greater for students at institutions not participating in any Experimental Sites Initiative. However, this same regression suggests that students at institutions other than those participating in the exit loan counseling experiment have 10 percent *lower* odds of default and the relationship is statistically firmer than in the case of the FY2000 CDR.

An assessment of the difference in graduation rates at institutions participating in the experiment and those that do not is presented in Technical Appendix table AI.9.12. In this regression, the population of interest is students in what should be their final term before graduation. That is, we examine students at academic levels 4 or 5 in the spring of AY01–02 at 4-year institutions and students at academic level 2 in the same term at 2-year institutions. This population is then subset to those with an academic status of “graduated” as of June 30, 2002. The regression leads to the inference that students attending institutions participating in this experiment are more than *twice* as likely to graduate as students that do not attend participating institutions.

The Wilcoxon comparison in Technical Appendix table AI.9.18 confirms this relationship in graduation rates, but it does not do so at a strong/traditional level of statistical significance. Appendix table AI.9.19 is a comparison of retention rates and returns results favorable to institutions participating in the exit loan counseling experiment.

Finally, Technical Appendix tables AI.9.16 and AI.9.17 provide the Wilcoxon comparisons for the FY2000 CDR and the EDM. Note that the comparison on the EDM suggests that the probability of default at institutions participating in the exit loan counseling experiment is lower than those at other institutions. This is in direct contradiction with the results of the logistic regression on the EDM.

CONCLUSIONS

It is worth underscoring that institutions are selected for participation in the Experimental Sites Initiatives based on the merits of the experiments they propose and, to a lesser extent, the degree

to which they add to a representation of the diversity of U.S. postsecondary institutions. However, approval for participation in the initiatives is also based on an institution's integrity and history of compliance with Federal regulations. The institutions selected are well established and widely known. It is difficult to imagine that any institution selected for participation in the Initiative would pose a threat to the integrity of any Title IV program, and it is understood that these institutions would not participate in an experiment that could potentially endanger their students' futures. Unfortunately, through the self-nomination and subsequent selection of institutions, a bias may have been introduced into the experiments. In other words, because institutions were selected with an eye toward protecting the integrity of the programs, test results indicating that participation in an experiment increased graduation rates, or decreased default rates, may be less a result of the "experimental treatment" and more a result of the characteristics of the institution. It is for this reason that the comparative analyses, particularly the logistic regressions, were conducted.

The comparative analyses most frequently infer that there is no reason to suspect that the relaxation of statute and regulations endangers the interests of institutions, students, or the Government. In most cases, the analyses seem to indicate that the interests of these stakeholder groups are advanced. However, because of the selection bias, as well as the fact that all conclusions must be based on statistical inference and not controlled experiments, the reader should be cautioned against such extreme judgments. Instead, the results of the comparisons should be filtered through a sieve of common sense.

Good sources of common sense are the quantitative data and anecdotal evidence provided by the institutions participating in the Experimental Sites Initiative. It has been repeatedly stated in this report that institutions within the Initiative widely support the experiments in which they participate. These institutions argue that the easement of statute/regulations removes barriers to their students' academic progress and lessens their expense and workload, without endangering the interests of the Federal Government. The comparative analyses should be viewed as tests of their assertions.

By combining the Experimental Sites Initiative self-reported performance data with the results of the comparisons between participating and nonparticipating institutions, readers are invited to draw their own conclusions concerning the merits of relaxing the statute and regulations that surround each experiment.

Analysis & Data Collection for the Experimental Sites Initiative

GSA MOBIS Contract # GS-23F-9777H

April 30, 2003

Technical Appendix
Revised September 25, 2003

Submitted to:



Office of Federal Student Aid
US Department of Education
830 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20202

Submitted by:

ORC MACROSM
Macro International Inc.



Analysis of the Experimental Sites Initiative: Technical Appendix

GSA MOBIS CONTRACT NO. GS-23F-9777H

April 30, 2003

Revised: September 25, 2003

Submitted to:

Office of Federal Student Aid
U.S. Department of Education
830 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20202

Submitted by:

ORC Macro International Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.....	1
DATA SOURCES	2
VARIABLES	4
METHODOLOGIES.....	8
Appendix Table AI.1—Loan Proration for Graduating Borrowers.....	13
Table AI.1.1 Experimental Sites Initiative Reporting Template for Loan Proration for Graduating Borrowers.....	13
Table AI.1.2. Loan Proration Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region	14
Table AI.1.3. Loan Proration: Graduating Students with FFEL/Direct Loan Funds (Q2_2)	14
Table AI.1.4. Loan Proration: Students Whose Loans Would Be Subject to Proration in Graduating Term (Q2_3)	15
Table AI.1.5. Loan Proration: Students Who Received Nonprorated Loans (Q2_3a)	15
Table AI.1.6. Loan Proration: Students Who Received Nonprorated Loans and Graduated (Q2_3b)	16
Table AI.1.7. Loan Proration: Students Who Received Nonprorated Loans and Withdrew (Q2_3c)	16
Table AI.1.8. Loan Proration: Total Amount Returned to Title IV for Students in (3c) Who Withdrew Before the End of the Term (Q2_3d)	17
Table AI.1.9. Loan Proration: Students Who Received Nonprorated Loans Who Completed Term (Q2_3e).....	17
Table AI.1.10. Loan Proration: Number of Graduating Students Who Received Prorated Loans in Their Graduating Term (Q2_4)	18
Table AI.1.11. Loan Proration: Number of Students in Graduating Term Who Received Prorated Loans in Their Graduating Term and Graduated (Q2_4a).....	18
Table AI.1.12. Loan Proration: Number of Students in Graduating Term Who Received Prorated Loans in Their Graduating Term and Withdrew (Q2_4b).....	18
Table AI.1.13. Loan Proration: Total Amount Returned to Title IV for Students Who Withdrew before the End of Term (Q2_4c).....	19
Table AI.1.14. Loan Proration: Number of Students in Graduating Term Who Received Prorated Loans in Their Graduating Term and Completed Term (Q2_4d)	19
Table AI.1.15. Loan Proration: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours (Q2_O1).....	20
Table AI.1.16. Loan Proration: Estimated Savings in Administrative Cost Per Borrower (Q2_O2).....	20
Table AI.1.17. Loan Proration: Logistic Regression for FY00 Cohort Default Rate.....	21
Table AI.1.18. Loan Proration - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate	23
Table AI.1.19. Loan Proration - Logistic Regression for Experimental Graduation Rate (all potentially graduating students)	24
Table AI.1.20. Loan Proration: Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Graduation Rate (All Potentially Graduating Students)	26

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Table AI.1.21. Loan Proration - Logistic Regression for Experimental Graduation Rate (part-time potentially graduating students only). Model Invalid due to Quasi-Complete Separation of Observations.....	27
Table AI.1.22. Loan Proration: Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Graduation Rate (Part-Time Potentially Graduating Students Only)	30
Table AI.1.23. Loan Proration	31
Table AI.1.24. Loan Proration	31
Table AI.1.25. Loan Proration	32
Table AI.1.26. Loan Proration	32
 Appendix Table AI.2—Overaward Tolerance	 33
Table AI.2.1. Experimental Sites Initiatives Reporting Template for Overaward Tolerance	33
Table AI.2.2. Overaward Toleration Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region	33
Table AI.2.2. Overaward Toleration Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region	34
Table AI.2.3. Overaward Tolerance: Total Number of Students Who Received FFEL/Direct Stafford Loans (Q3_2).....	34
Table AI.2.4. Overaward Tolerance: Total Dollar Amount for Students Receiving FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan Funds (Q3_3)	35
Table AI.2.5. Overaward Tolerance: Total Number of Students With Loan Funds Overawarded by \$300 or Less (Q3_4).....	35
Table AI.2.6. Overaward Tolerance: Total Amount of Overawards for Students Overawarded by \$300 or Less (Q3_5).....	36
Table AI.2.7. Overaward Tolerance: Number of Students with Loan Fund Overawards of \$100 or Less (Q3_6).....	36
Table AI.2.8. Overaward Tolerance: Number of Students with Loan Fund Overawards of \$200–\$300 or Less (Q3_8).....	37
Table AI.2.9. Overaward Tolerance: Average Amount of Overaward for Those with Overawards of \$300 or Less (Q3_9).....	37
Table AI.2.10. Overaward Tolerance: Average Cost of Attendance for FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan Population (Q3_O1)	38
Table AI.2.11. Overaward Tolerance: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours Per Borrower (Q3_O2).....	38
Table AI.2.12. Overaward Tolerance: Estimated Savings in Administrative Costs Per Borrower (Q3_O3)	39
Table AI.2.13. Overaward Tolerance - Logistic Regression for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate	40
Table AI.2.14. Overaward Tolerance - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate	42
Table AI.2.14. Overaward Tolerance - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate	42
Table AI.2.15 Overaward Tolerance - Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Measure.....	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Table AI.2.16. Overaward Tolerance - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Rate.....	45
Table AI.2.16. Overaward Tolerance - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Rate.....	45
Table AI.2.17 Overaward Tolerance - Logistic Regression for Experimental Retention Rate.....	46
Table AI.2.18. Overaward Tolerance - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Retention Rate.....	48
Table AI.2.19. Overaward Tolerance.....	48
Table AI.2.20. Overaward Tolerance.....	49
Table AI.2.21. Overaward Tolerance.....	50
Appendix Table AI.3—Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance	51
Table AI.3.1. Experimental Sites Initiative Reporting Template for Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance.....	51
Table AI.3.2. Loan Fees in COA Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region.....	52
Table AI.3.3. Loan Fees in COA: Total Number of Students Who Received FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan Funds (Q4_2).....	52
Table AI.3.4. Loan Fees in COA: Total Loan Funds for All Students Receiving FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan Funds (Q4_3).....	53
Table AI.3.5. Loan Fees in COA: Total Number of Students for Whom Loan Fees Were Included in Loans as Part of COA (Q4_4).....	53
Table AI.3.6. Loan Fees in COA: Total Amount of Loans for Students in (4) Who Have Loan Fees Included (Q4_5).....	54
Table AI.3.7. Loan Fees in COA: Total Amount of Loan Fees Included in Cost of Attendance for Students in (4) (Q4_6).....	54
Table AI.3.8. Loan Fees in COA: Total Number of Students for Whom Loan Fees Were Not Included in Cost of Attendance (Q4_7).....	55
Table AI.3.9. Loan Fees in COA: Total Number of Students Who Did Not Have Loan Fees Included in Their COA, Who Received Maximum Annual Loan Limit for Award Year (Q4_8).....	55
Table AI.3.10. Loan Fees in COA: Total Number of Students Who Could Have Had Loan Fees Included in their Cost of Attendance (Q4_9).....	56
Table AI.3.11. Loan Fees in COA: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours Per Borrower (Q4_O1).....	56
Table AI.3.12. Loan Fees in COA: Estimated Savings in Administrative Costs Per Borrower (Q4_O2).....	57
Table AI.3.13. Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance: Logistic Regression for FY00 Cohort Default Rate.....	58
Table AI.3.14. Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate.....	60
Table AI.3.15. Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance - Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Rate.....	61

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Table AI.3.16. Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Rate.....	63
Table AI.3.17. Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance - Logistic Regression for Retention Rate (Borrowers Only).....	64
Table AI.3.18. Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Retention Rate (Borrowers Only).....	66
Table AI.3.19. Loan Fees In Cost Of Attendance.....	66
Table AI.3.20. Loan Fees In Cost Of Attendance.....	67
Table AI.3.21. Loan Fees In Cost Of Attendance.....	67
 Appendix Table AI.4—Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges	 68
Table AI.4.1. Experimental Sites Initiative Reporting Template for Credit of Aid to Title IV Institutional Charges	68
Table AI.4.2. Credit of Title IV Aid to Nonallowable Institutional Charges Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region	69
Table AI.4.3. Institutional Charges: Total Number of Title IV Aid Recipients (Q5_3).....	69
Table AI.4.4. Institutional Charges: Total Dollar Amount of Title IV Fund for Title IV Aid Recipients (Q5_4)	70
Table AI.4.5. Institutional Charges: Total Amount of Title IV Aid Credited to Nonallowable Institutional Charges (Q5_5).....	70
Table AI.4.6. Institutional Charges: Percentage of Students Declining Automatic Credit to Nonallowable Institutional Charges (Q5_6).....	71
Table AI.4.8. Institutional Charges: Number of Students for Whom Title IV Aid was Credited to Nonallowable Institutional Charges (Q5_8).....	72
Table AI.4.9. Institutional Charges: Number of Students Who Used Some of Their 2001–2002 Aid for Credit to Nonallowable Institutional Charges, Who Either Graduated or Were Able to Continue Their Enrollment into the Following Semester (Q5_9)	72
Table AI.4.10. Institutional Charges: Number of Students Who Take Advantage of the Crediting of Nonallowable Charges Provision for Multiple Semesters (Q5_10).....	73
Table AI.4.11. Institutional Charges: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours Per Borrower (Q5_O1).....	73
Table AI.4.12. Institutional Charges: Estimated Savings in Administrative Costs Per Borrower (Q5_O2).....	74
Table AI.4.13. Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges: Logistic Regression for FY00 Cohort Default Rate	75
Table AI.4.14. Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate.....	77
Table AI.4.15 Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges: Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Measure.....	78
Table AI.4.16 Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Measure.....	80
Table AI.4.17. Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges - Logistic Regression for Retention (Title IV Aid Recipients).....	81

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Table AI.4.18 Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Retention Rate (Title IV Aid Recipients).....	83
Table AI.4.19 Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges.....	83
Table AI.4.20 Credit of Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges.....	84
Table AI.4.21 Credit of Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges.....	84
 Appendix Table AI.5—Credit Title IV Aid to Prior Term Charges	 85
Table AI.5.1. Experimental Sites Initiatives Reporting Template for Credit Title IV Aid to Prior Term Charges.....	85
Table AI.5.2. Credit of Title IV Aid to Prior Term Charges Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region.....	86
Table AI.5.3. Prior Term Charges: Total Number of Students Who Had Title IV Aid Credited to Prior Term Charges (Q6_3).....	86
Table AI.5.4. Prior Term Charges: Total Amount of Title IV Aid Credited to Prior Term Charges for Prior Year (Q6_4).....	87
Table AI.5.5. Prior Term Charges: Number of Students Declining Automatic Crediting of Title IV Aid to Prior Term Charges for Prior Award Year (Q6_5).....	87
Table AI.5.6. Prior Term Charges: Percentage of Students Declining Automatic Credit to Prior Term Charges for Prior Award Year (Q6_6).....	87
Table AI.5.7. Prior Term Charges: Number of Students Who Used Some of their 2001–2002 Aid to Pay 2000–2001 Prior Term Charges, Who Either Graduated or Were Able to Continue Their Enrollment into the Following Semester (Q6_7).....	88
Table AI.5.8. Prior Term Charges: Number of Students Who Take Advantage of the Crediting to Prior Term Charges Provision for Multiple Semesters (Q6_8).....	88
Table AI.5.9. Prior Term Charges: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours per Borrower (Q6_O1).....	89
Table AI.5.10. Prior Term Charges: Estimated Savings in Administrative Costs per Borrower (Q6_O2).....	89
Table AI.5.11. Prior Term Charges - Logistic Regression for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate.....	90
Table AI.5.12. Prior Term Charges Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate.....	92
Table AI.5.12. Prior Term Charges Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate.....	92
Table AI.5.13. Prior Term Charges - Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Measure.....	93
Table AI.5.14. Prior Term Charges - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Measure.....	95
Table AI.5.14. Prior Term Charges - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Measure.....	95
Table AI.5.15. Prior Term Charges - Logistic Regression for Experimental Retention Rate.....	96
Table AI.5.16. Prior Term Charges - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Retention Rate.....	98
Table AI.5.17 Prior Term Charges.....	98

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Table AI.5.18 Prior Term Charges	99
Table AI.5.19 Prior Term Charges	99
Appendix Table AI.6—Multiple Disbursements for Single-Term Loans	100
Table AI.6.1. Experimental Sites Initiatives Reporting Template for Multiple Disbursements for Single-Term Loans	100
Table AI.6.2. Multiple Disbursements for Single-Term Loans Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region	101
Table AI.6.3. Multiple Disbursements: Number of Students with Single-Term Loans (Q7_2)	101
Table AI.6.4. Multiple Disbursements: Total amount of Loan Funds for Students in (2) (Q7_3)	102
Table AI.6.5. Multiple Disbursements: Number of Students Withdrawing before Midpoint of Term (Q7_4)	102
Table AI.6.6. Multiple Disbursement: Total Amount of Title IV Loan Funds Returned to Title IV for Students Withdrawing before the Midpoint of the Term (Q7_5)	103
Table AI.6.7. Multiple Disbursements: Number of Students Completing the Term (Q7_6)	103
Table AI.6.8. Multiple Disbursements: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours per Borrower (Q7_O1)	104
Table AI.6.9. Multiple Disbursements: Estimated Savings in Administrative Costs (Q7_O2)	104
Table AI.6.10 Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Logistic Regression for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate	105
Table AI.6.11. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate	107
Table AI.6.12. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Measure	108
Table AI.6.13. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Measure	110
Table AI.6.14. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Logistic Regression for Experimental Graduation Rate for Students with Single-Term Loans in the Spring of 2002	111
Table AI.6.15. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Graduation Rate for Students with Single-Term Loans in the Spring of 2002	113
Table AI.6.16. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Logistic Regression for Retention Rate (Student Borrowers)	114
Table AI.6.17. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Retention Rate (Student Borrowers)	116
Table AI.6.18. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans	117
Table AI.6.19. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans	117
Table AI.6.20. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans	118
Table AI.6.21. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans	118

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Appendix Table AI.7—Thirty-Day Delay for First-Time, First-Year Borrowers	119
Table AI.7.1. Experimental Sites Initiatives Reporting Templates for Thirty-Day Delay for First-Time, First-Year Borrowers.....	119
Table AI.7.2. Exemption from the Thirty-Day Delay Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region.....	119
Table AI.7.3. Thirty-Day Delay: Number of First-Time, First-Year Borrowers (Q8_2).....	120
Table AI.7.4. Thirty-Day Delay: Total Amount of Title IV Loans for Students in (2) (Q8_3).....	120
Table AI.7.5. Thirty-Day Delay: Number of First-Time, First-Year Students Withdrawing within 30 Days of Enrollment (Q8_4).....	121
Table AI.7.6. Thirty-Day Delay: Total Amount Returned to Title IV for Students in (4) (Q8_5).....	121
Table AI.7.7. Thirty-Day Delay: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours Per Borrower (Q8_O1).....	122
Table AI.7.8. Thirty-Day Delay: Estimated Savings in Administrative Costs (Q8_O2).....	122
Table AI.7.9 Thirty Day Delay - Logistic Regression for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate.....	123
Table AI.7.10. Thirty Day Delay - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate.....	125
Table AI.7.11. Thirty Day Delay - Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Measure.....	126
Table AI.7.12. Thirty Day Delay - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Measure.....	128
Table AI.7.13. Thirty Day Delay - Logistic Regression for Withdrawal Rate for First Time, First Year Borrowers.....	129
Table AI.7.14 - Thirty Day Delay - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Withdrawal Rates for First Time, First Year Borrowers.....	131
Table AI.7.15. Thirty Day Delay - Logistic Regression for Experimental Retention Rate.....	132
Table AI.7.16. Thirty Day Delay - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Retention Rate.....	134
Table AI.7.17. Thirty Day Delay.....	134
Table AI.7.18. Thirty Day Delay.....	135
Table AI.7.19. Thirty Day Delay.....	135
Table AI.7.20. Thirty Day Delay.....	136
 Appendix Table AI.8—Entrance Loan Counseling	 137
Table AI.8.1. Experimental Sites Initiatives Reporting Template for Entrance Loan Counseling.....	137
Table AI.8.2. Alternative Entrance Loan Counseling Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region.....	138
Table AI.8.3. Entrance Loan Counseling: Number of First-Time Borrowers (Q9_2).....	138
Table AI.8.4. Entrance Loan Counseling: Total Loan Funds for Students in (2) (Q9_3).....	139
Table AI.8.5. Entrance Loan Counseling: Has the Institution Exempted Certain Groups? (Q9_4).....	139
Table AI.8.6. Entrance Loan Counseling: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours Per Borrower (Q9_O1).....	139

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Table AI.8.7. Entrance Loan Counseling: Estimated Savings in Administrative Cost Per Borrower (Q9_O2).....	140
Table AI.8.8. Entrance Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate.....	141
Table AI.8.9. Entrance Loan Counseling - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate.....	143
Table AI.8.10. Entrance Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Measure.....	144
Table AI.8.11. Entrance Loan Counseling - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Measure.....	146
Table AI.8.12. Entrance Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for Experimental Withdrawal Rate for First-Year, First-Time Borrowers.....	147
Table AI.8.13. Entrance Loan Counseling - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Withdrawal Rate for First-Year, First-Time Borrowers.....	149
Table AI.8.14. Entrance Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for Retention Rate (All Borrowers).....	150
Table AI.8.15. Entrance Loan Counseling - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Retention Rate (All Borrowers).....	152
Table AI.8.16. Entrance Loan Counseling.....	153
Table AI.8.17. Entrance Loan Counseling.....	153
Table AI.8.18. Entrance Loan Counseling.....	154
Table AI.8.19. Entrance Loan Counseling.....	154
 Appendix Table AI.9—Exit Loan Counseling	 155
Table AI.9.1. Experimental Sites Initiative Reporting Template for Exit Loan Counseling.....	155
Table AI.9.2. Alternative Exit Loan Counseling Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region.....	156
Table AI.9.3. Exit Loan Counseling: Number of Final-Term Borrowers (Q10_2).....	156
Table AI.9.4. Exit Loan Counseling: Total Amount of Title IV Loans for Students in (2) (Q10_3).....	157
Table AI.9.5. Exit Loan Counseling: Number of Students in (2) Attending In-Person Counseling Sessions (Q10_4).....	157
Table AI.9.6. Exit Loan Counseling: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours Per Borrower (Q10_O1).....	158
Table AI.9.7. Exit Loan Counseling: Estimated Savings in Administrative Costs (Q10_O2).....	158
Table AI.9.8. Exit Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate.....	159
Table AI.9.9. Exit Loan Counseling- Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate.....	161
Table AI.9.10. Exit Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Measure.....	162
Table AI.9.11. Exit Loan Counseling- Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Measure.....	164

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Table AI.9.12. Exit Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for Experimental Graduation Rate	165
Table AI.9.13. Exit Loan Counseling- Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Graduation Rate.....	167
Table AI.9.15. Exit Loan Counseling- Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Retention Rate	170
Table AI.9.16. Exit Loan Counseling	170
Table AI.9.17. Exit Loan Counseling	171
Table AI.9.18. Exit Loan Counseling	171
Table AI.9.19. Exit Loan Counseling	172
Ability to Benefit	173
Table AI.10.1. Experimental Sites Initiative Reporting Template for Ability to Benefit	173
Table AI.10.2. Ability to Benefit Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region	174
Table AI.10.3. Ability to Benefit Experiment Participants' Self-Reported Values	174
Table AI.10.4. Statistical Comparison of Students Who Failed the ATB Exam but Successfully Completed at Least Six College Units with All Other Groups.....	175
Table AI.10.5. Statistical Comparison of Students Who Failed the ATB Exam but Successfully Completed at Least Six College Units with All Other Groups Average Units Completed.....	176
Table AI.10.6. Statistical Comparison of Students Who Failed the ATB Exam but Successfully Completed at Least Six College Unites with All Other Groups Average Cumulative GPA	177

INTRODUCTION

The main theme emerging from the Analysis of the Experimental Sites Initiative is that institutions that participate in the various experiments enthusiastically support them. In most cases, they welcome the relief from statutory regulations that allows them to streamline procedures within their financial aid offices and provide their students with better service. They also cite the academic progress of their students with little or no risk to the integrity of Title IV aid programs. That institutions support the experiments in which they participate should come as no surprise.

Institutions participating in the Experimental Sites Initiative are largely self-selected. Often as a consortium, they propose experiments that promise benefits to their institutions and students. Since few institutions withdraw from the Initiative, the experiments seem to be working. Yet should it be concluded from their reports, however, that the statutory relief experienced within the particular experiment under the Initiative can be broadly extended to all Title IV participating institutions with the same benefits accruing to institutions and students, and with minimal risk to the integrity of the programs?

Table 1, reproduced from the Analysis of the Experimental Sites Initiative, reveals that the institutions participating in the initiative are a homogeneous group compared to institutions represented by the College Board's Common Data Set (CDS) and the final, base set of institutions used in the comparative analyses.¹ The vast majority of experimental sites are public (83 percent), four-year institutions (95 percent). They are generally four times the size of the average institution in the CDS, and they are clustered in the Midwest and West (70 percent). For the purpose of comparison, note that 44 percent of the institutions in the CDS are under public control, 51 percent are four-year institutions, and 45 percent are in the Midwest or West. The positive effects reported by participating institutions may result as much from the characteristics of the institutions as from the experiments in which they participate.

To examine this possibility, comparative analyses between participating and nonparticipating institutions for each experiment were conducted. To assist the reader in interpreting the findings, this appendix reviews the data, variables, and methodologies used to conduct the analyses; presents statistics that describe outcome and participation measures reported by participating institutions; and, finally, provides the results of the comparative analyses.

¹ A total of 4,492 private, for-profit institutions are identified in the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). The Postsecondary Education Participants System identifies 1,912 proprietary schools in addition to 495 foreign schools. The institutions in IPEDS are not necessarily eligible to Title IV.

Table 1. Comparison of Institutional Characteristics within Data Sets

	Data Comparison		
	College Board's Common Data Set	Experimental Sites Initiative Data Set for Comparative Analysis	Participating Experimental Sites Only
Total Number of Institutions	3,698	2,520	120
Number of Institutions by Type			
One year or less	9	0	0
Two year, lower	1,680	956	19
Two year, upper	54	43	1
Three year	43	2	0
Four year	1,886	1,499	100
Five year	22	17	0
Six year	4	3	0
Number of Institutions by Control			
Public	1,630	1,375	102
Private	1,368	1,145	18
Proprietary	700	0	0
Geographic Region			
New England	231	201	4
Mid-Atlantic	676	427	11
South	800	535	12
Midwest	980	692	45
Southwest	303	226	5
West	668	439	43
Foreign	36	0	0
Average Enrollment	3,184	3,980	13,152

DATA SOURCES

The data used in the analyses are derived from the following five sources:

- The Experimental Sites Initiative Reporting Templates
- The Postsecondary Education Participants System
- The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System
- The College Board’s Common Data Set
- The National Student Loan Data System

The Experimental Sites Initiative Reporting Templates. Institutions participating in the initiative received two reporting templates in the form of Microsoft Excel workbooks. Those participating in the loan proration for graduating borrowers; overaward tolerance; loan fees in cost of attendance; credit of Title IV aid to institutional charges; credit of Title IV aid to prior term charges; multiple disbursement for single-term loans; thirty-day delay for first-time, first-year borrowers; entrance loan counseling; and exit loan counseling experiments received one workbook that contained one worksheet to describe participation and outcomes for each of the aforementioned experiments. It also contained a worksheet that enabled participants to identify themselves and describe the extent of their participation in Title IV student aid programs. Additional worksheets allowed participants to provide written descriptions of experiment implementation procedures and general comments. Institutions participating in the ability to benefit (ATB) experiment received a separate workbook. The ATB template presented institutions with a matrix to record the number of students and their average academic progress and grade point average for six populations relevant for comparisons necessary to gauge the success of the ATB experiment. ATB institutions also received worksheets to describe the extent of their Title IV participation and relay general comments. The sections of this appendix that are specific to the experiment present a reproduction of each worksheet. Following the worksheets are descriptive statistics for each question contained in the worksheet. The number of institutions responding to the question, the sum, mean, median, standard deviation, minimum value, and maximum value are reported for all participating institutions, as well as for roughly homogeneous subpopulations. The subpopulations are defined by their membership in approximately equal percentiles, usually quintiles.

For the purposes of the comparative analyses, institutions not participating in the initiative are assigned a value of zero. It is understood that comparisons between participating and nonparticipating institutions based strictly on these values would be spurious and misleading, assuming that a model could be fitted at all. Therefore, institutions are characterized not merely by their participation in the initiative, but also by 25 to 28 additional variables, depending on the experiment.

The Postsecondary Education Participants System (PEPS). Two separate PEPS databases were drawn upon for these analyses. From the PEPSR300 database, official FY 2000 cohort default rates (FY 2000 CDR) were drawn. The PEPSR753 database identified institutions with official cohort default rates of less than 10 percent or in FY 2000. These institutions made single and nondelayed disbursements, as defined in Section 428G(a) and (b) of the Higher Education Act, without participating in the multiple disbursement for single-term loans or the thirty-day delay for first-time, first-year borrowers experiments. In the comparative analyses for these experiments, such institutions are identified by the variable “exempt.”

The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). The IPEDS IC2001HD institutional characteristics data set and SFA0001 data on student financial aid were sources of institutional characteristics variables used in the comparative analyses. Both are early release data sets, meaning that the comparative analyses do not benefit from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) procedures for follow-up and the imputation of missing values.

*The College Board's Common Data Set (CDS).*² The CDS, an ambitious data collection effort, contains a wealth of information about the characteristics of institutions and the students who attend them. Unfortunately, due to lack of response, the CDS could not be incorporated fully into the comparative analyses. The analyses contains only a few of the CDS variables.

The National Student Loan Data System (NSLDS). Along with the Central Processing System, the NSLDS is one of the U.S. Department of Education's most important sources of student financial aid information. The NSLDS amalgamates data provided by schools, guaranty agencies, the Direct Loan program, and the Pell Grant program. NSLDS monitors Title IV loans and Pell grants, from approval to closure, at the level of the aid beneficiary. Demographic data in the NSLDS are derived from the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA).

Ms. Marilyn Sango-Jordan of Holec FinAid Services, Inc., queried the NSLDS extensively to develop experimental dependent measures and institutional characteristics that are contemporary with the Experimental Sites Initiative academic year 2001–02 reporting cycle.

Regardless of data source, institutions with the following characteristics were omitted from the study:

- Proprietary schools
- Tribal schools and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU)
- Branch campuses
- Postsecondary institutions with maximum program lengths of one year or less
- Foreign schools or those in Puerto Rico or U.S. possessions and territories

Schools with the above characteristics were removed because no institution participating in the Experimental Sites Initiative possessed these characteristics. The resulting data set includes 2,520 postsecondary institutions.

VARIABLES

Variables to capture institutional characteristics were selected partly because of the broad coverage they provide. That is, nonmissing values are present for the majority of the 2,520 institutions in the analysis. The number of institutions in each test, however, is usually limited and varies by subsetting. For instance, 1,701 institutions were included in the loan proration test due to the inclusion of variables measuring the number and volume of loans for students on the cusp of graduation. These variables were drawn from NSLDS and were not available for all schools in the analytic data set.

The following variables were selected to characterize institutions:

- Experiment specific values obtained from the Experimental Sites Initiative reporting templates. Again, these variables take a nonzero value only in the case of an institution participating in a given experiment.

² The Annual Survey of Colleges of the College Board and Data Base, 2002–03. Copyright © 2002, College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved.

- The number of students at the institution with Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) program loans, direct loans, the counts of these types of loans, and the sum of their guaranteed loan volumes in AY01–02. These six variables were drawn from the NSLDS and were hypothesized to control for administrative burden as well as student dependence on these programs.
- The number and volume of Pell grants at each institution in AY01–02. These two separate variables were drawn from the NSLDS.
- The average percentage of students at each institution receiving State grant aid. This variable is derived from IPEDS and is for AY00–01.
- The average adjusted gross family income for students at each institution as well as the average family size and average number of family members in college. These variables were drawn from the NSLDS and are for AY01–02.
- The average investment value of students at each institution. This NSLDS draw is for AY01–02.
- The total enrollment in the fall of 2001 as reported in the CDS.
- Institution control—public versus private—as reported in the CDS.
- Institution type. This is a dichotomous variable. Institutions are coded as 0 if their maximum program length is two years, and 1 otherwise. Institutions with maximum program lengths of one year are not included in the analyses.
- The geographic region of each institution. The region code is from the CDS and assigns institutions to New England, the Mid-Atlantic, the South, the Midwest, the Southwest, and the West.
- The degree of urbanization surrounding the campus. Campuses are described in the CDS as urban, suburban, or rural.
- The location of the institution, which is defined by the CDS as cities with the following:
 - A population equal to or in excess of 500,000
 - A population between 250,00 and 499,999
 - A population between 50,000 and 249,999
 - A population between 10,000 and 49,999
 - A population between 2,500 and 9,999
 - A population less than 2,500
- A dichotomous variable taking a value of 1 if an institution participates in *any* Experimental Sites Initiative and 0 otherwise.
- A dichotomous variable taking a value of 1 if the institution participates in the specific experiment under examination and 0 otherwise.

- A dichotomous variable taking a value of 1 if the institutions participates in *all* of the experiments under the initiative (with the exception of the ATB experiment) and 0 otherwise.
- A dichotomous variable taking a value of 1 if the institution uses the services of the Student Loan Clearinghouse and 0 otherwise.
- The percentage of freshmen that live off campus or commute in AY01–02. This variable is derived from the CDS.
- The percentage of freshmen from out of state at the institution in the fall of 2001, as reported in the CDS.
- The maximum number of months an institution has participated in any Initiative experiment. These data were supplied by FSA and are calculated for institutions presently participating as well as those that participated in the past but no longer do so.
- Variations on the above-described NSLDS draws designed to enhance the analyses for particular subsets of interest. These variations include the following:
 - For the loan proration for graduating borrowers experiment and the exit loan counseling experiment:
 - The combined number and volume of FFEL program and Direct loans for students in their second year of study at two-year institutions or their fourth or fifth years of study at four-year (or greater) institutions.
 - For the multiple disbursement of single-term loans experiment:
 - The combined number and volume of FFEL program and Direct *single-term* loans for students, in the spring of 2002 only, in their second year of study at two-year institutions or their fourth or fifth years of study at four-year (or greater) institutions.
 - For the thirty-day delay for first-time, first-year borrowers experiment and the entrance loan counseling experiment:
 - The combined number and volume of FFEL program and Direct loans for students identified in the NSLDS as first-time, first-year borrowers.

The following variables are used to describe outcomes:

- Official FY 2000 cohort default rates derived from PEPSR300. FY 2000 roughly corresponds to AY99–00, an academic year for which there is no quantitative Experimental Sites Initiative data. Nonetheless, some may argue that Experimental Sites Initiative data from AY01–02 (the most recent reporting year) should be at least mildly correlated with hypothetical data from AY99–00 and previously. Therefore, AY01–02 Experimental Sites Initiative data may serve as a “predictor” of the past FY 2000 CDR.
- Experimental Default Measure (EDM) derived from the NSLDS. The EDM serves as an alternative to published CDRs. As an experimental measure, it may be higher than the published rates. The EDM incorporates a three-year window of defaults, beginning with FY 2000. The number of students entering repayment is used as a denominator. The EDM

should not be interpreted as identical to figures that will be used in the calculation of official CDRs for FY 2002. Specifically, the EDM uses an unduplicated count of students defaulting since FY 2000, as well as NSLDS-drawn “early warnings.” Early warnings are defaults by students in the 2002 CDR cohort who leave school early, are processed into repayment and then default status quickly, and are reported promptly to NSLDS. The advantage of the EDM relative to officially reported FY 2000 default rates is that it is more contemporaneous to the Experimental Sites Initiative reporting data for AY01–02. The following table confirms that, on average, the EDM is higher than the FY 2000 CDR, but the variables are correlated.

Table 2.

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
FY 2000 Cohort Default Rate	5.70	5.56
Experimental Default Measure	8.00	7.71

Pearson Correlation Coefficient 0.5630

Prob>|r| under HO: Rho=0 <.0001

- Experimental Graduation Rates (EGR) as calculated from the NSLDS. Officially published graduation rates are problematic because, for example, for a four-year institution the cohort is that of first-time, full-time undergraduates six years in the past. Thus, for the AY01–02 graduation rate, students would have had to enter in AY95–96 and may not have been subjected to the treatments of the Experimental Sites Initiative. Calculating the number of students with FFEL program or Direct loans at academic level 4 or 5 in AY0–02, and adding the number of students at level 2 at two-year institutions only in the same academic year, yields the denominator for the EGR. Thus we have a count of all student borrowers who are likely to be in their final year before graduation. The numerator for the EGR is derived by subsetting the students in the EGR denominator to those whose academic status as of June 30, 2002, was “G” (Graduated). The EGR evaluates only those experiments for which a graduation rate may be a relevant outcome, namely, the loan proration for graduating borrowers and the exit loan counseling experiments.
- Experimental Withdrawal Rate (EWR) as calculated from the NSLDS. The EWR is used to assess the thirty-day delay for first-time, first-year borrowers and entrance loan counseling experiments. It is calculated for first-time, first-year borrowers only and is the sum of all first-time, first-year borrowers in AY01–02 reported to the NSLDS as having withdrawn as of June 30, 2002, divided by the sum of all first-time, first-year borrowers in the same academic year.
- Experimental Retention Rate (ERR) as calculated from the NSLDS. An ERR was created for all Title IV aid recipients and another was constructed for FFEL program/Direct Loan borrowers only. In either case, the total number of aid recipients in the Fall of 2001 was used as a denominator. A numerator was formed by subsetting the denominator to students whose most recent NSLDS enrollment status code—as of June 30, 2002, or before—indicated they

had either graduated, remained as full-time students, remained as more than half-time but less than full-time students, or continued as less than half-time students. Students on approved leave of absence, students who never attended, were deceased, or for whom no enrollment status code could be found, were omitted from the numerator and denominator.

METHODOLOGIES

In comparing outcomes for participating and nonparticipating institutions in the Initiative, the following methodologies were employed.

Logistic Regression

Outcomes such as retention, withdrawal, graduation, and default rates are averages on binomial, categorical outcomes over all students. For example, students can either default or not default on their loans. Similarly, a student either graduates or does not. In both cases, there is no middle ground. Logistic regression is widely used to estimate the probabilities of such outcomes.

Like linear regression, logistic regression allows the analyst to model outcomes as a function of one, or many, explanatory factors. The explanatory factors may take the form of nominal, ordinal, or continuous variables. Unlike linear regression, though, it is able to deal with the peculiarities of binomial outcome data. In particular, it provides estimates on the odds of an outcome given specific factors, and it does so with an “understanding” that the probability of an outcome can never be greater than one or less than zero. Further, by iteratively estimating and then weighting the covariance matrix, one can compensate for the lack of independence between the mean and the variance of a binomial distribution. This lack of independence leads to heteroskedasticity, an unfavorable trait in linear regression.

The odds ratios produced by logistic regression are easy to interpret. For nominal variables, for example, such as institutional control, the odds ratio for graduation under the conditions of the loan proration experiment are given as .775 for publicly versus privately controlled schools. Therefore, the odds of graduating from a private school are 32 percent *higher* ($1/.775 = 1.324$) than those of graduating from a public institution. Conversely, one can interpret this particular odds ratio as meaning that, all other things being equal, the odds of graduating from a public school are about 25 percent lower ($1 - .775 = 0.245$) than they would be of graduating from a private school.

In logistic regression, categorical variables (nominal or ordinal) such as institutional control must be expressed as a series of dummy/dichotomous variables, although the parameterization of these variables can be expressed differently. In the models that follow, categorical variables are expressed in terms of “effects parameterization.” Effects parameterization is also referred to as “deviation from the mean” parameterization. Specifically, categorical variables are coded as in table 3 below.³

³ Categorical variables are sometimes referred to as class variables.

Table 3. Class-Level Information

Class	Value Label	Design Variables				
		1	2	3	4	5
Institutional Control	Public	1				
	Private	-1				
Institution Type	Two Year	1				
	More than Two Year	-1				
Participates in All Initiatives	No	1				
	Yes	-1				
Geographic Region	New England	1	0	0	0	0
	Mid-Atlantic	0	1	0	0	0
	South	0	0	1	0	0
	Midwest	0	0	0	1	0
	Southwest	0	0	0	0	1
	West	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
Campus Environment	Urban	1	0			
	Suburban	0	1			
	Rural	-1	-1			
Population Density	Population: Over 500,000	1	0	0	0	0
	Population: 250,000-499	0	1	0	0	0
	Population: 50,000-249,9	0	0	1	0	0
	Population: 10,000-49,99	0	0	0	1	0
	Population: 2,500-9,999	0	0	0	0	1
	Population: Under 2,500	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
Experimental Site	Does not participate in any experiment	-1				
	Participates in at least one experiment	1				
Experiment Indicator	Does not participate in this experiment	1				
	Participates in this experiment	-1				
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Does not use the services of the Student Loan Clearinghouse	1				
	Uses the services of the Student Loan Clearinghouse	-1				

Referring again to graduation under the conditions of the loan proration experiment (see Technical Appendix Table AI.1.19), effects parameterization means that odds ratios should be calculated as

$$\text{Odds}(B_n) = e^{\alpha + \sum \beta_{n-1} + \beta_n} / e^{\alpha + \sum \beta_{n-1} - \beta_n}$$

$$\text{Odds}(B_n) = e^{2\beta_n}$$

$$= e^{2(-0.1404)}$$

= .775 in the case of the comparison between students attending public versus private institutions.

For continuous variables—average adjusted gross family income, the number of family members in college, and so on, that is, variables that can be expressed as a ratio and do not need to be categorized to have meaning—the odds ratios reflect a change of one standard deviation in the continuous variable.

The reader is *strongly* cautioned, however, against attaching too much meaning to the specific values of coefficients and odds ratios for each of the models presented. It must be remembered that the outcomes being estimated are either experimental (EDM, EGR, EWR, ERR) or not contemporaneous with (FY 2000 CDR) AY01–02.

Moreover, whether or not a student defaults, graduates, withdraws, or remains in school is largely determined by factors unique to the student. Jenny H. Woo of EdFund recently developed a logistic model of student default in California.⁴ Not surprisingly, she finds factors such as an individual’s current wages and number of loans significant in contributing to an individual’s probability of default. The Experimental Sites Initiative experiments also act upon students, but they do so indirectly, altering the manner in which the institutions that students attend administer financial aid. Our models are not at the level of the student because the Experimental Sites Initiatives act at the level of the institution. We can characterize the student bodies of various institutions, but we cannot characterize the individuals themselves. In essence, students at the institutions in the analysis represent a stratified, random sample in which the strata (schools) represent the various combinations of “treatments” that may, or may not, influence students’ probabilities for graduation and/or default. One of the treatments may be the average adjusted gross family income for all students at the institution, but it will not be the average adjusted gross family income of the individual student.

The models, therefore, are *associative* and *not predictive* in nature. We strive to identify factors that have a reasonable influence over outcomes in the Experimental Sites Initiative experiments so as to gauge the success of the experiments.

To assess the overall fit of each model to the data, several statistics are presented.

- Likelihood Ratio: This test is identical in function to the global F-test in linear regression. It examines the hypothesis that the explanatory variables are jointly insignificant and is equal to

⁴ Woo, Jenny H., “Clearing Accounts: The Causes of Student Loan Default” (Rancho Cordova, Calif.: EdFund, 2002).

the difference between the log likelihood ratio for the full model less that for a model reduced to the intercept only. The statistic is distributed chi-square with degrees of freedom equal to the number of explanatory variables. In all models, explanatory variables are jointly significant.

- Full versus Reduced Likelihood Ratio: This test is nearly identical to the likelihood ratio except that it tests the joint significance of the variables used to characterize institution (type, control, region, loan volume, and so forth). A model reduced to the intercept and variables derived from the reporting templates is fitted, and its likelihood ratio is deducted from that of the full model. Degrees of freedom are equal to the number of variables used to characterize institutions. In all instances save two, institutional characteristics are seen to be jointly significant. In two instances reduced models could not be fitted and, therefore, the statistic could not be calculated.
- Max-rescaled R-square: In linear regression, the R-square statistic, which measures the ratio of variance explained by the model to total variance, assesses the overall fit of the model to the data. Logistic regression is distinctly nonlinear, though. To assess the fit of a logistic model, a generalized coefficient of determination is sometimes used.⁵

$$R^2 = 1 - \left\{ \frac{L(o)}{L(\beta)} \right\}^{\frac{2}{n}}$$

where $L(o)$ is the likelihood of the intercept only model and $L(B)$ is that of the full model. Unfortunately, this statistic is not bound between 0 and 1, but instead reaches a maximum at

$$R_{Max}^2 = 1 - \left\{ L(o) \right\}^{\frac{2}{n}}.$$

The R^2 can be rescaled, however, restoring the desirable range of the statistic.

$$R_{rescale}^2 = \frac{R^2}{R_{Max}^2}$$

This Max-rescaled R-square⁶ will be presented for each model, along with the ratio of the Max-rescaled R-square for the full model to that of the model reduced to the intercept and variables derived from the Experimental Sites Initiative reporting templates only—when the latter model can be fitted.

- Hosmer and Lemeshow⁷ Partitions and Goodness-of-Fit Test: Hosmer–Lemeshow partitions and goodness-of-fit statistic will be presented following each model. For the purposes of model assessment, it has been suggested that the predicted probabilities of outcomes for all observations be sorted in ascending order. The observations can be then grouped roughly into deciles. Averaging the predicted probabilities and then multiplying this average by the

⁵ Cox, D. R., and E. J. Snell, *The Analysis of Binary Data*, 2nd ed. (London: Chapman and Hall, 1989), 208–09.

⁶ Nagelkerke, N. J. D., “A Note on a General Definition of the Coefficient of Determination,” *Biometrika*, 78, 1991, 691–92.

⁷ Hosmer, D. W., Jr., and S. Lemeshow, *Applied Logistic Regression* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1989).

total membership in the group/decile provides an expected value for the number of events. The expected value can then be compared with the observed number of events to assess the degree to which the model successfully predicts events. The success of the model can be formally tested using the Hosmer–Lemeshow goodness-of-fit statistic, which is similar to a contingency test. Due to the large number of observations for each model, cell residuals tend to be large in *absolute terms*, causing the hypothesis of dependence between the observed and expected values to be rejected. In *relative terms*, most models are reasonable, but the reader must ultimately accept or reject each model.

- **Wilcoxon Rank Sum:** Another technique employed to compare experimental sites with institutions that do not participate in the initiative is the Wilcoxon Rank Sum test. This is a nonparametric procedure—that is, the procedure makes no assumptions about the underlying distribution of the data. Instead, it ranks the institutions by the outcome of interest, assigning a rank of 1 to the institution with the lowest value, a rank of 2 to the institution with the next lowest value, and so on. Ties are averaged. The institutions are then divided into the experimental and nonexperimental groups. The original assigned ranks are then summed within groups and averaged by the number of institutions within each group. The average ranks are then compared to determine if there is a statistically significant difference between the average ranks for the two groups. If so, the direction but not the magnitude of the relationship can be determined. For example, if the experimental group has a lower average rank than the nonexperimental group over default rates, it can be assumed that students within the experimental group display a lower propensity for default. Conversely, if the experimental group has a higher average rank than the nonexperimental group over graduation rates, it can be assumed that the experimental group is more likely to produce graduates than the nonexperimental group.
- **T-Tests:** In order to assess the ATB experiment, three different t-tests were used. Generally, the function of a t-test is to determine if the means of two populations differ significantly. In the case of ATB experiment, for example, the mean grade point average of students who did not pass an ATB exam but successfully completed six college units was compared with that of all other students (or a random sample of all other students). The idea is to determine if the difference in means for the two populations is significantly different from zero. The three tests employed were the pooled t-test, Satterthwaite’s t-test, and Cochran’s t-test. In the pooled t-test, it is assumed that the two groups have equal variances. Cochran’s and Satterthwaite’s tests do not make this assumption. All three tests are presented, but the hypothesis of equality of variances is not tested, as the three tests are always in agreement—there is no significant difference between the means of the group. Therefore, whether or not variances are equal is academic.

APPENDIX TABLE AI.1—LOAN PRORATION FOR GRADUATING BORROWERS

Table AI.1.1 Experimental Sites Initiative Reporting Template for Loan Proration for Graduating Borrowers


Experimental Sites Initiative		
Institution	<input type="text"/>	
Experiment	Loan Proration for Graduating Borrowers	
Reporting Year	2001-2002	
Goal of the Experiment: To evaluate enrollment patterns of students who would have been subject to loan proration in their graduating term.		
Target Student Population: Students who would have been subject to loan proration in their graduating term.		
Reporting Items		Supplemental Items (Optional)
1.	Provide description and brief rationale on how the institution is conducting this experiment. Please select one of the description worksheets at the bottom on the status bar.	1. <input type="text" value="Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower."/>
2.	Number of graduating students with FFEL/Direct loan funds. <input type="text"/>	2. <input type="text" value="Estimated savings in administrative costs per borrower."/>
3.	Number of students in (2) whose loans would have been subject to loan proration in their graduating term. <input type="text"/>	
3a.	Number of students in (3) who actually received non-prorated loans <input type="text"/>	
3b.	Number of students in (3a) who graduated <input type="text"/>	
3c.	Number of students in (3a) who withdrew before end of term <input type="text"/>	
3d.	Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (3c) who withdrew before the end of the term. <input type="text"/>	
3e.	Number of students in (3a) who completed term (not necessarily graduated.) <input type="text"/>	
4.	Number of students in (2) who received prorated loans in their graduating term. <input type="text"/>	
4a.	Number of students in (4) who graduated <input type="text"/>	
4b.	Number of students who withdrew before end of term <input type="text"/>	
4c.	Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (4b) who withdrew before the end of term. <input type="text"/>	
4d.	Number of students in (4) who completed term (not necessarily graduated). <input type="text"/>	
Conclusions about this experiment:		

Table AI.1.2. Loan Proration Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region

	Number	Percentage
Total Participation*	79	100
School Type		
Two Year, Lower Division	2	2.53
Four Year	77	97.47
Control		
Public	63	79.75
Private	16	20.25
Region		
New England	3	3.80
Mid-Atlantic	7	8.86
Southern	7	8.86
Midwest	34	43.04
Southwest	4	5.06
Western	24	30.38

* 21 institutions were disqualified from the comparative analysis due to faulty templates and logically inconsistent answers. All responses are reported in this appendix.

Table AI.1.3. Loan Proration: Graduating Students with FFEL/Direct Loan Funds (Q2_2)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	15	2,274	151.60	144.00	89.51	17	265
2 nd Quintile	16	7,351	459.44	436.50	96.21	341	688
3 rd Quintile	16	15,250	953.13	1,002.50	157.20	740	1,212
4 th Quintile	16	23,242	1,452.63	1,430.50	138.97	1234	1,647
Highest 20%	15	35,663	2,377.53	2,270.00	540.73	1712	3,290
Total	78	83,780	1,074.10	1,002.50	820.40	17	3,290

Table AI.1.4. Loan Proration: Students Whose Loans Would Be Subject to Proration in Graduating Term (Q2_3)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	15	455	30.33	33.00	14.06	0	47
2 nd Quintile	16	1,651	103.19	111.00	29.13	52	137
3 rd Quintile	16	3,292	205.75	207.50	35.02	139	257
4 th Quintile	16	5,380	336.25	343.50	54.93	264	424
Highest 20%	16	10,014	625.88	578.00	175.80	432	997
Total	79	20,792	263.19	212.00	226.70	0	997

Table AI.1.5. Loan Proration: Students Who Received Nonprorated Loans (Q2_3a)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	15	231	15.40	17.00	12.43	0	33
2 nd Quintile	16	912	57.00	54.00	16.05	34	84
3 rd Quintile	16	2,285	142.81	136.50	36.26	85	203
4 th Quintile	16	4,360	272.50	264.50	43.85	212	359
Highest 20%	16	8,840	552.50	474.50	191.22	362	997
Total	79	16,628	210.48	137.00	213.55	0	997

Table AI.1.6. Loan Proration: Students Who Received Nonprorated Loans and Graduated (Q2_3b)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	15	228	15.20	17.00	10.06	0	28
2 nd Quintile	16	832	52.00	48.00	18.53	31	82
3 rd Quintile	16	2,162	135.13	133.50	33.42	85	203
4 th Quintile	16	4,289	268.06	260.50	44.34	209	350
Highest 20%	16	10,741	671.31	459.50	615.24	360	2,895
Total	79	18,252	231.04	134.00	361.85	0	2,895

Table AI.1.7. Loan Proration: Students Who Received Nonprorated Loans and Withdrew (Q2_3c)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 50%	43	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Highest 50%	36	144.0	4.0	2.0	4.8	1.0	25.0
Total	79	144.0	1.8	0.0	3.8	0.0	25.0

Table AI.1.8. Loan Proration: Total Amount Returned to Title IV for Students in (3c) Who Withdrew Before the End of the Term (Q2_3d)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 64%	49	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Highest 36%	28	\$122,753	\$4,384	\$2,518	\$5,409	\$406	\$27,470
Total	77	\$122,753	\$1,594	\$0	\$3,860	\$0	\$27,470

Table AI.1.9. Loan Proration: Students Who Received Nonprorated Loans Who Completed Term (Q2_3e)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	15	39	2.60	0.00	4.31	0	11
2 nd Quintile	16	385	24.06	24.00	7.90	12	37
3 rd Quintile	16	1,243	77.69	76.00	28.00	40	126
4 th Quintile	16	3,110	194.38	200.00	52.37	128	264
Highest 20%	15	7,395	493.00	411.00	187.00	287	997
Total	78	12,172	156.05	76.00	197.40	0	997

Table AI.1.10. Loan Proration: Number of Graduating Students Who Received Prorated Loans in Their Graduating Term (Q2_4)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 65%	51	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Highest 35%	28	6,357.0	227.0	95.5	299.4	5.0	1,256.0
Total	79	6,357.0	80.5	0.0	207.3	0.0	1,256.0

Table AI.1.11. Loan Proration: Number of Students in Graduating Term Who Received Prorated Loans in Their Graduating Term and Graduated (Q2_4a)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 58%	45	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0
Highest 42%	32	5,031	157.2	72.5	189.3	1	849
Total	77	5,031	65.3	0.0	143.8	0	849

Table AI.1.12. Loan Proration: Number of Students in Graduating Term Who Received Prorated Loans in Their Graduating Term and Withdrew (Q2_4b)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 91%	71	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Highest 9%	7	45.0	6.4	3.0	8.4	2.0	25.0
Total	78	45.0	0.6	0.0	3.0	0.0	25.0

Table AI.1.13. Loan Proration: Total Amount Returned to Title IV for Students Who Withdrew before the End of Term (Q2_4c)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 91%	71	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Highest 9%	7	\$52,359	\$7,480	\$3,039	\$9,529	\$372	\$27,470
Total	78	\$52,359	\$671	\$0	\$3,421	\$0	\$27,470

Table AI.1.14. Loan Proration: Number of Students in Graduating Term Who Received Prorated Loans in Their Graduating Term and Completed Term (Q2_4d)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 61%	46	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Highest 39%	30	4,724	157.5	70.0	217.7	1.0	997.0
Total	76	4,724	62.2	0.0	156.0	0.0	997.0

Table AI.1.15. Loan Proration: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours (Q2_O1)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	2	0.33	0.16	0.16	0.00	0.16	0.17
2nd Quintile	4	1.00	0.25	0.25	0.00	0.25	0.25
3rd Quintile	1	0.30	0.30	0.30		0.30	0.30
4th Quintile	4	2.05	0.51	0.50	0.03	0.50	0.55
Highest 20%	3	16.00	5.33	3.00	4.93	2.00	11.00
Total	14	19.68	1.41	0.40	2.88	0.16	11.00

Table AI.1.16. Loan Proration: Estimated Savings in Administrative Cost Per Borrower (Q2_O2)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	2	\$4.15	\$2.08	\$2.08	\$1.01	\$1.36	\$2.79
2nd Quintile	3	\$12.21	\$4.07	\$3.75	\$1.46	\$2.80	\$5.66
3rd Quintile	3	\$28.80	\$9.60	\$10.00	\$1.64	\$7.80	\$11.00
4th Quintile	3	\$63.75	\$21.25	\$20.00	\$8.20	\$13.75	\$30.00
Highest 20%	2	\$125.00	\$62.50	\$62.50	\$17.68	\$50.00	\$75.00
Total	13	\$233.91	\$17.99	\$10.00	\$21.89	\$1.36	\$75.00

Table AI.1.17. Loan Proration: Logistic Regression for FY00 Cohort Default Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-0.767	0.1083	50.1607	<.0001	
2) Number of graduating students with FFEL/direct loan funds	Continuous	-0.00011	0.000028	14.774	0.0001	0.94
3) Number of students in (2) whose loans would have been subject to loan proration in their graduating term	Continuous	0.000909	0.00031	8.5708	0.0034	1.10
3a) Number of students in (3) who actually received nonprorated loans	Continuous	-0.0006	0.000275	4.8005	0.0285	0.95
3b) Number of students in (3a) who graduated	Continuous	0.000108	0.000036	9.2083	0.0024	1.03
3c) Number of students in (3a) who withdrew before end of term	Continuous	-0.018	0.0112	2.5934	0.1073	0.99
3d) Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (3c) who withdrew before the end of the term	Continuous	0.000022	0.000006929	9.8139	0.0017	1.02
3e) Number of students in (3a) who completed term (not necessarily graduated)	Continuous	0.000232	0.000136	2.8965	0.0888	1.02
4) Number of students in (2) who received prorated loans in their graduating term	Continuous	-0.00313	0.000731	18.298	<.0001	0.89
4a) Number of students in (4) who graduated	Continuous	0.000442	0.000917	0.2326	0.6296	1.02
4b) Number of students who withdrew before end of term	Continuous	0.1048	0.0301	12.1149	0.0005	1.05
4c) Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (4b) who withdrew before the end of term	Continuous	-0.00002	0.000019	0.6562	0.4179	0.99
4d) Number of students in (4) who completed term (not necessarily graduated)	Continuous	0.000806	0.0004	4.0694	0.0437	1.04
Loan volume for students potentially subject to loan proration	Continuous	2.364E-08	4.769E-09	24.5821	<.0001	1.17
Number of loans for students potentially subject to loan proration	Continuous	-0.00013	0.000016	65.7476	<.0001	0.77
Number of FFEL program loans	Continuous	0.000056	0.000004769	139.0416	<.0001	1.48
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000034	0.000008033	17.4584	<.0001	1.25
Number of students with FFEL program loans	Continuous	-0.00007	0.000008924	58.2898	<.0001	0.76
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	0.000049	0.000012	17.388	<.0001	1.23
Total FFEL program volume	Continuous	-2.43E-09	4.79E-10	25.7851	<.0001	0.95
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	-1.03E-08	1.121E-09	83.7291	<.0001	0.76
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00016	0.000033	23.568	<.0001	0.69

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	6.034E-08	1.033E-08	34.1169	<.0001	1.51
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	0.00000159	473.1742	<.0001	0.82
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.0119	0.0338	0.1235	0.7253	1.00
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-1.2296	0.1261	95.1079	<.0001	0.93
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00005	0.000003224	264.8044	<.0001	0.815
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.00501	0.00312	2.5837	0.108	1.013
Percentage of students with state grants	Continuous	-0.0012	0.000226	28.1616	<.0001	0.975
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	0.000000257	8.849E-07	0.0843	0.7715	1.002
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.00176	0.00026	45.8889	<.0001	1.03
Public institution versus private institution	Dummy	-0.0229	0.00793	8.3086	0.0039	0.955
Two-year college versus four-year college	Dummy	0.1324	0.00805	270.8609	<.0001	1.303
Institution does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.1076	0.0337	10.1724	0.0014	0.806
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.0771	0.0166	21.71	<.0001	1.273
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.0168	0.0108	2.3929	0.1219	1.158
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0395	0.00919	18.4668	<.0001	1.226
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	0.00401	0.00888	0.204	0.6515	1.183
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.06	0.0119	25.2276	<.0001	1.251
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0177	0.00852	4.339	0.0372	0.979
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.0142	0.00647	4.8129	0.0282	1.011
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0608	0.014	18.9628	<.0001	0.875
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00997	0.0139	0.5112	0.4746	0.92
Small City vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0136	0.0102	1.7902	0.1809	0.917
Large Town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00759	0.01	0.5714	0.4497	0.923
Small Town vs. rural	Dummy	0.019	0.0147	1.6516	0.1987	0.947
Participates in at least one experiment	Dummy	-0.0818	0.0123	44.4745	<.0001	0.849
Did not participate in loan proration experiment	Dummy	-0.00264	0.022	0.0145	0.9043	0.995
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0148	0.00666	4.9637	0.0259	0.971
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	0.0025	0.000239	109.4813	<.0001	1.092
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00108	0.000357	9.1388	0.0025	0.976

Likelihood Ratio = 18054.95
(p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.0404

Number of Institutions = 1700

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 16698.04
(p<.0001)

Ratio of Rescaled R-square to Reduced Rescaled R-square = 19.10

**Table AI.1.18. Loan Proration - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000
Cohort Default Rate**

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	138807	2370	2382.58	136437	136424.4	99.47%	100.01%
2	138791	3484	3482.71	135307	135308.3	100.04%	100.00%
3	138876	4277	4319.13	134599	134556.9	99.02%	100.03%
4	138538	4641	4848.08	133897	133689.9	95.73%	100.15%
5	138420	5446	5366.33	132974	133053.7	101.48%	99.94%
6	138986	6227	6204.16	132759	132781.8	100.37%	99.98%
7	138135	7137	7016.23	130998	131118.8	101.72%	99.91%
8	139295	8378	8419.56	130917	130875.4	99.51%	100.03%
9	138487	10928	10750.33	127559	127736.7	101.65%	99.86%
10	134714	14047	14101.98	120667	120612	99.61%	100.05%

Chi-Square = 16.8082 p < 0.0322

df = 8

**Table AI.1.19. Loan Proration - Logistic Regression for Experimental Graduation Rate
(all potentially graduating students)**

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		1.4944	0.0874	292.6068	<.0001	
2) Number of graduating students with FFEL/Direct loan funds	Continuous	-0.00017	0.00002	72.9184	<.0001	0.91
3) Number of students in (2) whose loans would have been subject to loan proration in their graduating term	Continuous	-0.00005	0.000266	0.0393	0.8428	0.99
3a) Number of students in (3) who actually received non-prorated loans	Continuous	0.00149	0.000265	31.3339	<.0001	1.16
3b) Number of students in (3a) who graduated	Continuous	0.000318	0.000023	190.54	<.0001	1.07
3c) Number of students in (3a) who withdrew before end of term	Continuous	-0.0734	0.00897	66.9472	<.0001	0.94
3d) Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (3c) who withdrew before the end of the term	Continuous	0.000088	0.000005281	279.7954	<.0001	1.12
3e) Number of students in (3a) who completed term (not necessarily graduated)	Continuous	0.00155	0.000084	338.6858	<.0001	1.15
4) Number of students in (2) who received prorated loans in their graduating term	Continuous	-0.00693	0.00049	199.6871	<.0001	0.75
4a) Number of students in (4) who graduated	Continuous	0.0202	0.000633	1018.7158	<.0001	2.06
4b) Number of students who withdrew before end of term	Continuous	0.0171	0.0217	0.6229	0.43	1.01
4c) Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (4b) who withdrew before the end of term.	Continuous	0.000187	0.000012	249.056	<.0001	1.08
4d) Number of students in (4) who completed term (not necessarily graduated).	Continuous	-0.0082	0.000347	557.5043	<.0001	0.65
Loan volume for students potentially subject to loan proration	Continuous	6.634E-08	3.912E-09	287.4978	<.0001	1.62
Number of loans for students potentially subject to loan proration	Continuous	-0.00047	0.000013	1202.6542	<.0001	0.36
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000198	0.000003966	2495.8177	<.0001	4.18
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000278	0.000006108	2064.4923	<.0001	6.58
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00029	0.000007439	1474.6064	<.0001	0.31
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00025	0.000008903	784.1119	<.0001	0.35
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	1.891E-09	3.13E-10	36.5013	<.0001	1.04

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	-2.54E-08	8.67E-10	860.6934	<.0001	0.51
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	0.000913	0.000029	983.3819	<.0001	9.17
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	-0.000000291	9.386E-09	959.9717	<.0001	0.12
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00001	0.000001344	63.7952	<.0001	0.95
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.6459	0.031	435.4487	<.0001	1.11
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-3.7441	0.1065	1235.672	<.0001	0.80
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	0.000084	0.000002167	1499.6984	<.0001	1.349
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	-0.053	0.00261	411.4971	<.0001	0.878
Percentage of students with State grants	Continuous	0.000462	0.00018	6.6028	0.0102	1.01
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-0.00000185	0.000001166	2.5045	0.1135	0.984
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	-0.00485	0.000253	368.3082	<.0001	0.913
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.1404	0.00572	603.5243	<.0001	0.755
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	-0.1416	0.00813	303.0841	<.0001	0.753
Institution does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.0717	0.0284	6.3527	0.0117	1.154
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.0967	0.0113	73.4207	<.0001	1.447
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	0.0164	0.00775	4.498	0.0339	1.335
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0785	0.00742	111.9633	<.0001	1.421
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.2704	0.00676	1599.2076	<.0001	1.002
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.3513	0.00959	1341.8891	<.0001	1.866
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0303	0.00654	21.4495	<.0001	0.945
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.00373	0.00487	0.5876	0.4434	0.977
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0411	0.0109	14.2512	0.0002	1.002
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.2486	0.0115	470.7602	<.0001	0.75
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0151	0.00789	3.6548	0.0559	0.976
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0118	0.00769	2.3717	0.1236	0.95
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.1651	0.0104	250.0394	<.0001	1.134
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0267	0.00888	9.0332	0.0027	1.055
Did not participate in loan proration experiment	Dummy	0.2971	0.016	344.0855	<.0001	1.811
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	0.0959	0.00673	202.956	<.0001	1.211
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	-0.00082	0.000201	16.621	<.0001	0.973
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	0.000242	0.000234	1.0661	0.3018	1.005

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
---------------	---------------	--------------------	----------------	-----------------	------------------------	-------------------------------

Likelihood Ratio = 60194.77
(p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.1197

Number of Institutions = 1495

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs.
Reduced Model = 50504.0864
(p<.0001)

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 8.41

Table AI.1.20. Loan Proration: Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Graduation Rate (All Potentially Graduating Students)

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event (%)	Nonevent (%)
1	7,7843	2,533	3,153.65	75,310	74,689.35	80.32	100.83
2	7,9322	5,070	6,575.23	74,252	72,746.77	77.11	102.07
3	7,8099	9,679	8,796.83	68,420	69,302.17	110.03	98.73
4	7,8296	12,463	10,901.58	65,833	67,394.42	114.32	97.68
5	7,7024	14,344	12,371.47	62,680	64,652.53	115.94	96.95
6	7,7500	12,178	14,126.59	65,322	63,373.41	86.21	103.07
7	7,8695	17,368	16,560.91	61,327	62,134.09	104.87	98.70
8	7,7991	19,930	19,492.52	58,061	58,498.48	102.24	99.25
9	7,7777	23,982	24,288.02	53,795	53,488.98	98.74	100.57
10	7,4952	30,551	31,819.61	44,401	43,132.39	96.01	102.94

Chi-Square = 1722.33
p<.0001
df = 8

Table AI.1.21. Loan Proration - Logistic Regression for Experimental Graduation Rate (part-time potentially graduating students only). Model Invalid due to Quasi-Complete Separation of Observations

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		5.9998	35.3579	0.0288	0.8653	
2) Number of graduating students with FFEL/Direct loan funds	Continuous	-0.00518	0.0384	0.0182	0.8927	568.10
3) Number of students in (2) whose loans would have been subject to loan proration in their graduating term	Continuous	-0.0295	0.7395	0.0016	0.9681	112.70
3a) Number of students in (3) who actually received non-prorated loans	Continuous	-0.051	0.4025	0.0161	0.8992	94.30
3b) Number of students in (3a) who graduated	Continuous	0.0112	0.0655	0.0292	0.8644	257.40
3c) Number of students in (3a) who withdrew before end of term	Continuous	-1.5733	11.4516	0.0189	0.8907	0.89
3d) Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (3c) who withdrew before the end of the term	Continuous	0.000488	0.00901	0.0029	0.9568	1424.20
3e) Number of students in (3a) who completed term (not necessarily graduated)	Continuous	0.0091	0.6078	0.0002	0.9881	82.22
4) Number of students in (2) who received prorated loans in their graduating term	Continuous	0.4674	0.9407	0.2469	0.6193	40.88
4a) Number of students in (4) who graduated	Continuous	-0.5249	1.2579	0.1741	0.6765	36.14
4b) Number of students who withdrew before end of term	Continuous	2.9981	29.087	0.0106	0.9179	0.44
4c) Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (4b) who withdrew before the end of term	Continuous	-0.00196	0.0205	0.0092	0.9237	394.90
4d) Number of students in (4) who completed term (not necessarily graduated).	Continuous	0.0769	0.4358	0.0311	0.86	53.90
Loan volume for students potentially subject to loan proration	Continuous	-0.00000199	0.000001821	1.1897	0.2754	1002321.00
Number of loans for students potentially subject to loan proration	Continuous	-0.0107	0.0114	0.8765	0.3492	151.10
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.0008	0.000636	1.5722	0.2099	7866.60
Number of Direct loans	Continuous	-0.00062	0.000519	1.4289	0.2319	7188.10
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	0.00185	0.00107	2.9994	0.0833	4358.20
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	0.000818	0.000705	1.346	0.246	4435.00

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-3.65E-08	3.29E-08	1.2343	0.2666	23668348.00
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	8.623E-08	7.851E-08	1.2064	0.272	28247595.00
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	0.00268	0.00248	1.168	0.2798	2592.80
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00000106	8.334E-07	1.609	0.2046	7633135.00
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00013	0.000105	1.6354	0.201	4561.70
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	-0.5653	1.9322	0.0856	0.7698	0.17
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-4.4494	7.2077	0.3811	0.537	0.06
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00024	0.000185	1.7184	0.1899	2873.1
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.1625	0.1605	1.0247	0.3114	2.2648
Percentage of students with State grants	Continuous	0.0212	0.013	2.6407	0.1042	21.333
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	0.000038	0.00012	0.1008	0.7509	9225.3
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	-0.00915	0.0207	0.1952	0.6586	23.0298
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.4781	0.4159	1.3211	0.2504	0.384
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	9.52	5.2129	3.3352	0.0678	>999.999
Institution does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	3.5448	34.7455	0.0104	0.9187	>999.999
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.5799	1.6639	0.1215	0.7274	0.109
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-5.9427	6.734	0.7788	0.3775	<0.001
South vs. West	Dummy	1.1198	1.4119	0.629	0.4277	0.188
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	0.7346	1.4353	0.262	0.6088	0.128
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.7163	1.6372	0.1914	0.6617	0.125
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.6071	0.5138	1.3959	0.2374	3.378
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.00319	0.4364	0.0001	0.9942	1.847
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0927	0.729	0.0162	0.8988	0.136
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.3888	0.7875	0.2438	0.6215	0.084
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.9209	0.6077	2.2959	0.1297	0.049
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.8667	0.5862	2.1862	0.1393	0.052
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0069	0.8382	0.0001	0.9934	0.123
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	4.3809	28.6536	0.0234	0.8785	>999.999
Did not participate in loan proration experiment	Dummy	-5.9849	28.7054	0.0435	0.8348	<0.001
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	0.1547	0.4336	0.1272	0.7213	1.363
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	-0.0244	0.016	2.3208	0.1277	30.1723
Percentage of out-of-State freshmen	Continuous	0.0224	0.0168	1.7866	0.1813	17.824

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
---------------	---------------	--------------------	----------------	-----------------	------------------------	-------------------------------

Likelihood Ratio = 122.6627
(p<.0001)

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = cannot be computed

Rescaled R-square = 0.2759

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = cannot be computed

Number of Institutions = 967

Invalid Model presented for completeness only.

Table AI.1.22. Loan Proration: Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Graduation Rate (Part-Time Potentially Graduating Students Only)

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event (%)	Nonevent (%)
1	12,715	0	1.27	12,715	12,713.73	0.00	100.01
2	1,958	0	0.2	1,958	1,957.8	0.00	100.01
3	2,362	1	0.57	2,361	2,361.43	175.44	99.98
4	2,313	2	1.59	2,311	2,311.41	125.79	99.98
5	2,347	6	4.54	2,341	2,342.46	132.16	99.94
6	2,283	20	21.45	2,263	2,261.55	93.24	100.06

Chi-Square = 2.4784
 p<0.6485
 df = 4

Quasi-complete separation: Model invalid

Table AI.1.23. Loan Proration

Loan Proration Experiment - Comparing Participating and Nonparticipating Institutions Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for FY00 Cohort Default Rate					
Participated in experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2,440	3,071,083.5	3,048,780.0	5,427.8	1,258.6
Yes	58	50,167.5	72,471.0	5,427.8	865.0

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	50,167.5
Normal Approximation	
Z	-4.109
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001

Table AI.1.24. Loan Proration

Loan Proration Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Default Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2352	2871481.0	2835336.0	5234.8	1220.9
Yes	58	33774.0	69919.0	5234.8	582.3

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	33774
Normal Approximation	
Z	-6.9047
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001

Table AI.1.25. Loan Proration

Loan Proration Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Graduation Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	1966	1990924.5	1990575.0	4379.2	1012.7
Yes	58	58375.5	58725.0	4379.2	1006.5

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	58375.5
Normal Approximation	
Z	-0.0797
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.4682
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.9365
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.4682
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.9365

Table AI.1.26. Loan Proration

Loan Proration Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Graduation Rate (part-time only)					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	1178	725878.5	727415.0	728.2	616.2
Yes	56	36116.5	34580.0	728.2	644.9

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	36116.5
Normal Approximation	
Z	2.1094
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0175
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0349
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0176
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0351

APPENDIX TABLE AI.2—OVERAWARD TOLERANCE

Table AI.2.1. Experimental Sites Initiatives Reporting Template for Overaward Tolerance


<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;"><i>Experimental Sites Initiative</i></div>		
Institution		
Experiment	Overaward Tolerance	
Reporting Year	2001-2002	
<p>Goal of the Experiment: To evaluate the dollar impact of small overawards in the FFEL/Direct Stafford loan programs.</p> <p>Target Student Population: Students who were overawarded loan funds by amounts of \$300 or less.</p>		
	Reporting Items	Supplemental Items (Optional)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide description and brief rationale on how the institution is conducting this experiment. Please select one of the description worksheets at the bottom on the status bar. 2. Total number of students who received FFEL/Direct Stafford loans. 3. Total dollar amount for students receiving FFEL/Direct Stafford loan funds. 4. Total number of students with loan funds overawarded by \$300 or less. 5. Total amount of overawards for students overawarded by \$300 or less. 6. # of students with loan funds with overawards \$100 or less. 7. # of students with loan funds with overawards \$100.01 - \$200 8. # of students with loan funds with overawards \$200.01 - \$300 9. Average amount of overaward for those with overawards of \$300 or less. 	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 20px; margin-bottom: 5px;"></div>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Average cost of attendance for FFEL/Direct Stafford loan population 2. Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower. 3. Estimated savings in administrative costs per borrower 4. Change in % of borrowers who receive overawards
		<p>Conclusions about this experiment:</p>

Table AI.2.2. Overaward Toleration Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region

	Number	Percentage
Total Participation	40	100
Institution Type		
Two Year, Lower	1	2.5
Two Year, Upper	1	2.5
Four Year	38	95
Control		
Public	37	92.5
Private	3	7.5
Region		
Mid-Atlantic	8	20
South	7	17.5
Midwest	13	32.5
Southwest	3	7.5
West	9	22.5

Table AI.2.3. Overaward Tolerance: Total Number of Students Who Received FFEL/Direct Stafford Loans (Q3_2)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	8	16,419	2,052.38	2,174.00	1,150.96	732	4,235
2nd Quintile	8	40,714	5,089.25	5,097.50	540.73	4,271	5,714
3rd Quintile	8	58,853	7,356.63	7,703.50	1,186.87	5,897	8,754
4th Quintile	8	83,647	10,455.88	9,962.00	1,391.41	8,853	12,392
Highest 20%	8	138,239	17,279.88	15,591.00	5,466.46	12,843	29,948
Total	40	337,872	8,446.80	7,703.50	5,833.56	732	29,948

Table AI.2.4. Overaward Tolerance: Total Dollar Amount for Students Receiving FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan Funds (Q3_3)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	8	\$85,882,876	\$10,735,360	\$10,688,856	\$5,509,519	\$3,233,386	\$19,033,517
2nd Quintile	8	\$225,854,341	\$28,231,793	\$28,832,966	\$3,625,983	\$21,101,484	\$33,934,815
3rd Quintile	8	\$364,349,932	\$45,543,741	\$46,551,701	\$5,933,042	\$35,067,919	\$53,179,782
4th Quintile	8	\$463,381,324	\$57,922,666	\$56,665,106	\$3,411,902	\$53,578,070	\$63,312,368
Highest 20%	8	\$689,580,394	\$86,197,549	\$75,414,342	\$24,767,645	\$63,971,402	\$125,437,361
Total	40	\$1,829,048,867	\$45,726,222	\$46,551,701	\$28,403,462	\$3,233,386	\$125,437,361

Table AI.2.5. Overaward Tolerance: Total Number of Students With Loan Funds Overawarded by \$300 or Less (Q3_4)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	7	37	5.29	6.00	3.55	0	9
2nd Quintile	8	176	22.00	20.50	9.74	10	35
3rd Quintile	8	491	61.38	52.50	23.03	38	104
4 th Quintile	8	1,916	239.50	263.00	67.37	110	309
Highest 20%	8	4,223	527.88	467.00	172.90	344	806
Total	39	6,843	175.46	56.00	215.64	0	806

Table AI.2.6. Overaward Tolerance: Total Amount of Overawards for Students Overawarded by \$300 or Less (Q3_5)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	7	\$5,034	\$719	\$955	\$599	\$0	\$1,438
2 nd Quintile	8	\$26,390	\$3,299	\$2,833	\$1,445	\$1,596	\$5,342
3 rd Quintile	8	\$74,279	\$9,285	\$8,245	\$3,141	\$6,287	\$14,963
4 th Quintile	8	\$286,226	\$35,778	\$34,507	\$14,351	\$16,497	\$56,276
Highest 20%	8	\$818,450	\$102,306	\$102,139	\$34,804	\$59,851	\$158,673
Total	39	\$1,210,378	\$31,035	\$8,733	\$42,051	\$0	\$158,673

Table AI.2.7. Overaward Tolerance: Number of Students with Loan Fund Overawards of \$100 or Less (Q3_6)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	8	22	2.75	3.50	1.58	0	4
2 nd Quintile	7	65	9.29	7.00	3.68	6	15
3 rd Quintile	8	203	25.38	24.50	6.80	17	37
4 th Quintile	8	513	64.13	62.00	13.40	44	84
Highest 20%	8	1,417	177.13	166.00	82.32	90	341
Total	39	2,220	56.92	27.00	74.77	0	341

Table AI.2.8. Overaward Tolerance: Number of Students with Loan Fund Overawards of \$100–\$200 or Less (Q3_7)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	7	7	1.00	1.00	0.82	0	2
2nd Quintile	8	45	5.63	5.50	2.07	3	9
3rd Quintile	9	147	16.33	14.00	4.80	10	23
4th Quintile	7	297	42.43	50.00	14.40	26	57
Highest 20%	8	960	120.00	111.00	59.33	59	211
Total	39	1,456	37.33	14.00	51.86	0	211

Table AI.2.9. Overaward Tolerance: Number of Students with Loan Fund Overawards of \$200–\$300 or Less (Q3_8)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	8	15	1.88	2.50	1.36	0	3
2 nd Quintile	7	55	7.86	6.00	3.39	5	13
3 rd Quintile	8	160	20.00	20.00	4.87	14	26
4 th Quintile	8	645	80.63	84.50	44.83	29	128
Highest 20%	8	2,376	297.00	271.50	122.77	134	493
Total	39	3,251	83.36	22.00	126.71	0	493

Table AI.2.10. Overaward Tolerance: Average Amount of Overaward for Those with Overawards of \$300 or Less (Q3_9)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	7	\$349	\$49.91	\$58.00	\$38.12	\$0	\$95
2 nd Quintile	8	\$1,031	\$128.83	\$136.00	\$15.74	\$102	\$141
3 rd Quintile	8	\$1,206	\$150.76	\$149.59	\$4.30	\$144	\$157
4 th Quintile	8	\$1,376	\$172.06	\$172.83	\$9.79	\$159	\$184
Highest 20%	8	\$1,798	\$224.71	\$218.77	\$24.38	\$197	\$264
Total	39	\$5,760	\$147.70	\$150.00	\$60.15	\$0	\$264

Table AI.2.11. Overaward Tolerance: Average Cost of Attendance for FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan Population (Q3_O1)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	2	\$21,482	\$10,741	\$10,741	\$1,189	\$9,900	\$11,582
2 nd Quintile	3	\$36,102	\$12,034	\$11,902	\$416	\$11,700	\$12,500
3 rd Quintile	2	\$27,700	\$13,850	\$13,850	\$297	\$13,640	\$14,060
4 th Quintile	3	\$57,410	\$19,137	\$16,109	\$5,854	\$15,417	\$25,884
Highest 20%	2	\$59,748	\$29,874	\$29,874	\$1,943	\$28,500	\$31,248
Total	12	\$202,442	\$16,870	\$13,850	\$7,332	\$9,900	\$31,248

Table AI.2.12. Overaward Tolerance: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours Per Borrower (Q3_O2)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	1	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00
2nd Quintile	1	0.25	0.25	0.25		0.25	0.25
3rd Quintile	1	0.30	0.30	0.30		0.30	0.30
4th Quintile	1	0.53	0.53	0.53		0.53	0.53
Highest 20%	1	1.50	1.50	1.50		1.50	1.50
Total	5	2.58	0.52	0.30	0.58	0.00	1.50

Table AI.2.13. Overaward Tolerance: Estimated Savings in Administrative Costs Per Borrower (Q3_03)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00
2nd Quintile	1	\$3.00	\$3.00	\$3.00		\$3.00	\$3.00
3rd Quintile	1	\$4.18	\$4.18	\$4.18		\$4.18	\$4.18
4th Quintile	1	\$10.00	\$10.00	\$10.00		\$10.00	\$10.00
Highest 20%	1	\$22.50	\$22.50	\$22.50		\$22.50	\$22.50
Total	5	\$39.68	\$7.94	\$4.18	\$8.91	\$0.00	\$22.50

Table AI.2.14. Overaward Tolerance: Change in % of Borrowers Who Received Overawards (Q3_04)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 25%	1	0	0	0		0	0
2nd Quartile	1	0.035	0.035	0.035		0.035	0.035
3rd Quartile	1	0.066	0.066	0.066		0.066	0.066
Highest 25%	1	0.586	0.586	0.586		0.586	0.586
Total	4	0.687	0.172	0.051	0.277	0.000	0.586

Table AI.2.15. Overaward Tolerance - Logistic Regression for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-0.8938	0.1038	74.2103	<.0001	
2) Total number of students who received FFEL/Direct Stafford loans	Continuous	-9.48E-06	1.00E-05	0.8987	0.3431	0.971
3) Total dollar amount for students receiving FFEL/Direct Stafford loan funds	Continuous	-8.19E-10	1.67E-09	0.2413	0.6233	0.986
4) Total number of students with loan funds overawarded by \$300 or less	Continuous	-0.0002	0.000253	0.6069	0.4359	0.985
5) Total amount of overawards for students overawarded by \$300 or less	Continuous	4.41E-07	1.45E-06	0.092	0.7616	1.006
9) Average amount of overaward for those with overawards of \$300 or less	Continuous	-0.00006	0.000337	0.0301	0.8622	0.997
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000022	3.05E-06	51.2756	<.0001	1.162
Number of Direct loans	Continuous	0.000014	7.07E-06	4.1316	0.0421	1.11
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00002	6.30E-06	14.0964	0.0002	1.162
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	0.000058	0.000011	28.7943	<.0001	1.11
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-2.15E-09	4.58E-10	21.9572	<.0001	0.953
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	-7.94E-09	8.90E-10	79.6694	<.0001	0.79
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00013	0.000032	17.6227	<.0001	0.724
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	4.96E-08	9.97E-09	24.7347	<.0001	1.417
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	1.57E-06	496.0766	<.0001	0.825
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.034	0.033	1.0593	0.3034	1.006
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-1.4224	0.1198	140.9893	<.0001	0.918
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00005	3.09E-06	288.7405	<.0001	0.816
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.0119	0.003	15.7001	<.0001	1.03
Percentage of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00097	0.000219	19.4472	<.0001	0.979
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-5.78E-07	8.58E-07	0.4543	0.5003	0.995
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.00197	0.000246	64.1434	<.0001	1.035
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0379	0.00778	23.7097	<.0001	0.956
Two-year vs. Four-year college	Dummy	0.1241	0.00773	257.9144	<.0001	1.321

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.00834	0.0249	0.1119	0.738	1.084
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.0857	0.0163	27.6482	<.0001	1.355
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.0121	0.0107	1.2747	0.2589	1.218
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0222	0.00883	6.3194	0.0119	1.252
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	0.005	0.00851	0.3443	0.5574	1.231
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.0697	0.0118	35.0787	<.0001	1.316
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0161	0.00818	3.8969	0.0484	1.014
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.0137	0.00632	4.7157	0.0299	1.039
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.078	0.0135	33.3321	<.0001	0.925
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0011	0.0136	0.0065	0.9358	1.001
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0201	0.00988	4.1212	0.0423	0.976
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	0.00338	0.00981	0.1191	0.73	0.995
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0229	0.0146	2.4649	0.1164	1.017
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0232	0.00848	7.468	0.0063	1.083
Did not participate in overaward tolerance experiment	Dummy	-0.0122	0.0313	0.1516	0.697	1.103
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0143	0.00665	4.6204	0.0316	0.997
Percentage of freshman off campus/commute	Continuous	0.00275	0.000231	142.4543	<.0001	1.101
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00049	0.000344	2.0239	0.1548	0.989

Likelihood Ratio = 18432.62 Rescaled R-Square = .0395 Number of Institutions = 1730

(p< .0001)

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 49.125

Table AI.2.16. Overaward Tolerance - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	143697	2488	2436.38	141209	141260.6	102.12%	99.96%
2	147861	3691	3752.49	144170	144108.5	98.36%	100.04%
3	142554	4563	4415.63	137991	138138.4	103.34%	99.89%
4	146676	4769	5070.72	141907	141605.3	94.05%	100.21%
5	144958	5590	5659.56	139368	139298.4	98.77%	100.05%
6	145187	6507	6492.16	138680	138694.8	100.23%	99.99%
7	143851	7438	7323.01	136413	136528	101.57%	99.92%
8	143326	8533	8521.1	134793	134804.9	100.14%	99.99%
9	144452	10902	10841.69	133550	133610.3	100.56%	99.95%
10	147499	15286	15210.09	132213	132288.9	100.50%	99.94%

Chi-Square = 29.45

p< 0.0003

df = 8

Table AI.2.17. Overaward Tolerance - Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Measure

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-0.9501	0.1014	87.8456	<.0001	
2) Total number of students who received FFEL/Direct Stafford loans	Continuous	0.000102	0.000016	41.0725	<.0001	1.365
3) Total dollar amount for students receiving FFEL/Direct Stafford loan funds	Continuous	-7.06E-10	2.82E-09	0.0627	0.8023	0.988
4) Total number of students with loan funds overawarded by \$300 or less	Continuous	-0.00108	0.000649	2.791	0.0948	0.92
5) Total amount of overawards for students overawarded by \$300 or less	Continuous	8.26E-06	3.34E-06	6.1155	0.0134	1.125
9) Average amount of overaward for those with overawards of \$300 or less	Continuous	0.0017	0.000475	12.8236	0.0003	1.078
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000029	2.48E-06	136.7813	<.0001	1.222
Number of Direct loans	Continuous	-0.00002	0.000015	2.3647	0.1241	0.841
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00004	5.21E-06	49.2975	<.0001	0.865
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00046	0.000022	436.4454	<.0001	0.123
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	9.94E-10	3.88E-10	6.5526	0.0105	1.023
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	3.97E-08	1.66E-09	572.5151	<.0001	3.265
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	0.000022	0.000033	0.4597	0.4977	1.055
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	6.28E-09	1.02E-08	0.3802	0.5375	1.045
Average adjusted Gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	1.44E-06	353.9774	<.0001	0.861
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.3219	0.0312	106.3742	<.0001	1.058
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-2.0828	0.1127	341.7045	<.0001	0.882
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00006	2.94E-06	411.6299	<.0001	0.794
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.026	0.00276	88.7311	<.0001	1.068
Percent of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00342	0.000211	262.7326	<.0001	0.929
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-4.47E-06	7.96E-07	31.529	<.0001	0.961
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.00153	0.000236	41.9353	<.0001	1.027
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0961	0.00724	176.2309	<.0001	0.825
Two-year vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.1646	0.00727	512.3172	<.0001	1.39

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Does not participates in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.4166	0.0369	127.3771	<.0001	0.435
New England vs. West	Dummy	-0.0178	0.0157	1.2893	0.2562	1.116
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.1223	0.0101	146.0149	<.0001	1.006
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0177	0.00838	4.4631	0.0346	1.157
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0227	0.00811	7.8132	0.0052	1.111
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.273	0.00996	751.8988	<.0001	1.493
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0195	0.00763	6.5338	0.0106	0.969
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.00782	0.00605	1.6723	0.196	0.996
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0587	0.0126	21.692	<.0001	0.822
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0268	0.0132	4.1019	0.0428	0.849
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00818	0.00932	0.7704	0.3801	0.865
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0392	0.00919	18.1368	<.0001	0.838
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00457	0.0138	0.1102	0.7399	0.868
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0408	0.00987	17.0995	<.0001	1.085
Did not participate in overaward tolerance experiment	Dummy	0.4725	0.0469	101.55	<.0001	2.573
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.00823	0.00605	1.8515	0.1736	0.984
Percentage of freshman off campus/commute	Continuous	0.000646	0.000219	8.7341	0.0031	1.023
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00355	0.000327	117.4687	<.0001	0.925

Likelihood Ratio = 52522.11 Rescaled R-Square = 0.1038 Number of Institutions = 1730

(p< .0001)

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 20.29

Model = 49025.86

Table AI.2.18. Overaward Tolerance - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Rate

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	146045	976	311.91	145069	145733.1	312.91%	99.54%
2	144339	1209	1121.34	143130	143217.7	107.82%	99.94%
3	144353	1941	2817.99	142412	141535	68.88%	100.62%
4	143700	4377	4760.08	139323	138939.9	91.95%	100.28%
5	142965	5840	6362.74	137125	136602.3	91.78%	100.38%
6	142715	7212	7608.02	135503	135107	94.79%	100.29%
7	143807	9351	9070.61	134456	134736.4	103.09%	99.79%
8	144793	10782	11157.62	134011	133635.4	96.63%	100.28%
9	143951	14719	14605.58	129232	129345.4	100.78%	99.91%
10	144766	22065	20622.18	122701	124143.8	107.00%	98.84%

Chi-Square = 1942.4716
df = 8

p= <.0001

Table AI.2.19. Overaward Tolerance - Logistic Regression for Experimental Retention Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		0.8631	0.0401	463.3409	<.0001	
2) Total number of students who received FFEL/Direct Stafford loans	Continuous	-0.00004	3.33E-06	122.8985	<.0001	0.889
3) Total dollar amount for students receiving FFEL/Direct Stafford loan funds	Continuous	8.24E-09	5.56E-10	219.4454	<.0001	1.159
4) Total number of students with loan funds overawarded by \$300 or less	Continuous	0.00134	0.000086	242.3429	<.0001	1.117
5) Total amount of overawards for students overawarded by \$300 or less	Continuous	-2.75E-06	4.87E-07	32.0642	<.0001	0.959
9) Average amount of overaward for those with overawards of \$300 or less	Continuous	-0.00246	0.000114	466.7305	<.0001	0.894
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	-5.89E-06	1.27E-06	21.703	<.0001	0.96
Number of Direct loans	Continuous	0.00002	2.55E-06	61.4304	<.0001	1.159
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000026	2.53E-06	107.3826	<.0001	1.112
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00002	3.72E-06	28.1997	<.0001	0.913
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-1.76E-09	1.47E-10	144.0979	<.0001	0.96
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	-6.23E-10	3.17E-10	3.8669	0.0492	0.982
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00018	0.000012	212.8488	<.0001	0.656
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	5.53E-08	3.97E-09	194.1694	<.0001	1.455
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-5.34E-06	6.49E-07	67.7594	<.0001	0.972
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.302	0.0141	461.3097	<.0001	1.053
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-0.4502	0.0491	84.0843	<.0001	0.974
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	0.000074	1.08E-06	4650.3856	<.0001	1.324
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	-0.0361	0.00122	882.2069	<.0001	0.917
Percentage of students with State grants	Continuous	0.000865	0.000088	95.8122	<.0001	1.018
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	6.07E-06	4.04E-07	225.8949	<.0001	1.054
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	-0.0019	0.000102	344.9801	<.0001	0.969
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0706	0.00282	626.3986	<.0001	0.868
Two-year vs. four-year college	Dummy	-0.1798	0.00367	2402.1575	<.0001	0.698

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.0615	0.00882	48.6968	<.0001	1.131
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.0947	0.00561	285.0859	<.0001	1.225
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	0.1291	0.00388	1105.403	<.0001	1.267
South vs. West	Dummy	-0.00617	0.00363	2.8904	0.0891	1.107
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0853	0.00319	714.5435	<.0001	1.023
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0245	0.00503	23.7165	<.0001	1.087
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.0416	0.00316	172.8947	<.0001	1.054
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0305	0.0024	161.9487	<.0001	0.981
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0349	0.00519	45.0627	<.0001	1.192
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0143	0.00544	6.8794	0.0087	1.135
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0362	0.00384	88.6226	<.0001	1.194
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0442	0.00377	137.1482	<.0001	1.203
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0398	0.00548	52.7847	<.0001	1.198
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	-0.0121	0.00285	17.9065	<.0001	0.976
Did not participate in overaward tolerance experiment	Dummy	-0.096	0.0105	82.917	<.0001	0.825
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	0.0107	0.00329	10.6116	0.0011	1.022
Percentage of freshman off campus/commute	Continuous	-0.00227	0.000089	648.5798	<.0001	0.93
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00064	0.000117	30.407	<.0001	0.985

Likelihood Ratio = 102134.90 Rescaled R-Square = 0.0657 Number of Institutions = 1717

(p < .0001)

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 14.91

Model = 93429.71

Table AI.2.20. Overaward Tolerance - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Retention Rate

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	209052	91115	91005.1	117937	118046.9	100.12%	99.91%
2	209131	109032	110751.9	100099	98379.08	98.45%	101.75%
3	208545	122263	120293.3	86282	88251.68	101.64%	97.77%
4	207955	128642	128010.9	79313	79944.08	100.49%	99.21%
5	208269	134506	135001.9	73763	73267.13	99.63%	100.68%
6	211414	145547	142586.7	65867	68827.35	102.08%	95.70%
7	210223	140842	146747.8	69381	63475.16	95.98%	109.30%
8	205776	149261	148266.4	56515	57509.59	100.67%	98.27%
9	207775	157086	156578.9	50689	51196.07	100.32%	99.01%
10	205045	165604	164624.5	39441	40420.48	100.59%	97.58%

Chi-Square = 1182.56

p < .0001

df = 8

Table AI.2.21. Overaward Tolerance

Overaward Tolerance Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2479	3134568.5	3123540	4562.504	1264.4488
Yes	40	39371.5	50400	4562.504	984.2875

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	39371.5
Normal Approximation	
Z	-2.4171
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0078
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0156
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0079
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0157

Table AI.2.22. Overaward Tolerance

Overaward Tolerance Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Default Measure					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2391	2928169	2907456	4402.2047	1224.6629
Yes	40	27927	48640	4402.2047	698.175

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	27927
Normal Approximation	
Z	-4.705
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001

Table AI.2.23. Overaward Tolerance

Overaward Tolerance Experiment - Comparing Participating and Nonparticipating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Retention Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2,296	2,671,018	2,682,876	4,229.1622	1,163.3354
Yes	40	58,598	46,740	4,229.1622	1,464.95

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	58,598
Normal Approximation	
Z	2.8037
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0025
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0051
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0025
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0051

APPENDIX TABLE AI.3—LOAN FEES IN COST OF ATTENDANCE

Table AI.3.1. Experimental Sites Initiative Reporting Template for Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance

Experimental Sites Initiative

Institution

Experiment Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance

Reporting Year 2001-2002



Goal of the Experiment: To evaluate the impact of allowing alternative methods of including or excluding loan fees in the Cost of Attendance.

Target Student Population: Students who received FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan Funds.

Reporting Items

1. Provide description and brief rationale on how the institution is conducting this experiment. Please select one of the description worksheets at the bottom on the status bar.
2. Total # of students received FFEL/Direct Stafford loan funds.
3. Total loan funds for all students receiving FFEL/Direct Stafford loan funds.
4. Total # for whom loan fees are included in loans as part of COA.
5. Total amount of loans for students in (4) who have loan fees included.
6. Total amount of loan fees included in cost of attendance for students in (4).
7. Total # of students for whom loan fees were NOT included in cost of attendance.
8. Total # of students that did NOT have loan fees included in their COA, who received the maximum annual loan limit for the award year.
9. Total # of students who could have had the loan fees included in their cost of attendance.
10. Methods of informing students, when requested, that loan fees may be included in cost of attendance. Please specify:

Supplemental Items (Optional)

1. Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower.
2. Estimated savings in administrative cost.

Table AI.3.2. Loan Fees in COA Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region

	Number	Percentage
Total Participation	45	100
Institution Type		
Two Year, Lower	1	2.22
Four Year	44	97.78
Control		
Public	36	80
Private	9	20
Region		
Mid-Atlantic	5	11.11
South	8	17.78
Midwest	22	48.89
Southwest	1	2.22
West	9	20

Table AI.3.3. Loan Fees in COA: Total Number of Students Who Received FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan Funds (Q4_2)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	11	18,806	1,709.64	1,401.00	1,177.26	240	4,235
2 nd Quintile	11	61,304	5,573.09	5,714.00	713.47	4,364	6,745
3 rd Quintile	11	87,545	7,958.64	7,734.00	791.27	6,803	9,059
4 th Quintile	11	125,435	11,403.18	10,870.00	1,710.47	9,136	14,159
Highest 20%	11	211,520	19,229.09	17,102.00	6,956.12	14,477	39,506
Total	55	504,610	9,174.73	7,734.00	6,772.66	240	39,506

Table AI.3.4. Loan Fees in COA: Total Loan Funds for All Students Receiving FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan Funds (Q4_3)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	11	\$88,302,948	\$8,027,541	\$5,049,218	\$6,930,700	\$817,303	\$21,101,484
2nd Quintile	11	\$343,997,405	\$31,272,491	\$31,272,061	\$4,031,099	\$25,064,540	\$37,299,953
3rd Quintile	11	\$522,423,837	\$47,493,076	\$46,602,174	\$6,341,241	\$38,397,856	\$57,145,540
4th Quintile	11	\$726,569,059	\$66,051,733	\$64,089,991	\$6,087,364	\$58,119,675	\$77,195,707
Highest 20%	11	\$1,349,780,656	\$122,707,332	\$124,484,329	\$37,761,717	\$77,451,170	\$183,886,045
Total	55	\$3,031,073,906	\$55,110,435	\$46,602,174	\$42,715,325	\$817,303	\$183,886,045

Table AI.3.5. Loan Fees in COA: Total Number of Students for Whom Loan Fees Were Included in Loans as Part of COA (Q4_4)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	11	25	2.27	0.00	3.07	0	9
2nd Quintile	11	1,420	129.09	134.00	72.13	25	226
3 rd Quintile	11	3,827	347.91	346.00	91.30	240	522
4 th Quintile	11	9,091	826.45	936.00	183.51	525	1,019
Highest 20%	11	64,330	5,848.18	2,998.00	6,061.70	1,104	18,809
Total	55	78,693	1,430.78	346.00	3,444.17	0	18,809

Table AI.3.6. Loan Fees in COA: Total Amount of Loans for Students in (4) Who Have Loan Fees Included (Q4_5)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	11	\$309,363	\$28,124	\$0	\$39,301	\$0	\$102,769
2nd Quintile	11	\$7,407,548	\$673,413	\$487,257	\$442,295	\$106,474	\$1,329,786
3 rd Quintile	11	\$27,134,521	\$2,466,775	\$2,660,327	\$916,657	\$1,425,799	\$3,715,624
4 th Quintile	11	\$66,083,549	\$6,007,595	\$5,784,382	\$1,665,212	\$3,900,766	\$8,271,211
Highest 20%	11	\$550,022,196	\$50,002,018	\$46,602,174	\$46,415,500	\$9,398,714	\$139,576,536
Total	55	\$650,957,177	\$11,835,585	\$2,660,327	\$27,838,418	\$0	\$139,576,536

Table AI.3.7. Loan Fees in COA: Total Amount of Loan Fees Included in Cost of Attendance for Students in (4) (Q4_6)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	11	\$7,501	\$682	\$0	\$1,063	\$0	\$3,487
2nd Quintile	11	\$158,270	\$14,388	\$14,342	\$7,907	\$3,909	\$26,672
3rd Quintile	11	\$715,971	\$65,088	\$67,025	\$24,611	\$29,371	\$109,598
4th Quintile	11	\$1,900,143	\$172,740	\$151,477	\$48,334	\$111,094	\$243,141
Highest 20%	11	\$16,142,923	\$1,467,538	\$702,619	\$1,533,778	\$250,466	\$4,292,039
Total	55	\$18,924,807	\$344,087	\$67,025	\$872,528	\$0	\$4,292,039

Table AI.3.8. Loan Fees in COA: Total Number of Students for Whom Loan Fees Were Not Included in Cost of Attendance (Q4_7)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	11	4,722	429.27	0.00	558.22	0	1,580
2nd Quintile	11	45,898	4,172.55	4,642.00	1,250.63	2,103	5,678
3rd Quintile	11	77,687	7,062.45	7,190.00	862.00	5,711	8,307
4th Quintile	11	104,780	9,525.45	9,056.00	1,102.48	8,388	12,046
Highest 20%	11	193,357	17,577.91	16,076.00	7,625.99	12,216	39,417
Total	55	426,444	7,753.53	7,190.00	6,739.25	0	39,417

Table AI.3.9. Loan Fees in COA: Total Number of Students Who Did Not Have Loan Fees Included in Their COA, Who Received Maximum Annual Loan Limit for Award Year (Q4_8)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	10	1,372	137.20	26.00	199.16	0	592
2nd Quintile	11	13,876	1,261.45	1,214.00	397.62	778	1,784
3rd Quintile	10	30,119	3,011.90	3,242.50	598.34	2,078	3,788
4th Quintile	11	58,613	5,328.45	5,846.00	1,140.65	3,858	7,150
Highest 20%	10	124,302	12,430.20	10,710.50	8,492.12	7,203	35,979
Total	52	228,282	4,390.04	3,242.50	5,654.90	0	35,979

Table AI.3.10. Loan Fees in COA: Total Number of Students Who Could Have Had Loan Fees Included in their Cost of Attendance (Q4_9)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	10	6,110	611.00	831.50	488.94	0	1,169
2nd Quintile	11	30,020	2,729.09	2,908.00	605.73	1,401	3,438
3rd Quintile	10	50,390	5,039.00	5,064.00	700.65	4,193	5,758
4th Quintile	11	85,790	7,799.09	7,673.00	1,276.54	6,032	9,825
Highest 20%	10	137,169	13,716.90	13,501.00	3,294.89	9,879	20,703
Total	52	309,479	5,951.52	5,064.00	4,794.94	0	20,703

Table AI.3.11. Loan Fees in COA: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours Per Borrower (Q4_O1)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	1	0.03	0.03	0.03		0.03	0.03
2 nd Quintile	3	0.28	0.09	0.10	0.01	0.08	0.10
3 rd Quintile	1	0.25	0.25	0.25		0.25	0.25
4 th Quintile	2	1.05	0.53	0.53	0.32	0.30	0.75
Highest 20%	1	1.50	1.50	1.50		1.50	1.50
Total	8	3.12	0.39	0.18	0.50	0.03	1.50

Table AI.3.12. Loan Fees in COA: Estimated Savings in Administrative Costs Per Borrower (Q4_O2)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	1.00	\$0.38	\$0.38	\$0.38	.	\$0.38	\$0.38
2nd Quintile	2.00	\$2.05	\$1.03	\$1.03	\$0.67	\$0.55	\$1.50
3rd Quintile	2.00	\$7.58	\$3.79	\$3.79	\$0.10	\$3.72	\$3.86
4th Quintile	2.00	\$262.50	\$131.25	\$131.25	\$153.80	\$22.50	\$240.00
Highest 20%	1.00	\$326.40	\$326.40	\$326.40		\$326.40	\$326.40
Total	8.00	\$598.91	\$74.86	\$3.79	\$130.84	\$0.38	\$326.40

Table AI.3.13. Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance: Logistic Regression for FY00 Cohort Default Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-0.9284	0.1037	80.1284	<.0001	
2) Total number of students received FFEL/Direct Stafford loan funds	Continuous	-0.00004	0.000237	0.0242	0.8764	0.87
3) Total loan funds for all students receiving FFEL/Direct Stafford loan funds	Continuous	-1.87E-09	1.037E-09	3.2549	0.0712	0.95
4) Total number for whom loan fees are included in loans as part of COA	Continuous	0.000042	0.000245	0.0296	0.8634	1.08
5) Total amount of loans for students in (4) who have loan fees included	Continuous	1.052E-08	2.556E-09	16.9568	<.0001	1.17
6) Total amount of loan fees included in cost of attendance for students in (4)	Continuous	-0.000000332	7.031E-08	22.3433	<.0001	0.86
7) Total number of students for whom loan fees were NOT included in cost of attendance	Continuous	0.000035	0.000237	0.0224	0.881	1.12
8) Total number of students that did NOT have loan fees included in their COA who received the maximum annual loan limit for the award year	Continuous	0.000027	0.000006173	19.6305	<.0001	1.05
9) Total number of students who could have had the loan fees included in their cost of attendance	Continuous	-0.000000385	0.000003258	0.014	0.9058	1.00
Number of FFEL program loans	Continuous	0.000025	0.000003042	70.2017	<.0001	1.19
Number of direct loans	Continuous	-0.00000378	0.000006347	0.3538	0.552	0.97
Number of students with FFEL program loans	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000006285	18.51	<.0001	0.90
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	0.00007	0.000009727	52.2708	<.0001	1.38
Total FFEL program volume	Continuous	-2.66E-09	4.67E-10	32.398	<.0001	0.94
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	-5.45E-09	9.5E-10	32.9438	<.0001	0.85
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00019	0.000033	34.7037	<.0001	0.63
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	6.691E-08	1.02E-08	43.0236	<.0001	1.60
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000001567	451.1792	<.0001	0.83
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.0157	0.0332	0.2254	0.635	1.00
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-1.3996	0.1212	133.3192	<.0001	0.92
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00005	0.000003143	293.6536	<.0001	0.812
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.00931	0.00301	9.5359	0.002	1.024

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Percentage of students with state grants	Continuous	-0.00091	0.000219	17.2075	<.0001	0.981
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-0.000000171	8.576E-07	0.0397	0.8421	0.998
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.002	0.000255	61.6113	<.0001	1.036
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0314	0.00774	16.447	<.0001	0.939
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.1159	0.00777	222.7837	<.0001	1.261
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.0646	0.0284	5.1795	0.0229	1.138
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.0817	0.0163	25.1485	<.0001	1.28
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.0205	0.0107	3.6887	0.0548	1.155
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0254	0.0089	8.1222	0.0044	1.209
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	0.00232	0.00853	0.0742	0.7854	1.182
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.0759	0.0118	41.6793	<.0001	1.272
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0159	0.00821	3.7366	0.0532	0.976
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.00762	0.00632	1.4538	0.2279	0.999
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0735	0.0136	29.3242	<.0001	0.868
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.00202	0.0136	0.022	0.882	0.936
Small City vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0112	0.00994	1.2714	0.2595	0.923
Large Town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00364	0.00984	0.1367	0.7116	0.931
Small Town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0179	0.0146	1.5059	0.2198	0.951
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0787	0.00937	70.5945	<.0001	1.171
Did not participate in COA experiment	Dummy	-0.0654	0.0223	8.6076	0.0033	0.877
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0184	0.00664	7.7202	0.0055	0.964
Percentage of Freshmen of Campus/Commute	Continuous	0.00308	0.00023	178.9727	<.0001	1.114
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00028	0.000351	0.6279	0.4281	0.994
Likelihood Ratio = 18465.29 (p<.0001) Rescaled R-square = 0.0395 Number of Institutions = 1730 Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 17277.02 (p<.0001) Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 21.89						

Table AI.3.14. Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	144938	2410	2462.93	142528	142475.1	97.85%	100.04%
2	140019	3639	3532.46	136380	136486.5	103.02%	99.92%
3	145575	4388	4486.89	141187	141088.1	97.80%	100.07%
4	146958	4977	5138.57	141981	141819.4	96.86%	100.11%
5	141635	5418	5497.19	136217	136137.8	98.56%	100.06%
6	143343	6303	6307.75	137040	137035.3	99.92%	100.00%
7	144425	7574	7230.23	136851	137194.8	104.75%	99.75%
8	146209	8519	8580.8	137690	137628.2	99.28%	100.04%
9	144890	10854	10906.49	134036	133983.5	99.52%	100.04%
10	152069	15685	15578.33	136384	136490.7	100.68%	99.92%

Chi-Square = 31.92

p<.0001

df = 8

Table AI.3.15. Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance - Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-0.9281	0.0969	91.6775	<.0001	
2) Total # of students received FFEL/Direct Stafford loan funds	Continuous	-0.00261	0.000328	63.3719	<.0001	<0.001
3) Total loan funds for all students receiving FFEL/Direct Stafford loan funds	Continuous	-8.12E-09	9.7E-10	70.0665	<.0001	0.80
4) Total # for whom loan fees are included in loans as part of COA	Continuous	0.00301	0.00034	78.0817	<.0001	256.32
5) Total amount of loans for students in (4) who have loan fees included	Continuous	2.792E-09	5.277E-09	0.2799	0.5967	1.04
6) Total amount of loan fees included in cost of attendance for students in (4)	Continuous	-0.00000101	1.663E-07	36.7165	<.0001	0.63
7) Total # of students for whom loan fees were NOT included in cost of attendance	Continuous	0.00265	0.000327	65.3358	<.0001	>999.999
8) Total # of students that did NOT have loan fees included in their COA, who received the maximum annual loan limit for the award year	Continuous	0.000107	0.000007988	178.256	<.0001	1.22
9) Total # of students who could have had the loan fees included in their cost of attendance	Continuous	-0.00001	0.000004932	9.1014	0.0026	0.96
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.00003	0.000002484	144.1593	<.0001	1.23
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000061	0.000015	16.4621	<.0001	1.55
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00002	0.000005254	19.4222	<.0001	0.91
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00058	0.000022	681.4586	<.0001	0.07
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-1.78E-09	3.92E-10	20.4842	<.0001	0.96
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	3.58E-08	1.659E-09	465.6662	<.0001	2.90
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00007	0.000034	3.8478	0.0498	0.85
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	3.469E-08	1.061E-08	10.6967	0.0011	1.28
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000001443	349.2716	<.0001	0.86
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.2219	0.0314	49.9966	<.0001	1.04
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-1.5357	0.1144	180.225	<.0001	0.91
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00006	0.000002931	363.3878	<.0001	0.806
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.0189	0.00278	46.2489	<.0001	1.049

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Percentage of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00308	0.000212	211.6169	<.0001	0.936
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-0.0000052	8.014E-07	42.0892	<.0001	0.955
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.000313	0.000245	1.6282	0.202	1.005
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.1013	0.00729	193.0389	<.0001	0.817
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.1678	0.00736	520.15	<.0001	1.399
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.1378	0.0385	12.8019	0.0003	0.759
New England vs. West	Dummy	-0.0151	0.0157	0.9198	0.3375	1.11
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.1315	0.0101	168.4135	<.0001	0.988
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0225	0.0084	7.1451	0.0075	1.152
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0293	0.00818	12.8588	0.0003	1.094
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.2728	0.01	739.5382	<.0001	1.48
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0238	0.00767	9.6555	0.0019	0.956
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.00232	0.00607	0.1464	0.702	0.981
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0655	0.0127	26.8096	<.0001	0.832
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0292	0.0131	4.976	0.0257	0.863
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	0.00002	0.00937	0	0.9983	0.889
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0282	0.00916	9.4945	0.0021	0.864
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.00483	0.0137	0.1236	0.7251	0.893
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0844	0.0116	52.5904	<.0001	1.184
Did not participate in COA experiment	Dummy	0.026	0.0276	0.8871	0.3463	1.053
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0109	0.00605	3.22	0.0727	0.979
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	0.000794	0.000219	13.1306	0.0003	1.028
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00397	0.000331	144.2653	<.0001	0.916

Likelihood Ratio = 53071.42
 (p<.0001)
 Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 46438.44
 (p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.1048 Number of Institutions = 1730
 Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 10.56

Table AI.3.16. Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Rate

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	141195	893	233.44	140302	140961.6	382.54%	99.53%
2	144700	1157	1083.29	143543	143616.7	106.80%	99.95%
3	143785	1940	2717.34	141845	141067.7	71.39%	100.55%
4	143740	4232	4680.52	139508	139059.5	90.42%	100.32%
5	149511	5675	6650.55	143836	142860.4	85.33%	100.68%
6	144429	7394	7675.68	137035	136753.3	96.33%	100.21%
7	144490	9583	9101.08	134907	135388.9	105.30%	99.64%
8	143833	11178	11328.6	132655	132504.4	98.67%	100.11%
9	145349	14951	14889.19	130398	130459.8	100.42%	99.95%
10	140402	21469	20077.59	118933	120324.4	106.93%	98.84%

Chi-Square = 2445.60

p<.0001

df = 8

Table AI.3.17. Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance - Logistic Regression for Retention Rate (Borrowers Only)

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		0.6348	0.0403	247.996	<.0001	
2) Total # of students received FFEL/Direct Stafford loan funds	Continuous	-0.0011	0.000079	192.8302	<.0001	0.01
3) Total loan funds for all students receiving FFEL/Direct Stafford loan funds	Continuous	-1.69E-09	2.93E-10	33.033	<.0001	0.95
4) Total # for whom loan fees are included in loans as part of COA	Continuous	0.00112	0.000082	186.9726	<.0001	8.16
5) Total amount of loans for students in (4) who have loan fees included	Continuous	-8.79E-09	8.2E-10	114.7657	<.0001	0.87
6) Total amount of loan fees included in cost of attendance for students in (4)	Continuous	1.392E-07	2.485E-08	31.3996	<.0001	1.07
7) Total # of students for whom loan fees were NOT included in cost of attendance	Continuous	0.00109	0.000079	189.9446	<.0001	34.81
8) Total # of students that did NOT have loan fees included in their COA, who received the maximum annual loan limit for the award year	Continuous	0.000009352	0.000002139	19.1192	<.0001	1.02
9) Total # of students who could have had the loan fees included in their cost of attendance	Continuous	0.000046	0.00000105	1945.1005	<.0001	1.14
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00000321	0.00000126	6.4845	0.0109	0.98
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000018	0.000002282	59.534	<.0001	1.14
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000017	0.00000253	46.6416	<.0001	1.07
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00005	0.000003433	227.4906	<.0001	0.79
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-1.92E-09	1.49E-10	167.8029	<.0001	0.96
Total Direct loan volume	Continuous	5.078E-09	3.33E-10	232.5661	<.0001	1.16
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00021	0.000013	276.6409	<.0001	0.61
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	6.498E-08	4.11E-09	250.0074	<.0001	1.56
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00000424	0.000000647	42.8782	<.0001	0.98
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.3305	0.0142	538.2126	<.0001	1.06
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-0.3917	0.05	61.3456	<.0001	0.98
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	0.000072	0.00000109	4351.2233	<.0001	1.315
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	-0.037	0.00122	915.5654	<.0001	0.915

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Percent of students with State grants	Continuous	0.000928	0.000088	110.5392	<.0001	1.02
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	0.000009669	4.079E-07	561.8385	<.0001	1.088
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	-0.00195	0.000108	324.1542	<.0001	0.969
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0649	0.00283	525.9872	<.0001	0.878
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	-0.1775	0.00369	2311.1133	<.0001	0.701
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.0651	0.00996	42.7504	<.0001	1.139
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.096	0.00562	292.4793	<.0001	1.242
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	0.1329	0.00388	1171.7039	<.0001	1.289
South vs. West	Dummy	-0.0105	0.00366	8.304	0.004	1.116
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0831	0.00319	679.294	<.0001	1.038
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0146	0.00502	8.4873	0.0036	1.112
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.0341	0.00316	115.9232	<.0001	1.039
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0298	0.00241	153.5402	<.0001	0.975
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0354	0.00522	45.9959	<.0001	1.203
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0105	0.00542	3.7407	0.0531	1.149
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0491	0.00387	160.4814	<.0001	1.219
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	0.029	0.00378	58.5368	<.0001	1.195
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0463	0.00547	71.7786	<.0001	1.216
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0141	0.00304	21.4493	<.0001	1.029
Did not participate in COA experiment	Dummy	0.00194	0.00773	0.0628	0.8021	1.004
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	0.0132	0.00328	16.2458	<.0001	1.027
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	-0.00257	0.00009	817.5914	<.0001	0.921
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00079	0.000118	44.7133	<.0001	0.982

Likelihood Ratio = 103347.97
(p<.0001)

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 91595.34
(p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.0665

Number of Institutions = 1717

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 11.05

Table AI.3.18. Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Retention Rate (Borrowers Only)

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	207,909	90,807	90,134.16	117,102	117,774.80	100.75%	99.43%
2	211,031	108,686	110,953.70	102,345	100,077.30	97.96%	102.27%
3	209,658	121,805	121,346.90	87,853	88,311.05	100.38%	99.48%
4	209,596	130,236	129,881.70	79,360	79,714.34	100.27%	99.56%
5	207,685	137,279	135,269.30	70,406	72,415.72	101.49%	97.22%
6	207,960	139,910	139,772.70	68,050	68,187.33	100.10%	99.80%
7	203,415	137,829	141,532.20	65,586	61,882.82	97.38%	105.98%
8	210,215	151,263	151,737.80	58,952	58,477.21	99.69%	100.81%
9	207,817	157,971	156,019.20	49,846	51,797.76	101.25%	96.23%
10	207,899	168,112	167,221	39,787	40,677.98	100.53%	97.81%

Chi-Square = 645.35

p<.0001

df = 8

Table AI.3.19. Loan Fees In Cost Of Attendance

Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance Experiment – Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for FY00 Cohort Default Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2,464	3,117,953.0	3,104,640.0	5,333.8	1,265.4
Yes	55	55,987.0	69,300.0	5,333.8	1,017.9

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	55987
Normal Approximation	
Z	-2.4959
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0063
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0126
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0063
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0126

Table AI.3.20. Loan Fees In Cost Of Attendance

Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Default Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2376	2917722.5	2889216.0	5145.8	1228.0
Yes	55	38373.5	66880.0	5145.8	697.7

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	38373.5
Normal Approximation	
Z	-5.5396
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001

Table AI.3.21. Loan Fees In Cost Of Attendance

Loan Fees in Cost of Attendance Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Retention Rate (Borrowers Only)					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2282	2648005.0	2666517.0	4898.8	1160.4
Yes	54	81611.0	63099.0	4898.8	1511.3

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	81611
Normal Approximation	
Z	3.7788
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0002
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0002

APPENDIX TABLE AI.4—CREDIT TITLE IV AID TO INSTITUTIONAL CHARGES

Table AI.4.1. Experimental Sites Initiative Reporting Template for Credit of Aid to Title IV Institutional Charges

Experimental Sites Initiative

Institution	<input type="text"/>
Experiment	Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges
Reporting Year	2001-2002
Goal of the Experiment:	To evaluate the impact of simplifying services to students by allowing crediting of Title IV funds to nonallowable institutional charges (other than tuition and fees and/or room and board without written authorization from students).
Target Student Population:	Students whose Title IV aid was credited to nonallowable institutional charges.



Reporting Items

- Provide description and brief rationale on how the institution is conducting this experiment. Please select one of the description worksheets at the bottom of the status bar.
- Provide method of informing students of crediting of Title IV funds to institutional charges. Please specify.
- Total number of Title IV aid recipients.
- Total dollar amount of Title IV funds for Title IV aid recipients.
- Total amount of Title IV aid credited to nonallowable institutional charges.
- Percentage of students declining automatic credit to nonallowable institutional charges.
- Number of students declining automatic credit of Title IV aid to nonallowable institutional charges.
- Number for whom Title IV aid was credited to nonallowable institutional charges.
- Number of students who used some of their 2001-2002 aid for credit to nonallowable institutional charges who either graduated or were able to continue their enrollment into the following semester.
- Number of students who take advantage of the Crediting to nonallowable charges provision for multiple semesters.

Supplemental Items (Optional)

- Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower.
- Estimated savings in administrative

Table AI.4.2. Credit of Title IV Aid to Nonallowable Institutional Charges Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region

	Number	Percentage
Total Participation	31	100
School Type		
Two Year, Lower	1	3.23
Four Year	30	96.77
Control		
Public	26	83.87
Private	5	16.13
Region		
Mid-Atlantic	1	3.23
South	3	9.68
Midwest	19	61.29
West	8	25.81

Table AI.4.3. Institutional Charges: Total Number of Title IV Aid Recipients (Q5_3)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	6	8,567	1,427.83	1,463.00	738.60	287	2,267
2nd Quintile	6	29,274	4,879.00	5,051.00	1,062.73	2,917	5,881
3rd Quintile	7	61,624	8,803.43	9,142.00	1,860.51	6,145	10,745
4th Quintile	6	81,981	13,663.50	13,091.00	2,078.40	11,558	16,386
Highest 20%	6	119,117	19,852.83	19,063.50	3,455.13	17,041	26,362
Total	31	300,563	9,695.58	9,142.00	6,779.43	287	26,362

Table AI.4.4. Institutional Charges: Total Dollar Amount of Title IV Fund for Title IV Aid Recipients (Q5_4)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	6	\$45,085,486	\$7,514,248	\$7,489,462	\$4,238,079	\$1,221,000	\$13,937,952
2nd Quintile	6	\$176,955,756	\$29,492,626	\$31,166,882	\$12,541,244	\$14,178,198	\$42,512,374
3rd Quintile	7	\$448,547,639	\$64,078,234	\$63,150,316	\$13,989,158	\$44,658,789	\$83,598,864
4th Quintile	6	\$573,541,468	\$95,590,245	\$94,502,796	\$7,045,158	\$87,390,261	\$107,953,416
Highest 20%	6	\$939,309,901	\$156,551,650	\$146,429,463	\$34,287,165	\$119,016,476	\$217,799,477
Total	31	\$2,183,440,249	\$70,433,556	\$63,150,316	\$54,943,746	\$1,221,000	\$217,799,477

Table AI.4.5. Institutional Charges: Total Amount of Title IV Aid Credited to Nonallowable Institutional Charges (Q5_5)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	5	\$287,974	\$57,595	\$46,646	\$65,366	\$2,300	\$164,036
2nd Quintile	5	\$1,572,531	\$314,506	\$332,231	\$110,085	\$164,289	\$463,390
3rd Quintile	5	\$3,003,420	\$600,684	\$577,409	\$120,148	\$467,627	\$797,139
4th Quintile	5	\$8,844,152	\$1,768,830	\$1,423,382	\$1,133,347	\$887,896	\$3,719,400
Highest 20%	5	\$72,964,947	\$14,592,989	\$7,994,466	\$17,227,608	\$4,229,628	\$45,230,431
Total	25	\$86,673,025	\$3,466,921	\$577,409	\$9,070,718	\$2,300	\$45,230,431

Table AI.4.6. Institutional Charges: Percentage of Students Declining Automatic Credit to Nonallowable Institutional Charges (Q5_6)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 87%	27.00	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Highest 13%	4.00	15.20%	3.80%	0.62%	6.78%	0.01%	13.95%
Total	31.00	15.20%	0.49%	0.00%	2.50%	0.00%	13.95%

Table AI.4.7. Institutional Charges: Number of Students Declining Automatic Credit of Title IV Aid to Nonallowable Institutional Charges (Q5_7)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 84%	26	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
Highest 16%	5	447	89.40	15.00	115.43	1	232
Total	31	447	14.42	0.00	53.79	0	232

Table AI.4.8. Institutional Charges: Number of Students for Whom Title IV Aid was Credited to Nonallowable Institutional Charges (Q5_8)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	5	942	188.40	89.00	202.49	2.00	488.00
2 nd Quintile	5	4,686	937.20	826.00	326.72	614.00	1,288.00
3 rd Quintile	6	15,660	2,610.00	2,321.50	1,018.25	1,431.00	3,881.00
4 th Quintile	5	26,722	5,344.40	5,497.00	1,131.42	3,958.00	6,636.00
Highest 20%	5	70,578	14,115.60	14,388.00	1,966.99	11,097.00	15,886.00
Total	26	118,588	4,561.08	2,321.50	5,176.83	2.00	15,886.00

Table AI.4.9. Institutional Charges: Number of Students Who Used Some of Their 2001–2002 Aid for Credit to Nonallowable Institutional Charges, Who Either Graduated or Were Able to Continue Their Enrollment into the Following Semester (Q5_9)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	4	94	23.50	7.50	37.67	0	79
2 nd Quintile	5	1,919	383.80	372.00	117.71	236	562
3 rd Quintile	5	9,150	1,830.00	1,880.00	512.18	1,282	2,579
4 th Quintile	5	22,483	4,496.60	3,839.00	1,140.71	3,383	5,939
Highest 20%	4	44,060	11,015.00	10,831.50	3,799.76	6,636	15,761
Total	23	77,706	3,378.52	1,880.00	4,215.76	0	15,761

Table AI.4.10. Institutional Charges: Number of Students Who Take Advantage of the Crediting of Nonallowable Charges Provision for Multiple Semesters (Q5_10)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	4	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
2 nd Quintile	4	639	159.75	102.50	166.48	36	398
3 rd Quintile	5	5,517	1,103.40	1,282.00	537.85	465	1,692
4 th Quintile	4	12,631	3,157.75	3,258.50	1,023.73	1,978	4,136
Highest 20%	4	31,341	7,835.25	6,245.00	4,745.82	4,145	14,706
Total	21	50,128	2,387.05	1,282.00	3,492.38	0	14,706

Table AI.4.11. Institutional Charges: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours Per Borrower (Q5_01)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 50%	1	0.00	0.00	0.00		0	0
Highest 50%	1	0.33	0.33	0.33		0.33	0.33
Total	2	0.33	0.17	0.17	0.23	0	0.33

Table AI.4.12. Institutional Charges: Estimated Savings in Administrative Costs Per Borrower (Q5_O2)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 50%	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00
Highest 50%	1	\$5.67	\$5.67	\$5.67		\$5.67	\$5.67
Total	2	\$5.67	\$2.84	\$2.84	\$4.01	\$0.00	\$5.67

Table AI.4.13. Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges: Logistic Regression for FY00 Cohort Default Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-0.7663	0.105	53.253	<.0001	
3) Total number of Title IV aid recipients	Continuous	0.000002266	0.000008915	0.0646	0.7994	1.01
4) Total dollar amount of Title IV funds for Title IV aid recipients	Continuous	-1.17E-09	8.89E-10	1.7352	0.1877	0.97
5) Total amount of Title IV aid credited to nonallowable institutional charges	Continuous	-8.89E-09	8.381E-09	1.1258	0.2887	0.98
6) Percentage of students declining automatic credit to nonallowable institutional charges	Continuous	-3.0307	5.5223	0.3012	0.5831	0.99
7) Number of students declining automatic credit of Title IV aid to nonallowable institutional charges	Continuous	0.00119	0.00265	0.2022	0.6529	1.02
8) Number for whom Title IV aid was credited to nonallowable institutional charges	Continuous	-0.00001	0.000029	0.2078	0.6485	0.98
9) Number of students who used some of their 2001-2002 aid for credit to nonallowable institutional charges, who either graduated or were able to continue their enrollment into the following semester	Continuous	0.000024	0.00003	0.6233	0.4298	1.03
10) Number of students who take advantage of the crediting to nonallowable charges provision for multiple semesters	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000022	2.0372	0.1535	0.98
Number of FFEL program loans	Continuous	0.000024	0.000003038	64.1258	<.0001	1.18
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000001704	0.000007406	0.053	0.818	1.01
Number of students with FFEL program loans	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000006251	16.7466	<.0001	0.90
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	0.000067	0.000011	39.6915	<.0001	1.36
Total FFEL program volume	Continuous	-2.25E-09	4.53E-10	24.7001	<.0001	0.95
Total Direct Loan volume	Continuous	-6.11E-09	8.94E-10	46.6325	<.0001	0.83
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00017	0.000033	26.8206	<.0001	0.67
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	5.955E-08	1.017E-08	34.2994	<.0001	1.52
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000001573	453.7008	<.0001	0.83
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.0331	0.033	1.0108	0.3147	1.01
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-1.4753	0.1192	153.2068	<.0001	0.92

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00005	0.000003124	302.5537	<.0001	0.81
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.0112	0.00299	14.0336	0.0002	1.029
Percentage of students with state grants	Continuous	-0.00102	0.000218	21.9882	<.0001	0.978
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-0.000000217	8.557E-07	0.064	0.8002	0.998
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.00191	0.000244	60.8767	<.0001	1.034
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.035	0.00778	20.2382	<.0001	0.932
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.1196	0.00774	238.5601	<.0001	1.27
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.0476	0.0339	1.9681	0.1607	0.909
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.0827	0.0163	25.6539	<.0001	1.276
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.018	0.0107	2.8462	0.0916	1.154
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0218	0.00885	6.051	0.0139	1.201
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	0.00172	0.00856	0.0404	0.8407	1.177
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.073	0.0117	38.6937	<.0001	1.264
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0126	0.0082	2.3793	0.123	0.984
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.00939	0.00633	2.1988	0.1381	1.006
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0783	0.0135	33.3929	<.0001	0.858
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.00289	0.0136	0.045	0.832	0.931
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.017	0.0099	2.9647	0.0851	0.912
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00063	0.00981	0.0042	0.9484	0.928
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0185	0.0146	1.6041	0.2053	0.945
Does not participate in at Least one experiment	Dummy	0.0634	0.00762	69.1771	<.0001	1.135
Did not participate in institutional charges experiment	Dummy	-0.1076	0.0281	14.6726	0.0001	0.806
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0176	0.00664	7.0626	0.0079	0.965
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	0.00298	0.000229	168.5959	<.0001	1.11
Percentage as of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00029	0.000346	0.7086	0.3999	0.994

Likelihood Ratio = 18442.72
(p<.0001)
Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 17899.76
(p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.0395 Number of Institutions = 1730
Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 49.13

Table AI.4.14. Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	146570	2491	2479.15	144079	144090.9	100.48%	99.99%
2	145161	3725	3686.28	141436	141474.7	101.05%	99.97%
3	147287	4536	4597.14	142751	142689.9	98.67%	100.04%
4	144796	4860	5092.18	139936	139703.8	95.44%	100.17%
5	141999	5547	5548.41	136452	136450.6	99.97%	100.00%
6	144713	6409	6407.47	138304	138305.5	100.02%	100.00%
7	143681	7503	7263.65	136178	136417.4	103.30%	99.82%
8	145087	8576	8621.75	136511	136465.3	99.47%	100.03%
9	143987	10902	10897.76	133085	133089.2	100.04%	100.00%
10	146780	15218	15125.36	131562	131654.6	100.61%	99.93%

Chi-Square = 21.49

p < 0.006

df = 8

Table AI.4.15 Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges: Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Measure

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-1.4323	0.1034	191.973	<.0001	
3) Total number of Title IV aid recipients	Continuous	0.000376	0.000015	646.3565	<.0001	3.54
4) Total dollar amount of Title IV funds for Title IV aid recipients	Continuous	-1.95E-08	1.034E-09	353.9252	<.0001	0.58
5) Total amount of Title IV aid credited to nonallowable institutional charges	Continuous	-0.000000139	1.829E-08	57.6233	<.0001	0.69
6) Percentage of students declining automatic credit to nonallowable institutional charges	Continuous	74.7185	17.4904	18.2498	<.0001	1.25
7) Number of students declining automatic credit of Title IV aid to nonallowable institutional charges	Continuous	-0.0459	0.00617	55.2176	<.0001	0.53
8) Number for whom Title IV aid was credited to nonallowable institutional charges	Continuous	0.000396	0.000065	36.9635	<.0001	2.12
9) Number of students who used some of their 2001-2002 aid for credit to nonallowable institutional charges who either graduated or were able to continue their enrollment into the following semester	Continuous	-0.00031	0.000062	25.1376	<.0001	0.69
10) Number of students who take advantage of the crediting to nonallowable charges provision for multiple semesters	Continuous	-0.00004	0.000031	1.8395	0.175	0.97
Number of FFEL program loans	Continuous	0.000027	0.000002481	120.6798	<.0001	1.21
Number of direct loans	Continuous	-0.00016	0.000018	77.0676	<.0001	0.31
Number of students with FFEL program loans	Continuous	-0.00002	0.000005193	14.7252	0.0001	0.92
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00027	0.000025	123.8379	<.0001	0.29
Total FFEL program volume	Continuous	-1.02E-09	3.67E-10	7.7474	0.0054	0.98
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	4.318E-08	1.718E-09	632.1357	<.0001	3.62
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00006	0.000034	3.5064	0.0611	0.86
Total Volume of Pell grants	Continuous	3.325E-08	1.042E-08	10.1915	0.0014	1.26
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000001442	326.0569	<.0001	0.87
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.24	0.0313	58.7782	<.0001	1.04
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-1.703	0.1131	226.7555	<.0001	0.90

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00006	0.000002923	419.1728	<.0001	0.794
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.0217	0.00277	61.288	<.0001	1.056
Percentage of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00323	0.000211	234.2657	<.0001	0.933
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-0.00000567	7.992E-07	50.416	<.0001	0.951
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.000501	0.000244	4.2146	0.0401	1.009
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0994	0.00727	186.9866	<.0001	0.82
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.162	0.00727	496.9836	<.0001	1.383
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.8053	0.06	180.1985	<.0001	0.2
New England vs. West	Dummy	-0.0349	0.0157	4.9223	0.0265	1.088
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.1211	0.0101	144.0261	<.0001	0.998
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0279	0.00837	11.0683	0.0009	1.159
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0221	0.00817	7.3406	0.0067	1.102
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.2697	0.00997	732.2904	<.0001	1.476
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0228	0.00767	8.8132	0.003	0.962
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.00716	0.00606	1.3974	0.2372	0.992
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0647	0.0127	26.1072	<.0001	0.834
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.039	0.0131	8.8513	0.0029	0.856
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00184	0.00933	0.0387	0.8441	0.888
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0242	0.00914	7.0174	0.0081	0.869
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0132	0.0138	0.9193	0.3377	0.902
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0213	0.00862	6.1342	0.0133	1.044
Did not participate in institutional charges experiment	Dummy	1.2711	0.0595	456.4372	<.0001	12.706
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.00887	0.00604	2.1586	0.1418	0.982
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	0.000927	0.000216	18.431	<.0001	1.033
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00345	0.000329	110.1955	<.0001	0.927

Likelihood Ratio = 53118.70
(p<.0001)

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 47595.13
(p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.1049

Number of Institutions = 1730

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 12.76

**Table AI.4.16 Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges - Hosmer and Lemeshow
Partition for Experimental Default Measure**

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	142092	854	263.57	141238	141828.4	324.01%	99.58%
2	141667	1222	1037.49	140445	140629.5	117.78%	99.87%
3	145942	2024	2707.36	143918	143234.6	74.76%	100.48%
4	144323	4155	4654.99	140168	139668	89.26%	100.36%
5	144407	5656	6373.59	138751	138033.4	88.74%	100.52%
6	145036	6988	7685.36	138048	137350.6	90.93%	100.51%
7	143447	9566	9058.41	133881	134388.6	105.60%	99.62%
8	144485	11139	11305.08	133346	133179.9	98.53%	100.12%
9	144212	14678	14672.61	129534	129539.4	100.04%	100.00%
10	145823	22190	20678.22	123633	125144.8	107.31%	98.79%

Chi-Square = 1902.50 p < 0.0001

df = 8

Table AI.4.17. Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges - Logistic Regression for Retention (Title IV Aid Recipients)

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		0.4878	0.0378	166.781	<.0001	
3) Total number of Title IV aid recipients	Continuous	0.000046	0.000002871	255.8596	<.0001	1.16
4) Total dollar amount of Title IV funds for Title IV aid recipients	Continuous	-2.48E-09	2.59E-10	92.1186	<.0001	0.93
5) Total amount of Title IV aid credited to non-allowable institutional charges	Continuous	4.433E-08	2.953E-09	225.4309	<.0001	1.14
6) Percentage of students declining automatic credit to non-allowable institutional charges	Continuous	-16.2894	1.8013	81.7812	<.0001	0.95
7) Number of students declining automatic credit of Title IV aid to non-allowable institutional charges	Continuous	0.00846	0.000936	81.6662	<.0001	1.09
8) Number for whom Title IV aid was credited to non-allowable institutional charges	Continuous	-0.00011	0.00001	120.5309	<.0001	0.82
9) Number of students who used some of their 2001-2002 aid for credit to non-allowable institutional charges, who either graduated or were able to continue their enrollment into the following semester	Continuous	0.000079	0.00001	57.3104	<.0001	1.10
10) Number of students who take advantage of the crediting to non-allowable charges provision for multiple semesters	Continuous	0.000056	0.000006828	66.3245	<.0001	1.04
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00001	0.000001182	83.5278	<.0001	0.93
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000025	0.000002479	102.3038	<.0001	1.20
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000031	0.000002345	174.4815	<.0001	1.13
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000003498	91.2404	<.0001	0.86
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-1.2E-09	1.37E-10	77.1906	<.0001	0.97
Total Direct loan volume	Continuous	4.61E-11	2.94E-10	0.0247	0.8752	1.00
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00023	0.000011	419.0482	<.0001	0.58
Total Volume of Pell grants	Continuous	6.959E-08	3.559E-09	382.3394	<.0001	1.62
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00001	5.658E-07	330.1434	<.0001	0.94
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.2912	0.0121	574.7819	<.0001	1.05
Average number of family Members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-0.3162	0.0424	55.5074	<.0001	0.98

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	0.000078	0.000000991	6165.5134	<.0001	1.353
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	-0.0318	0.00107	885.6156	<.0001	0.923
Percent of students with State grants	Continuous	0.00115	0.00008	204.3521	<.0001	1.024
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	0.000007234	3.454E-07	438.7402	<.0001	1.066
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	-0.00169	0.000092	336.0437	<.0001	0.972
Public institution versus private institution	Dummy	-0.057	0.00265	463.6779	<.0001	0.892
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	-0.1691	0.00317	2837.2598	<.0001	0.713
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.1226	0.0122	101.0508	<.0001	1.278
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.1029	0.00532	373.6281	<.0001	1.245
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	0.1255	0.00361	1209.0695	<.0001	1.273
South vs. West	Dummy	-0.00476	0.00331	2.0614	0.1511	1.118
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.083	0.00295	790.6605	<.0001	1.033
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0247	0.00455	29.413	<.0001	1.096
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.0402	0.00293	188.2417	<.0001	1.054
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.028	0.00223	157.0008	<.0001	0.984
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.026	0.00479	29.4764	<.0001	1.187
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00687	0.00498	1.9055	0.1675	1.148
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0455	0.00356	163.2097	<.0001	1.21
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0443	0.0035	160.7432	<.0001	1.209
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0363	0.00511	50.5601	<.0001	1.199
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	-0.0217	0.00239	81.8655	<.0001	0.958
Did not participate in institutional charges experiment	Dummy	0.1452	0.00895	263.1101	<.0001	1.337
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	0.00336	0.00281	1.4296	0.2318	1.007
Percent of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	-0.00261	0.000082	1020.8861	<.0001	0.915
Percent of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00076	0.000111	47.3461	<.0001	0.983

Likelihood Ratio = 125987.99
(p<.0001)
Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 117429.04
(p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.0703 Number of Institutions = 1734
Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 19.47

Table AI.4.18 Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Retention Rate (Title IV Aid Recipients)

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	238353	101967	98918.1	136386	139434.9	103.08%	97.81%
2	238329	116432	119892	121897	118437	97.11%	102.92%
3	238421	130318	133130.9	108103	105290.1	97.89%	102.67%
4	238881	143108	143849.7	95773	95031.25	99.48%	100.78%
5	236776	154929	150818.8	81847	85957.15	102.73%	95.22%
6	238597	158842	158016.4	79755	80580.63	100.52%	98.98%
7	238771	161770	164222.4	77001	74548.59	98.51%	103.29%
8	239009	170779	170133.4	68230	68875.64	100.38%	99.06%
9	244191	179811	181714.3	64380	62476.72	98.95%	103.05%
10	233527	188380	185606.5	45147	47920.45	101.49%	94.21%

Chi-Square = 1232.76 p < 0.0001
df = 8

Table AI.4.19 Credit Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges

Credit of Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2488	3142833.5	3134880.0	4023.8	1263.2
Yes	31	31106.5	39060.0	4023.8	1003.4

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	31106.5
Normal Approximation	
Z	-1.9765
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0241
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0481
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0241
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0482

Table AI.4.20 Credit of Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges

Credit of Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Default Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2400	2938354.0	2918400.0	3882.7	1224.3
Yes	31	17742.0	37696.0	3882.7	572.3

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	17742
Normal Approximation	
Z	-5.139
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001

Table AI.4.21 Credit of Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges

Credit of Title IV Aid to Institutional Charges Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Retention Rate (Title IV Aid Recipients)					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2450	3026887.5	3040450.0	3963.5	1235.5
Yes	31	52033.5	38471.0	3963.5	1678.5

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	52033.5
Normal Approximation	
Z	3.4218
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0003
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0006
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0003
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0006

APPENDIX TABLE AI.5—CREDIT TITLE IV AID TO PRIOR TERM CHARGES

Table AI.5.1. Experimental Sites Initiatives Reporting Template for Credit Title IV Aid to Prior Term Charges


Experimental Sites Initiative		
Institution		
Experiment	Credit Title IV Aid to Prior Term Charges	
Reporting Year	2001-2002	
Goal of the Experiment: To evaluate the impact of simplifying services to students by allowing crediting of Title IV funds to prior term charges in a prior award year without authorization from students.		
Target Student Population: Students whose Title IV aid was credited to prior term charges for a prior award year.		
Reporting Items		
1.	Provide description and brief rationale on how the institution is conducting this experiment. Please select one of the description worksheets at the bottom of the status bar.	
2.	Provide method of informing students of crediting of Title IV funds to prior term charges. <i>Please specify.</i>	
3.	Total # of students who had Title IV aid credited to prior term charges.	
4.	Total amount of Title IV aid credited to prior term charges for a prior year.	
5.	Number of students declining automatic crediting of Title IV aid to prior term charges for a prior award year.	
6.	Percentage of students declining automatic credit to prior term charges for a prior award year.	
7.	Number of students who used some of their 2001-2002 aid to pay 2000-2001 prior term charges, who either graduated or were able to continue their enrollment into the following semester.	
8.	Number of students who take advantage of the Crediting to non-allowable charges provision for multiple semesters.	
Supplemental Items (Optional)		
1.	Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower.	
2.	Estimated savings in administrative costs	

Table AI.5.2. Credit of Title IV Aid to Prior Term Charges Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region

	Number	Percentage
Total Participation	23	100
Institution Type		
Four Year	23	100
Control		
Public	20	86.96
Private	3	13.04
Region		
Mid-Atlantic	1	4.35
South	2	8.7
Midwest	13	56.52
West	7	30.43

Table AI.5.3. Prior Term Charges: Total Number of Students Who Had Title IV Aid Credited to Prior Term Charges (Q6_3)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	4	80	20.00	23.00	14.33	0	34
2 nd Quintile	5	589	117.80	68.00	91.86	45	246
3rd Quintile	5	2,049	409.80	313.00	196.23	308	759
4th Quintile	5	8,636	1,727.20	1,484.00	462.71	1,293	2,361
Highest 20%	4	17,493	4,373.25	3,856.50	1,731.04	3,013	6,767
Total	23	28,847	1,254.22	313.00	1,734.44	0	6,767

Table AI.5.4. Prior Term Charges: Total Amount of Title IV Aid Credited to Prior Term Charges for Prior Year (Q6_4)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	4	\$55,297	\$13,824	\$14,420	\$10,849	\$0	\$26,457
2nd Quintile	5	\$240,310	\$48,062	\$52,065	\$18,552	\$26,752	\$67,817
3rd Quintile	4	\$764,091	\$191,023	\$209,902	\$44,469	\$124,692	\$219,595
4th Quintile	5	\$2,060,424	\$412,085	\$398,692	\$142,754	\$254,647	\$573,666
Highest 20%	4	\$7,670,199	\$1,917,550	\$1,186,187	\$1,875,160	\$663,926	\$4,633,900
Total	22	\$10,790,323	\$490,469	\$209,902	\$1,001,448	\$0	\$4,633,900

Table AI.5.5. Prior Term Charges: Number of Students Declining Automatic Crediting of Title IV Aid to Prior Term Charges for Prior Award Year (Q6_5)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
All values are identically zero	22	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	22	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table AI.5.6. Prior Term Charges: Percentage of Students Declining Automatic Credit to Prior Term Charges for Prior Award Year (Q6_6)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
All values are identically zero	23	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	23	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table AI.5.7. Prior Term Charges: Number of Students Who Used Some of their 2001–2002 Aid to Pay 2000–2001 Prior Term Charges, Who Either Graduated or Were Able to Continue Their Enrollment into the Following Semester (Q6_7)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	2	35	17.50	17.50	6.36	13	22
2 nd Quintile	3	248	82.67	59.00	74.38	23	166
3 rd Quintile	3	902	300.67	275.00	48.85	270	357
4 th Quintile	3	4,708	1,569.33	1,454.00	368.78	1,272	1,982
Highest 20%	3	9,680	3,226.67	3,195.00	231.13	3,013	3,472
Total	14	15,573	1,112.36	316.00	1,300.50	13	3,472

Table AI.5.8. Prior Term Charges: Number of Students Who Take Advantage of the Crediting to Prior Term Charges Provision for Multiple Semesters (Q6_8)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	2	3	1.50	1.50	0.71	1	2
2 nd Quintile	3	12	4.00	4.00	1.00	3	5
3 rd Quintile	3	301	100.33	49.00	119.57	15	237
4 th Quintile	3	1,505	501.67	613.00	208.62	261	631
Highest 20%	2	15,395	7,697.50	7,697.50	4,309.82	4,650	10,745
Total	13	17,216	1,324.31	49.00	3,098.11	1	10,745

Table AI.5.9. Prior Term Charges: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours per Borrower (Q6_O1)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 33%	1	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00
2 nd Third	1	0.33	0.33	0.33		0.33	0.33
Highest 33%	1	1.50	1.50	1.50		1.50	1.50
Total	3	1.83	0.61	0.33	0.79	0.00	1.50

Table AI.5.10. Prior Term Charges: Estimated Savings in Administrative Costs per Borrower (Q6_O2)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 33%	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00
2nd Third	1	\$5.66	\$5.66	\$5.66		\$5.66	\$5.66
Highest 33%	1	\$77.77	\$77.77	\$77.77		\$77.77	\$77.77
Total	3	\$83.43	\$27.81	\$5.66	\$43.36	\$0.00	\$77.77

Table AI.5.11. Prior Term Charges - Logistic Regression for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-0.9397	0.1011	86.3384	<.0001	
3) Total number of students who had Title IV aid credited to prior term charges	Continuous	0.000092	0.000029	9.9393	0.0016	1.046
4) Total amount of Title IV aid credited to prior term charges for a prior year	Continuous	-1.10E-07	5.00E-08	4.8277	0.028	0.973
5) Number of students declining automatic crediting of Title IV aid to prior term charges for a prior award year	Continuous	0	.	.	.	1
6) Percentage of students declining automatic credit to prior term charges for a prior award year	Continuous	0	.	.	.	1
7) Number of students who used some of their 2001-2002 aid to pay 2000-2001 prior term charges, who either graduated or were able to continue their enrollment into the following semester	Continuous	-0.00007	0.000035	4.374	0.0365	0.98
8) Number of students who take advantage of the crediting to non-allowable charges provision for multiple semesters	Continuous	-0.00001	0.000013	0.7159	0.3975	0.993
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000025	3.04E-06	65.5234	<.0001	1.185
Number of direct loans	Continuous	-7.06E-06	6.24E-06	1.2798	0.2579	0.95
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00003	6.25E-06	18.0766	<.0001	0.9
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	0.000073	9.38E-06	60.4963	<.0001	1.393
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-2.36E-09	4.53E-10	27.1635	<.0001	0.948
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	-5.03E-09	8.83E-10	32.4559	<.0001	0.861
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00018	0.000032	31.8894	<.0001	0.647
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	6.37E-08	1.00E-08	40.4386	<.0001	1.564
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	1.56E-06	455.2003	<.0001	0.832
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.0306	0.0329	0.8666	0.3519	1.005
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-1.4212	0.1192	142.1399	<.0001	0.918
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00005	3.09E-06	308.1684	<.0001	0.811
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.0101	0.00299	11.3527	0.0008	1.026

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Percent of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00108	0.000218	24.5652	<.0001	0.977
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-5.56E-07	8.54E-07	0.4244	0.5148	0.995
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.00168	0.000245	46.8479	<.0001	1.03
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0313	0.00775	16.2625	<.0001	0.939
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.1148	0.00769	222.6585	<.0001	1.258
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.071	0.0266	7.0931	0.0077	1.152
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.0793	0.0163	23.7499	<.0001	1.262
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.0208	0.0107	3.793	0.0515	1.142
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0212	0.00885	5.7254	0.0167	1.191
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	0.0016	0.00852	0.0352	0.8512	1.168
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.0723	0.0117	37.945	<.0001	1.253
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0134	0.00815	2.6965	0.1006	0.986
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.0123	0.00633	3.767	0.0523	1.011
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0807	0.0136	35.3304	<.0001	0.854
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.00174	0.0136	0.0164	0.8981	0.927
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0199	0.0099	4.0218	0.0449	0.907
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-3.41E-06	0.00982	0	0.9997	0.925
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0212	0.0146	2.1148	0.1459	0.945
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0619	0.00743	69.4792	<.0001	1.132
Did not participate in prior term charges experiment	Dummy	-0.0659	0.019	12.0459	0.0005	0.876
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0195	0.00663	8.6325	0.0033	0.962
Percentage of freshmen off campus/commute	Continuous	0.00303	0.000228	176.0178	<.0001	1.112
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00041	0.000343	1.4622	0.2266	0.991

Likelihood Ratio = 18432.4673

Rescaled R-square = 0.0395

Number of Institutions = 1730

p<.0001

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs.

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 196.5

Reduced Model = 18231.3674

Table AI.5.12. Prior Term Charges Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	141578	2421	2395.47	139157	139182.5	101.07%	99.98%
2	144475	3588	3596.99	140887	140878	99.75%	100.01%
3	139418	4259	4275.68	135159	135142.3	99.61%	100.01%
4	145892	4916	5099.37	140976	140792.6	96.40%	100.13%
5	149806	5698	5838.72	144108	143967.3	97.59%	100.10%
6	145308	6569	6437.03	138739	138871	102.05%	99.90%
7	144693	7464	7290.6	137229	137402.4	102.38%	99.87%
8	144735	8503	8548.38	136232	136186.6	99.47%	100.03%
9	145358	10937	10951.57	134421	134406.4	99.87%	100.01%
10	148798	15412	15287.45	133386	133510.5	100.81%	99.91%

Chi-Square = 19.3109

p= 0.0133

df = 8

Table AI.5.13. Prior Term Charges - Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Measure

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-0.7679	0.0956	64.5105	<.0001	
3) Total number of students who had Title IV aid credited to prior term charges	Continuous	0.000784	0.00004	375.3229	<.0001	1.47
4) Total amount of Title IV aid credited to prior term charges for a prior year	Continuous	-1.96E-06	1.03E-07	360.5311	<.0001	0.614
5) Number of students declining automatic crediting of Title IV aid to prior term charges for a prior award year	Continuous	0	.	.	.	1
6) Percentage of students declining automatic credit to prior term charges for a prior award year	Continuous	0	.	.	.	1
7) Number of students who used some of their 2001-2002 aid to pay 2000-2001 prior term charges, who either graduated or were able to continue their enrollment into the following semester	Continuous	0.00245	0.000074	1084.8075	<.0001	1.996
8) Number of students who take advantage of the crediting to non-allowable charges provision for multiple semesters	Continuous	-0.00083	0.00006	194.8276	<.0001	0.592
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000029	2.47E-06	135.4185	<.0001	1.219
Number of Direct loans	Continuous	-0.00005	0.000014	11.9626	0.0005	0.706
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00002	5.16E-06	22.6732	<.0001	0.907
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00047	0.000019	585.8008	<.0001	0.118
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-8.84E-10	3.68E-10	5.7552	0.0164	0.98
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	4.59E-08	1.65E-09	769.0219	<.0001	3.919
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00006	0.000033	3.2805	0.0701	0.865
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	3.20E-08	1.03E-08	9.6584	0.0019	1.253
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	1.44E-06	332.4384	<.0001	0.865
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.2605	0.0313	69.2206	<.0001	1.047
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-1.7857	0.1132	248.9441	<.0001	0.898
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00006	2.92E-06	411.1352	<.0001	0.796
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.0215	0.00277	60.3837	<.0001	1.056

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Percentage of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00323	0.000211	233.7987	<.0001	0.933
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-4.31E-06	7.92E-07	29.6595	<.0001	0.962
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.000763	0.000244	9.741	0.0018	1.013
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0962	0.00724	176.6268	<.0001	0.825
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.1649	0.00724	517.9075	<.0001	1.391
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.4939	0.0413	143.1652	<.0001	0.372
New England vs. West	Dummy	-0.029	0.0157	3.3981	0.0653	1.085
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.1218	0.0101	145.5473	<.0001	0.989
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0222	0.00836	7.0327	0.008	1.142
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.029	0.00815	12.6839	0.0004	1.085
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.2679	0.00995	725.0561	<.0001	1.46
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0234	0.00765	9.3451	0.0022	0.959
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.00503	0.00604	0.6947	0.4046	0.987
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0601	0.0127	22.5045	<.0001	0.839
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0302	0.0131	5.3132	0.0212	0.864
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	0.002	0.00932	0.0459	0.8304	0.892
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0296	0.00914	10.4851	0.0012	0.865
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.00194	0.0137	0.02	0.8874	0.892
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0374	0.0085	19.326	<.0001	1.078
Did not participate in prior term charges experiment	Dummy	0.3274	0.0279	137.9915	<.0001	1.925
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.00953	0.00604	2.4931	0.1143	0.981
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	0.000748	0.000215	12.0618	0.0005	1.027
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.0036	0.000327	121.3917	<.0001	0.924

Likelihood Ratio = 53177.6784 Rescaled R-square = 0.1051 Number of Institutions = 1730
 p<.0001
 Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 50038.5815 Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 23.26667

Table AI.5.14. Prior Term Charges - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Measure

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	144578	895	227.17	143683	144350.8	393.98%	99.54%
2	146628	1198	1115.37	145430	145512.6	107.41%	99.94%
3	147943	2124	2963.87	145819	144979.1	71.66%	100.58%
4	144149	4475	4786.24	139674	139362.8	93.50%	100.22%
5	144854	5591	6490.08	139263	138363.9	86.15%	100.65%
6	144187	7126	7710.63	137061	136476.4	92.42%	100.43%
7	144750	9817	9233.68	134933	135516.3	106.32%	99.57%
8	144399	11140	11477.23	133259	132921.8	97.06%	100.25%
9	144798	15156	14942.48	129642	129855.5	101.43%	99.84%
10	135148	20950	19485.7	114198	115662.3	107.51%	98.73%

Chi-Square = 2595.64

p<.0001

df = 8

Table AI.5.15. Prior Term Charges - Logistic Regression for Experimental Retention Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE
Intercept		0.8149	0.0359	516.1626	<.0001
3) Total number of students who had Title IV aid credited to prior term charges	Continuous	-0.00006	9.23E-06	40.9832	<.0001
4) Total amount of Title IV aid credited to prior term charges for a prior year	Continuous	-1.26E-08	1.54E-08	0.6642	0.4151
5) Number of students declining automatic crediting of Title IV aid to prior term charges for a prior award year	Continuous	0	.	.	.
6) Percentage of students declining automatic credit to prior term charges for a prior award year	Continuous	0	.	.	.
7) Number of students who used some of their 2001-2002 aid to pay 2000-2001 prior term charges, who either graduated or were able to continue their enrollment into the following semester	Continuous	0.000254	0.000012	415.561	<.0001
8) Number of students who take advantage of the crediting to non-allowable charges provision for multiple semesters	Continuous	-0.00011	4.20E-06	646.5014	<.0001
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00001	1.18E-06	76.1197	<.0001
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000025	2.16E-06	133.1048	<.0001
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000027	2.34E-06	136.4078	<.0001
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00003	3.13E-06	78.7499	<.0001
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-1.16E-09	1.37E-10	71.6402	<.0001
Total Direct loan volume	Continuous	-9.99E-10	2.91E-10	11.804	0.0006
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00019	0.000011	308.1353	<.0001
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	5.73E-08	3.51E-09	266.6243	<.0001
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00001	5.63E-07	344.7806	<.0001
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.2833	0.0121	544.1639	<.0001
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-0.4206	0.0424	98.2862	<.0001
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	0.000077	9.84E-07	6173.1991	<.0001
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	-0.0304	0.00107	811.5126	<.0001

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE
Percent of students with State grants	Continuous	0.00125	0.00008	243.1809	<.0001
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	8.28E-06	3.46E-07	573.8845	<.0001
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	-0.00149	0.000093	257.447	<.0001
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.056	0.00263	453.3134	<.0001
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	-0.167	0.00316	2788.2605	<.0001
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.0376	0.00898	17.5084	<.0001
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.1017	0.00531	367.0424	<.0001
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	0.1279	0.0036	1259.6244	<.0001
Southern vs. West	Dummy	-0.00547	0.00332	2.7165	0.0993
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0889	0.00294	911.9143	<.0001
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0244	0.00455	28.7322	<.0001
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.0463	0.00291	253.4269	<.0001
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0359	0.00224	256.8722	<.0001
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0283	0.00481	34.5688	<.0001
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00447	0.00498	0.8052	0.3695
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0555	0.00357	241.3711	<.0001
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0402	0.0035	131.8266	<.0001
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0299	0.00512	34.1082	<.0001
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	-0.0206	0.00233	78.6511	<.0001
Did not participate in prior term charges experiment	Dummy	-0.00877	0.00598	2.1521	0.1424
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	0.00554	0.00281	3.8789	0.0489
Percent of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	-0.00275	0.000081	1144.8024	<.0001
Percent of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00061	0.00011	30.3621	<.0001

Likelihood Ratio = 125852.313

Rescaled R-square = 0.0702

Number of Institutions = 1734

p<.0001

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs.

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 50

Reduced Model = 122305.0897

Table AI.5.16. Prior Term Charges - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Retention Rate

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	237499	101414	98571.52	136085	138927.5	102.88%	97.95%
2	236363	115897	118878.1	120466	117484.9	97.49%	102.54%
3	236719	128953	132163	107766	104556	97.57%	103.07%
4	238280	143496	143450.1	94784	94829.87	100.03%	99.95%
5	237574	152921	151121.6	84653	86452.41	101.19%	97.92%
6	239666	160910	158578.2	78756	81087.83	101.47%	97.12%
7	242865	164240	166489.1	78625	76375.95	98.65%	102.94%
8	240320	171866	170983.9	68454	69336.14	100.52%	98.73%
9	239270	177714	177880.7	61556	61389.31	99.91%	100.27%
10	236299	188925	188188.2	47374	48110.79	100.39%	98.47%

Chi-Square = 754.47

p<.0001

df = 8

Table AI.5.17 Prior Term Charges

Prior Term Charges Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2496	3149848	3144960	3471.5323	1261.9583
Yes	23	24092	28980	3471.5323	1047.4783

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	24092
Normal Approximation	
Z	-1.4079
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0796
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.1592
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0796
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.1593

Table AI.5.18 Prior Term Charges

Prior Term Charges Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Default Measure					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2408	2941512.5	2928128	3349.9831	1221.5584
Yes	23	14583.5	27968	3349.9831	634.06522

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	14583.5
Normal Approximation	
Z	-3.9952
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001

Table AI.5.19 Prior Term Charges

Prior Term Charges Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Retention Rate (Borrowers Only)					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2458	3039273	3050378	3419.5185	1236.4821
Yes	23	39648	28543	3419.5185	1723.8261

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	39648
Normal Approximation	
Z	3.2474
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0006
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0012
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0006
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0012

APPENDIX TABLE AI.6—MULTIPLE DISBURSEMENTS FOR SINGLE-TERM LOANS

Table AI.6.1. Experimental Sites Initiatives Reporting Template for Multiple Disbursements for Single-Term Loans

Experimental Sites Initiative

Institution

Experiment

Reporting Year

Goal of the Experiment: To evaluate the enrollment and withdrawal patterns of students benefiting from disbursing single term loans in one disbursement.

Target Student Population: Students who received single term loans in one disbursement.



Reporting Items

1. Provide description and brief rationale on how the institution is conducting this experiment. Please select one of the description worksheets at the bottom of the status bar.
2. Number of students with single term loans.
3. Total amount of loan funds for students in (2).
4. Number of students withdrawing before midpoint of term.
5. Total amount of Title IV loan funds return to Title IV for students withdrawing before the midpoint of the term.
6. Number of student completing the term.

Supplemental Items (Optional)

1.
2.

Table AI.6.2. Multiple Disbursements for Single-Term Loans Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region

	Number	Percentage
Total Participation	83	100
Institution Type		
Two Year, Lower	4	4.82
Two Year, Upper	1	1.2
Four Year	78	93.98
Control		
Public	73	87.95
Private	10	12.05
Region		
New England	2	2.41
Mid-Atlantic	9	10.84
South	8	9.64
Midwest	38	45.78
Southwest	4	4.82
West	22	26.51

Table AI.6.3. Multiple Disbursements: Number of Students with Single-Term Loans (Q7_2)

	Reporting	Not Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	17	0	2,607	153.35	170.00	114.79	5	324
2 nd Quintile	16	0	9,246	577.88	606.00	129.62	325	799
3 rd Quintile	17	0	20,883	1,228.41	1,218.00	260.05	899	1,583
4 th Quintile	17	0	36,628	2,154.59	2,050.00	347.67	1,657	2,705
Highest 20%	16	0	77,308	4,831.75	3,528.00	2,334.99	3,053	9,363
Total	83	0	146,672	1,767.13	1,218.00	1,944.10	5	9,363

Table AI.6.4. Multiple Disbursements: Total amount of Loan Funds for Students in (2) (Q7_3)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	16	\$7,184,100	\$449,006	\$344,495	\$373,711	\$27,500	\$1,213,966
2nd Quintile	17	\$30,933,142	\$1,819,597	\$1,877,533	\$345,480	\$1,214,320	\$2,202,145
3rd Quintile	16	\$58,619,485	\$3,663,718	\$3,846,654	\$807,046	\$2,209,357	\$4,666,984
4th Quintile	17	\$105,175,592	\$6,186,800	\$6,120,210	\$1,232,761	\$4,694,946	\$8,221,447
Highest 20%	16	\$306,518,245	\$19,157,390	\$13,467,821	\$12,204,399	\$9,858,135	\$50,062,359
Total	82	\$508,430,564	\$6,200,373	\$3,846,654	\$8,546,827	\$27,500	\$50,062,359

Table AI.6.5. Multiple Disbursements: Number of Students Withdrawing before Midpoint of Term (Q7_4)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	16	7	0.44	0.00	0.73	0	2
2 nd Quintile	17	105	6.18	6.00	2.77	3	11
3 rd Quintile	17	232	13.65	14.00	1.54	12	16
4 th Quintile	16	428	26.75	27.50	4.86	17	33
Highest 20%	16	1,099	68.69	58.00	31.58	35	127
Total	82	1,871	22.82	13.50	28.01	0	127

Table AI.6.6. Multiple Disbursement: Total Amount of Title IV Loan Funds Returned to Title IV for Students Withdrawing before the Midpoint of the Term (Q7_5)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	16	\$4,014	\$251	\$0	\$560	\$0	\$1,639
2 nd Quintile	16	\$79,644	\$4,978	\$5,737	\$2,037	\$2,084	\$8,167
3 rd Quintile	16	\$221,620	\$13,851	\$12,661	\$3,509	\$8,526	\$19,720
4 th Quintile	16	\$578,589	\$36,162	\$35,373	\$11,027	\$22,375	\$52,118
Highest 20%	16	\$1,697,855	\$106,116	\$73,213	\$80,043	\$52,215	\$366,059
Total	80	\$2,581,722	\$32,272	\$12,661	\$52,702	\$0	\$366,059

Table AI.6.7. Multiple Disbursements: Number of Students Completing the Term (Q7_6)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	16	2,150	134.38	133.50	102.61	5	312
2 nd Quintile	17	8,789	517.00	509.00	129.58	321	700
3 rd Quintile	16	18,852	1,178.25	1,168.50	262.92	764	1,535
4 th Quintile	17	34,452	2,026.59	1,974.00	318.08	1,563	2,506
Highest 20%	16	70,718	4,419.88	3,410.00	2,190.44	2,662	8,957
Total	82	134,961	1,645.87	1,168.50	1,799.71	5	8,957

Table AI.6.8. Multiple Disbursements: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours per Borrower (Q7_O1)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	3	0.24	0.08	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.08
2nd Quintile	3	0.60	0.20	0.25	0.09	0.10	0.25
3rd Quintile	2	1.00	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.50
4th Quintile	4	4.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
Highest 20%	3	5.50	1.83	2.00	0.29	1.50	2.00
Total	15	11.34	0.76	0.50	0.67	0.08	2.00

Table AI.6.9. Multiple Disbursements: Estimated Savings in Administrative Costs (Q7_O2)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	2	\$1.89	\$0.95	\$0.95	\$0.63	\$0.50	\$1.39
2nd Quintile	3	\$146.50	\$48.83	\$35.00	\$55.56	\$1.50	\$110.00
3rd Quintile	3	\$1,162.00	\$387.33	\$322.00	\$188.68	\$240.00	\$600.00
4th Quintile	3	\$10,890.68	\$3,630.23	\$3,500.00	\$1,309.53	\$2,390.68	\$5,000.00
Highest 20%	3	\$178,889.50	\$59,629.83	\$57,120.00	\$33,480.38	\$27,475.00	\$94,294.50
Total	14	\$191,090.57	\$13,649.33	\$461.00	\$28,208.38	\$0.50	\$94,294.50

Table AI.6.10 Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Logistic Regression for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-0.9251	0.1058	76.3814	<.0001	
2) Number of students with single term loans	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000016	3.6846	0.0549	0.96
3) Total amount of loan funds for students in (2)	Continuous	-3.28E-09	3.788E-09	0.7501	0.3864	0.98
4) Number of students withdrawing before midpoint of term	Continuous	0.00207	0.000761	7.4398	0.0064	1.04
5) Total amount of Title IV loan funds return to Title IV for students withdrawing before the midpoint of the term	Continuous	1.803E-07	0.000000319	0.3194	0.5719	1.01
6) Number of student completing the term	Continuous	0.000058	0.000016	13.1871	0.0003	1.08
Volume of loans for students with single-term loans in the Spring of 2002	Continuous	2.123E-09	1.741E-09	1.4876	0.2226	1.02
Number of students with single-term loans in the Spring of 2002	Continuous	-8.87E-08	1.13E-08	61.6522	<.0001	0.93
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.00005	0.000005137	94.6695	<.0001	1.42
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000013	0.000007592	2.9659	0.085	1.10
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00008	0.000009793	61.3527	<.0001	0.74
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	0.000035	0.000012	8.903	0.0028	1.18
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-1.51E-09	4.77E-10	10.0213	0.0015	0.97
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	-5.65E-09	9.16E-10	38.0349	<.0001	0.84
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00005	0.000034	1.8198	0.1773	0.89
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	2.116E-08	1.069E-08	3.9208	0.0477	1.16
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000001646	233.3919	<.0001	0.87
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	-0.0643	0.0341	3.5532	0.0594	0.99
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-1.0178	0.1257	65.5512	<.0001	0.94
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00006	0.0000032	306.7372	<.0001	0.805
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	-0.00294	0.00317	0.8596	0.3538	0.993
Percentage of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00094	0.000226	17.1671	<.0001	0.98
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	9.009E-07	0.000001111	0.6581	0.4172	1.008
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.00217	0.000259	70.1004	<.0001	1.039

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0227	0.00779	8.4814	0.0036	0.956
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.0143	0.00858	2.7768	0.0956	1.029
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.0244	0.032	0.5838	0.4448	1.05
Institution was not statutorily exempt from requirement	Dummy	0.2091	0.00689	922.6228	<.0001	1.519
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.0719	0.0165	19.0025	<.0001	1.217
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.0248	0.011	5.1229	0.0236	1.105
South vs. West	Dummy	0.014	0.00904	2.412	0.1204	1.149
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.011	0.00895	1.5064	0.2197	1.121
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.0747	0.0119	39.339	<.0001	1.221
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.00669	0.00855	0.6134	0.4335	0.989
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.00268	0.00648	0.1716	0.6787	0.999
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0824	0.014	34.5556	<.0001	0.828
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00289	0.0139	0.043	0.8357	0.897
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0216	0.0102	4.5089	0.0337	0.88
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0101	0.01	1.021	0.3123	0.909
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0089	0.0149	0.3558	0.5509	0.892
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0564	0.0135	17.545	<.0001	1.119
Did not participate in multiple disbursements experiment	Dummy	0.0232	0.0166	1.9371	0.164	1.047
Does not use the Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0116	0.00691	2.8223	0.093	0.977
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	0.00277	0.000235	139.0638	<.0001	1.1
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00044	0.000349	1.5765	0.2093	0.99

Likelihood Ratio = 17800.30
(p<.0001)

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 17348.68
(p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.0396 Number of Institutions = 1643

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 56.43

Table AI.6.11. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	141640	2336	2498.57	139304	139141.4	93.49%	100.12%
2	138126	3557	3520.41	134569	134605.6	101.04%	99.97%
3	141291	4307	4306	136984	136985	100.02%	100.00%
4	142801	4690	4894.81	138111	137906.2	95.82%	100.15%
5	141520	5371	5370.99	136149	136149	100.00%	100.00%
6	142970	6028	6078.49	136942	136891.5	99.17%	100.04%
7	141551	7163	6861.36	134388	134689.6	104.40%	99.78%
8	142366	8244	7723.31	134122	134642.7	106.74%	99.61%
9	141348	9590	9740.42	131758	131607.6	98.46%	100.11%
10	144293	15169	15412.53	129124	128880.5	98.42%	100.19%

Chi-Square =78.33

p<.0001

df = 8

Table AI.6.12. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Measure

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-0.6608	0.0967	46.6812	<.0001	
2) Number of students with single term loans	Continuous	0.000385	0.000033	136.961	<.0001	1.69
3) Total amount of loan funds for students in (2)	Continuous	-4.83E-08	4.484E-09	115.9465	<.0001	0.77
4) Number of students withdrawing before midpoint of term	Continuous	-0.00023	0.00136	0.0289	0.865	1.00
5) Total amount of Title IV loan funds return to Title IV for students withdrawing before the midpoint of the term	Continuous	0.000001331	0.000000526	6.4001	0.0114	1.04
6) Number of student completing the term	Continuous	-0.00000941	0.000029	0.1076	0.7428	0.99
Volume of Loans for Students with Single-Term Loans in the Spring of 2002	Continuous	1.364E-08	2.199E-09	38.4804	<.0001	1.11
Number of Students with Single-Term Loans in the Spring of 2002	Continuous	-9.78E-08	1.033E-08	89.5429	<.0001	0.92
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000042	0.000004611	81.9888	<.0001	1.34
Number of direct loans	Continuous	-0.00001	0.000016	0.6308	0.4271	0.91
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00007	0.000009007	67.0882	<.0001	0.75
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00037	0.000023	262.7959	<.0001	0.18
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	2.352E-09	4.1E-10	32.9542	<.0001	1.06
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	2.273E-08	1.761E-09	166.6232	<.0001	1.98
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	0.000044	0.000036	1.5042	0.22	1.11
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	-2.12E-10	1.105E-08	0.0004	0.9847	1.00
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00002	0.000001487	210.1009	<.0001	0.89
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.2294	0.0317	52.5324	<.0001	1.04
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-1.7114	0.1162	216.8943	<.0001	0.90
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00007	0.000002995	483.7725	<.0001	0.776
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.0129	0.00287	20.2818	<.0001	1.033
Percentage of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00239	0.000213	125.5824	<.0001	0.95
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-0.00000514	0.000001024	25.2229	<.0001	0.956
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.00085	0.000245	12.0257	0.0005	1.015

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0965	0.00731	174.0967	<.0001	0.825
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.1666	0.00803	430.6728	<.0001	1.395
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.1795	0.0366	24.0874	<.0001	0.698
Institution was not statutorily exempt from requirement	Dummy	0.1624	0.00625	675.1755	<.0001	1.384
New England vs. West	Dummy	-0.0221	0.0158	1.9579	0.1617	1.033
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.1253	0.0102	149.446	<.0001	0.932
South vs. West	Dummy	-0.0151	0.0085	3.1566	0.0756	1.04
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0423	0.00838	25.4744	<.0001	1.012
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.2594	0.0101	663.4684	<.0001	1.369
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0135	0.00784	2.9703	0.0848	0.968
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.00507	0.00614	0.681	0.4092	0.977
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0166	0.0128	1.6751	0.1956	0.878
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0282	0.0133	4.5009	0.0339	0.868
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00244	0.00948	0.0663	0.7968	0.891
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.028	0.00923	9.2374	0.0024	0.868
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0381	0.0139	7.5086	0.0061	0.859
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.1239	0.0157	62.6408	<.0001	1.281
Did not participate in multiple disbursements experiment	Dummy	0.064	0.0198	10.4429	0.0012	1.137
Does not use the Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0124	0.00615	4.0923	0.0431	0.975
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	-0.00018	0.000219	0.6757	0.4111	0.994
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00339	0.000331	105.0742	<.0001	0.928

Likelihood Ratio = 54431.94
(p<.0001)

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 48871.17
(p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.1092 Number of Institutions = 1643

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 13.12

Table AI.6.13. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Measure

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	140132	898	332.46	139234	139799.5	270.11%	99.60%
2	140631	1086	1140.98	139545	139490	95.18%	100.04%
3	141161	1880	2684.82	139281	138476.2	70.02%	100.58%
4	143304	4029	4705.98	139275	138598	85.61%	100.49%
5	140320	5781	6085.63	134539	134234.4	94.99%	100.23%
6	141365	7377	7356.31	133988	134008.7	100.28%	99.98%
7	141802	9151	8790.44	132651	133011.6	104.10%	99.73%
8	140817	10860	10727.01	129957	130090	101.24%	99.90%
9	141454	14543	14091.21	126911	127362.8	103.21%	99.65%
10	138509	21943	21598.31	116566	116910.7	101.60%	99.71%

Chi-Square =1369.80 p<.0001

df = 8

Table AI.6.14. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Logistic Regression for Experimental Graduation Rate for Students with Single-Term Loans in the Spring of 2002

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		0.8734	0.4054	4.6423	0.0312	
2) Number of students with single term loans	Continuous	-0.00935	0.0018	26.9561	<.0001	<0.001
3) Total amount of loan funds for students in (2)	Continuous	-3.04E-08	1.083E-08	7.8548	0.0051	0.76
4) Number of students withdrawing before midpoint of term	Continuous	0.0485	0.00516	88.3901	<.0001	3.80
5) Total amount of Title IV loan funds return to Title IV for students withdrawing before the midpoint of the term	Continuous	-0.00001	0.000002607	22.0971	<.0001	0.59
6) Number of student completing the term	Continuous	0.00922	0.00182	25.7864	<.0001	>999.999
Volume of loans for students with single-term loans in the Spring of 2002	Continuous	9.819E-09	6.324E-09	2.4109	0.1205	1.09
Number of students with single-term loans in the Spring of 2002	Continuous	-0.000000203	2.691E-08	56.8882	<.0001	0.66
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000204	0.000014	206.3053	<.0001	6.54
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.0022	0.000153	204.7374	<.0001	>999.999
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.0004	0.000028	202.9981	<.0001	0.19
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00506	0.000263	370.6767	<.0001	<0.001
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-1.03E-09	1.134E-09	0.8167	0.3661	0.98
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	5.968E-08	1.43E-08	17.4079	<.0001	6.91
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	0.000979	0.000115	72.7097	<.0001	12.64
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	-0.000000315	3.64E-08	74.9358	<.0001	0.09
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000005218	24.2243	<.0001	0.89
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.6795	0.1171	33.6914	<.0001	1.13
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-6.7979	0.4121	272.0923	<.0001	0.65
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	0.000105	0.000009017	136.1212	<.0001	1.385
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.0859	0.00959	80.3222	<.0001	1.223
Percentage of students with State grants	Continuous	0.00378	0.000644	34.4467	<.0001	1.091
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	0.000015	0.000003982	13.7789	0.0002	1.152
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	-0.00926	0.000926	99.9541	<.0001	0.845

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	0.0398	0.0213	3.4733	0.0624	1.083
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	-0.4524	0.0308	215.3428	<.0001	0.405
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.4468	0.2729	2.6804	0.1016	2.444
Institution was not statutorily exempt from requirement	Dummy	-0.0794	0.0245	10.5208	0.0012	0.853
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.2184	0.0566	14.9082	0.0001	1.626
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	0.015	0.0324	0.2138	0.6438	1.327
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0908	0.0264	11.809	0.0006	1.431
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.3571	0.026	188.9905	<.0001	0.914
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.3005	0.0313	92.017	<.0001	1.765
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.2157	0.0253	72.4774	<.0001	0.751
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.1445	0.0186	60.6371	<.0001	1.076
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.4428	0.04	122.7474	<.0001	2.657
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.2755	0.0398	47.912	<.0001	2.247
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.2046	0.0313	42.7575	<.0001	1.391
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0216	0.0286	0.5721	0.4494	1.67
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0423	0.0429	0.9681	0.3251	1.78
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	-0.1593	0.0378	17.7863	<.0001	0.727
Did not participate in multiple disbursements experiment	Dummy	0.1347	0.0557	5.8597	0.0155	1.309
Does not use the Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	0.0338	0.022	2.3523	0.1251	1.07
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	-0.00494	0.0007	49.8443	<.0001	0.847
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00274	0.000936	8.5866	0.0034	0.952

Likelihood Ratio = 15490.72
(p<.0001)

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 13663.14
(p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.3056 Number of Institutions = 1172

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 9.16

Table AI.6.15. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Graduation Rate for Students with Single-Term Loans in the Spring of 2002

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	12486	14	1.25	12472	12484.75	1120.00%	99.90%
2	7437	12	11.47	7425	7425.53	104.62%	99.99%
3	7860	195	222.46	7665	7637.54	87.66%	100.36%
4	7859	495	670.49	7364	7188.51	73.83%	102.44%
5	7827	1194	1072.55	6633	6754.45	111.32%	98.20%
6	7866	1472	1431.86	6394	6434.14	102.80%	99.38%
7	7849	1760	1756.72	6089	6092.28	100.19%	99.95%
8	7745	2228	2189.12	5517	5555.88	101.78%	99.30%
9	7820	2941	2989.2	4879	4830.8	98.39%	101.00%
10	3947	2264	2230.17	1683	1716.83	101.52%	98.03%

Chi-Square =204.69

p<.0001

df = 8

Table AI.6.16. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Logistic Regression for Retention Rate (Student Borrowers)

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		0.709	0.0405	306.3094	<.0001	
2) Number of students with single term loans	Continuous	0.000072	0.000005435	173.5201	<.0001	1.10
3) Total amount of loan funds for students in (2)	Continuous	1.047E-08	1.211E-09	74.6249	<.0001	1.06
4) Number of students withdrawing before midpoint of term	Continuous	-0.00259	0.000271	91.4605	<.0001	0.95
5) Total amount of Title IV loan funds return to Title IV for students withdrawing before the midpoint of the term	Continuous	0.000003055	1.213E-07	633.8135	<.0001	1.09
6) Number of student completing the term	Continuous	-0.00011	0.000005156	472.0359	<.0001	0.87
Volume of loans for students with single-term loans in the Spring of 2002	Continuous	-1.13E-08	6.62E-10	292.7237	<.0001	0.92
Number of students with single-term loans in the Spring of 2002	Continuous	-6.03E-08	4.377E-09	189.7376	<.0001	0.95
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000017	0.000001937	75.7443	<.0001	1.13
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000026	0.000002644	93.124	<.0001	1.21
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00001	0.000003672	8.044	0.0046	0.96
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00004	0.000004101	76.7269	<.0001	0.85
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-9.09E-10	1.49E-10	37.3717	<.0001	0.98
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	1.923E-09	3.17E-10	36.7876	<.0001	1.06
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00013	0.000013	97.3672	<.0001	0.74
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	4.176E-08	4.191E-09	99.2877	<.0001	1.33
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.000004	6.651E-07	36.2296	<.0001	0.98
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.2889	0.0142	413.3513	<.0001	1.05
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-0.3979	0.0498	63.8187	<.0001	0.98
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	0.000069	0.000001102	3935.2007	<.0001	1.3
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	-0.0395	0.00124	1009.1233	<.0001	0.91
Percentage of students with State grants	Continuous	0.000849	0.000089	91.2774	<.0001	1.018
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	0.00001	4.768E-07	480.2209	<.0001	1.094
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	-0.00141	0.000109	166.501	<.0001	0.977

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0704	0.00282	623.2042	<.0001	0.869
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	-0.1721	0.00411	1753.1385	<.0001	0.709
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.1524	0.0116	171.1824	<.0001	1.356
Institution was not statutorily exempt from requirement	Dummy	-0.0486	0.00351	191.296	<.0001	0.907
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.0843	0.00565	222.9579	<.0001	1.211
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	0.1241	0.00392	999.9907	<.0001	1.26
South vs. West	Dummy	0.00834	0.00367	5.1646	0.0231	1.123
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0985	0.00327	908.6379	<.0001	1.009
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0108	0.00504	4.6099	0.0318	1.101
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.0343	0.00324	112.1992	<.0001	1.037
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0322	0.00242	177.2141	<.0001	0.97
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0265	0.00524	25.5018	<.0001	1.182
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.00206	0.00546	0.1422	0.7061	1.153
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0287	0.0039	54.1728	<.0001	1.184
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0403	0.0038	112.4634	<.0001	1.198
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.043	0.0055	61.1008	<.0001	1.201
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	-0.0512	0.00421	147.9202	<.0001	0.903
Did not participate in multiple disbursements experiment	Dummy	0.0519	0.0052	99.4283	<.0001	1.109
Does not use the Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	0.00801	0.00335	5.723	0.0167	1.016
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	-0.00245	0.00009	745.8106	<.0001	0.926
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00115	0.000118	96.1272	<.0001	0.974

Likelihood Ratio = 98505.76
(p<.0001)

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 92654.09
(p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.0643 Number of Institutions = 1642

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 21.4

Table AI.6.17. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Retention Rate (Student Borrowers)

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	205787	91750	90935.77	114037	114851.2	100.90%	99.29%
2	205713	106358	109275	99355	96437.98	97.33%	103.02%
3	206188	119283	120134.1	86905	86053.88	99.29%	100.99%
4	206431	129297	127735.6	77134	78695.43	101.22%	98.02%
5	208342	137934	135645.3	70408	72696.71	101.69%	96.85%
6	205787	141507	138928.6	64280	66858.38	101.86%	96.14%
7	203176	136649	141702.1	66527	61473.93	96.43%	108.22%
8	207359	147106	149729.1	60253	57629.89	98.25%	104.55%
9	205491	157204	154805.6	48287	50685.43	101.55%	95.27%
10	204591	166303	164472.2	38288	40118.78	101.11%	95.44%

Chi-Square =1517.11 p<.0001

df = 8

Table AI.6.18. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans

Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2436	3088916.0	3069360.0	6515.0	1268.0
Yes	83	85024.0	104580.0	6515.0	1024.4

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	85024
Normal Approximation	
Z	-3.0016
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0013
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0027
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0014
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0027

Table AI.6.19. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans

Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Default Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2348	2899639.0	2855168.0	6284.0	1234.9
Yes	83	56457.0	100928.0	6284.0	680.2

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	56457
Normal Approximation	
Z	-7.0767
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001

Table AI.6.20. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans

Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Graduation Rate for Single-Term Borrowers in the Spring of 2002					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	1637	1422163.0	1405364.5	4109.7	868.8
Yes	79	51023.0	67821.5	4109.7	645.9

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	51023
Normal Approximation	
Z	-4.0874
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001

Table AI.6.21. Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans

Multiple Disbursement for Single Term Loans Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Retention Rate (Borrowers Only)					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2254	2613522.0	2633799.0	5999.6	1159.5
Yes	82	116094.0	95817.0	5999.6	1415.8

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	116094
Normal Approximation	
Z	3.3796
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0004
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0007
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0004
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0007

APPENDIX TABLE AI.7—THIRTY-DAY DELAY FOR FIRST-TIME, FIRST-YEAR BORROWERS

Table AI.7.1. Experimental Sites Initiatives Reporting Templates for Thirty-Day Delay for First-Time, First-Year Borrowers

Experimental Sites Initiative		
Institution	<input type="text"/>	
Experiment	Thirty Day Delay for First Time, First Year Borrowers	
Reporting Year	2001-2002	
Goal of the Experiment: To evaluate the withdrawal rate of students subject to the 30-day delay exemption (first time, first year borrowers).		
Target Student Population: Students subject to the 30-day delay exemption (first time, first year).		
Reporting Items		Supplemental Items (Optional)
1. Provide description and brief rationale on how the institution is conducting this experiment. Please select one of the description worksheets at the bottom of the status bar.	<input type="text"/>	1. <input type="text"/> Estimated savings in administrative work hours per borrower.
2. Number of first time, first year borrowers.	<input type="text"/>	2. <input type="text"/> Estimated savings in administrative costs.
3. Total amount of Title IV loans for students in (2).	<input type="text"/>	
4. # of 1st time/1st year students withdrawing within 30 day of enrollment.	<input type="text"/>	
5. Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (4).	<input type="text"/>	

Table AI.7.2. Exemption from the Thirty-Day Delay Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region

	Number	Percentage
Total Participation	75	100
Institution Type		
Two Year, Lower	1	1.33
Four Year	74	98.67
Control		
Public	64	85.33
Private	11	14.67
Region		
New England	2	2.67
Mid-Atlantic	6	8
South	8	10.67
Midwest	33	44
Southwest	4	5.33
West	22	29.33

Table AI.7.3. Thirty-Day Delay: Number of First-Time, First-Year Borrowers (Q8_2)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	15	4,662	310.80	357.00	94.99	145	430
2nd Quintile	15	9,137	609.13	575.00	132.10	466	801
3rd Quintile	15	15,780	1,052.00	1,087.00	152.54	804	1,312
4th Quintile	15	23,965	1,597.67	1,669.00	151.20	1,330	1,748
Highest 20%	15	46,608	3,107.20	2,241.00	2,790.72	1,852	12,988
Total	75	100,152	1,335.36	1,087.00	1,572.72	145	12,988

Table AI.7.4. Thirty-Day Delay: Total Amount of Title IV Loans for Students in (2) (Q8_3)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	15	\$11,181,807	\$745,454	\$767,412	\$196,639	\$446,345	\$981,374
2nd Quintile	15	\$22,986,770	\$1,532,451	\$1,404,202	\$373,634	\$1,001,519	\$2,062,652
3rd Quintile	15	\$40,431,818	\$2,695,455	\$2,747,422	\$471,491	\$2,064,791	\$3,384,567
4th Quintile	15	\$62,774,851	\$4,184,990	\$4,194,430	\$399,476	\$3,468,308	\$4,757,676
Highest 20%	15	\$140,442,559	\$9,362,837	\$6,935,716	\$5,887,691	\$4,842,191	\$26,022,562
Total	75	\$277,817,805	\$3,704,237	\$2,747,422	\$4,017,268	\$446,345	\$26,022,562

Table AI.7.5. Thirty-Day Delay: Number of First-Time, First-Year Students Withdrawing within 30 Days of Enrollment (Q8_4)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	19	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0
2nd Quintile	12	12	1.00	1.00	0.00	1	1
3rd Quintile	15	42	2.80	2.00	0.94	2	4
4th Quintile	15	105	7.00	7.00	1.36	5	9
Highest 20%	14	453	32.36	17.50	45.16	10	184
Total	75	612	8.16	2.00	22.39	0	184

Table AI.7.6. Thirty-Day Delay: Total Amount Returned to Title IV for Students in (4) (Q8_5)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	22	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2nd Quintile	7	\$3,968	\$567	\$653	\$286	\$209	\$1,021
3rd Quintile	15	\$31,067	\$2,071	\$2,084	\$666	\$1,117	\$3,264
4th Quintile	15	\$105,895	\$7,060	\$6,347	\$2,512	\$3,352	\$11,815
Highest 20%	14	\$490,420	\$35,030	\$23,376	\$39,995	\$12,573	\$170,204
Total	73	\$631,349	\$8,649	\$2,084	\$21,546	\$0	\$170,204

Table AI.7.7. Thirty-Day Delay: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours Per Borrower (Q8_O1)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	2	0.28	0.14	0.14	0.08	0.08	0.20
2nd Quintile	1	0.25	0.25	0.25		0.25	0.25
3rd Quintile	4	4.00	1.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
4th Quintile	2	3.00	1.50	1.50	0.00	1.50	1.50
Highest 20%	3	6.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	2.00	2.00
Total	12	13.53	1.13	1.00	0.70	0.08	2.00

Table AI.7.8. Thirty-Day Delay: Estimated Savings in Administrative Costs (Q8_O2)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	2	\$4	\$2	\$2	\$1.14	\$1	\$3
2nd Quintile	2	\$1,455	\$728	\$728	\$965.20	\$45	\$1,410
3rd Quintile	3	\$17,980	\$5,993	\$5,000	\$4,571.67	\$2,000	\$10,980
4th Quintile	2	\$32,517	\$16,259	\$16,259	\$6,238.80	\$11,847	\$20,670
Highest 20%	2	\$72,713	\$36,357	\$36,357	\$12,223.75	\$27,713	\$45,000
Total	11	\$124,669	\$11,334	\$5,000	\$14,488.65	\$1	\$45,000

Table AI.7.9 Thirty Day Delay - Logistic Regression for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-1.1711	0.1026	130.2391	<.0001	
2) Number of first time, first year borrowers	Continuous	0.000096	0.00002	24.1929	<.0001	1.061
3) Total amount of Title IV loans for students in (2)	Continuous	-7.03E-09	5.25E-09	1.7956	0.1802	0.986
4) Number of first time, first year students withdrawing within 30 days of enrollment	Continuous	0.000515	0.000565	0.832	0.3617	1.005
5) Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (4)	Continuous	-5.29E-06	1.61E-06	10.8447	0.001	0.979
Number of loans for first time, first year borrowers	Continuous	-0.00001	0.000018	0.3957	0.5293	0.978
Volume of loans for first year, first time borrowers	Continuous	2.68E-08	7.56E-09	12.5856	0.0004	1.127
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000021	3.53E-06	36.8534	<.0001	1.159
Number of direct loans	Continuous	5.55E-06	6.37E-06	0.7605	0.3832	1.041
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00004	7.09E-06	28.6435	<.0001	0.86
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	0.000018	0.00001	3.1132	0.0777	1.086
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-1.95E-09	4.53E-10	18.5828	<.0001	0.957
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	-3.80E-09	9.32E-10	16.6212	<.0001	0.893
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00012	0.000032	13.8633	0.0002	0.749
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	4.09E-08	1.01E-08	16.4085	<.0001	1.333
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00002	1.60E-06	244.343	<.0001	0.871
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	-0.0878	0.0338	6.7347	0.0095	0.985
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-0.7646	0.1252	37.3174	<.0001	0.955
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00005	3.10E-06	276.9633	<.0001	0.819
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	-0.00219	0.00305	0.5144	0.4732	0.994
Percent of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00083	0.00022	14.3899	0.0001	0.982
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-2.41E-07	8.58E-07	0.079	0.7787	0.998
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.0023	0.000251	84.2355	<.0001	1.041
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0185	0.00785	5.5659	0.0183	0.964
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.0163	0.00834	3.843	0.05	1.033
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.0581	0.0252	5.3374	0.0209	1.123
Institution was not statutorily exempt from requirement	Dummy	0.2034	0.00675	907.1471	<.0001	1.502

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
New England vs. Wes	Dummy	0.0691	0.0163	17.8552	<.0001	1.212
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.0422	0.0107	15.4719	<.0001	1.084
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0238	0.00889	7.1824	0.0074	1.158
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0148	0.00876	2.8637	0.0906	1.114
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.087	0.0118	54.2568	<.0001	1.234
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.00811	0.00829	0.9563	0.3281	0.985
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.000858	0.00631	0.0185	0.8918	0.994
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0887	0.0138	41.3991	<.0001	0.834
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0135	0.0137	0.9696	0.3248	0.899
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0151	0.01	2.262	0.1326	0.898
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0166	0.00986	2.831	0.0925	0.927
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.00778	0.0147	0.2805	0.5964	0.918
Did not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0665	0.0116	33.0709	<.0001	1.142
Did not participate in 30-day delay experiment	Dummy	-0.00649	0.0172	0.1431	0.7053	0.987
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0081	0.00665	1.4813	0.2236	0.984
Percentage+B21 of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	0.00277	0.00023	144.9953	<.0001	1.102
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00071	0.000351	4.1016	0.0428	0.984

Likelihood Ratio = 19560.37

Rescaled R-square = 0.0419

Number of Institutions = 1718

p<.0001

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs.

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 27.93

Reduced Model = 18612.95

Table AI.7.10. Thirty Day Delay - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	145178	2519	2604.57	142659	142573.4	96.71%	100.06%
2	146839	3634	3795.38	143205	143043.6	95.75%	100.11%
3	143713	4330	4481.5	139383	139231.5	96.62%	100.11%
4	145606	5018	5036.71	140588	140569.3	99.63%	100.01%
5	147719	5603	5667.74	142116	142051.3	98.86%	100.05%
6	144521	6368	6280.14	138153	138240.9	101.40%	99.94%
7	143562	7623	6989.02	135939	136573	109.07%	99.54%
8	145088	8217	8126.32	136871	136961.7	101.12%	99.93%
9	145356	10947	10950.02	134409	134406	99.97%	100.00%
10	140724	15347	15629.94	125377	125094.1	98.19%	100.23%

Chi-Square = 84.6053

p<.0001

df = 8

Table AI.7.11. Thirty Day Delay - Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Measure

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-1.0182	0.0969	110.3484	<.0001	
2) Number of first time, first year borrowers	Continuous	0.000724	0.000043	281.26	<.0001	1.557
3) Total amount of Title IV loans for students in (2)	Continuous	-1.65E-07	1.33E-08	153.539	<.0001	0.726
4) Number of first time, first year students withdrawing within 30 days of enrollment	Continuous	0.000314	0.00074	0.1805	0.6709	1.003
5) Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (4)	Continuous	0.000035	3.19E-06	123.5971	<.0001	1.152
Number of loans for first time, first year borrowers	Continuous	0.000078	0.000018	19.3009	<.0001	1.163
Volume of loans for first year, first time borrowers	Continuous	-4.83E-09	7.70E-09	0.3943	0.5301	0.979
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.00001	3.02E-06	11.0814	0.0009	1.072
Number of Direct loans	Continuous	3.26E-06	0.000015	0.0472	0.828	1.024
Number of students with FFELP Loans	Continuous	-0.00002	6.21E-06	10.6451	0.0011	0.923
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00056	0.000022	653.3748	<.0001	0.078
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	1.14E-09	3.72E-10	9.3581	0.0022	1.026
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	4.46E-08	1.63E-09	748.0473	<.0001	3.773
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	0.000104	0.000034	9.6327	0.0019	1.285
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	-2.51E-08	1.05E-08	5.7012	0.017	0.838
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00002	1.48E-06	257.0634	<.0001	0.877
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.1974	0.0319	38.211	<.0001	1.035
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-1.2858	0.1166	121.5143	<.0001	0.925
Average family investment value for students at Institution	Continuous	-0.00006	2.94E-06	378.5588	<.0001	0.802
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.014	0.00282	24.5968	<.0001	1.036
Percent of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00281	0.000212	175.4349	<.0001	0.941
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-4.21E-06	7.81E-07	29.0582	<.0001	0.963
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.00132	0.00024	30.2882	<.0001	1.023
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.106	0.00733	209.3845	<.0001	0.809
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.1089	0.00792	188.9708	<.0001	1.243
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.2369	0.0342	47.901	<.0001	0.623

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Institution was not statutorily exempt from requirement	Dummy	0.1441	0.00619	541.5374	<.0001	1.334
New England vs. Wes	Dummy	-0.0468	0.0159	8.6742	0.0032	1.039
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.1388	0.0102	185.9166	<.0001	0.948
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0165	0.00843	3.8377	0.0501	1.107
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0276	0.00831	11.0288	0.0009	1.059
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.2818	0.01	790.4687	<.0001	1.443
Urban versus rural campus	Dummy	-0.0303	0.00774	15.3468	<.0001	0.945
Suburban versus rural campus	Dummy	0.0039	0.00605	0.4162	0.5189	0.978
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0567	0.0128	19.5353	<.0001	0.825
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0298	0.0131	5.1432	0.0233	0.848
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	0.000298	0.00943	0.001	0.9748	0.874
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0202	0.00917	4.8525	0.0276	0.856
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0291	0.0139	4.3802	0.0364	0.848
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.1307	0.0132	98.3354	<.0001	1.299
Did not participate in 30-day delay experiment	Dummy	0.079	0.0237	11.1232	0.0009	1.171
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.00189	0.00607	0.0972	0.7553	0.996
Percent of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	0.000134	0.000215	0.3859	0.5345	1.005
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.0042	0.00033	162.3093	<.0001	0.911

Likelihood Ratio = 53608.25

Rescaled R-square =0.106

Number of Institutions = 1718

p<.0001

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 49830.66

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 18.58

Table AI.7.12. Thirty Day Delay - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Measure

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	145531	950	281.33	144581	145249.7	337.68%	99.54%
2	144218	1199	1065.16	143019	143152.8	112.57%	99.91%
3	143991	1909	2862.11	142082	141128.9	66.70%	100.68%
4	143779	4363	4769.94	139416	139009.1	91.47%	100.29%
5	145386	6087	6529.12	139299	138856.9	93.23%	100.32%
6	144057	7199	7719.94	136858	136337.1	93.25%	100.38%
7	142033	9195	8950.98	132838	133082	102.73%	99.82%
8	143998	11056	10915.68	132942	133082.3	101.29%	99.89%
9	144177	14046	14179.56	130131	129997.4	99.06%	100.10%
10	142531	22434	21130.84	120097	121400.2	106.17%	98.93%

Chi-Square = 2142.34

p<.0001

df = 8

Table AI.7.13. Thirty Day Delay - Logistic Regression for Withdrawal Rate for First Time, First Year Borrowers

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-0.7724	0.0848	82.8854	<.0001	
2) Number of first time, first year borrowers	Continuous	0.000258	0.000023	127.2996	<.0001	1.162
3) Total amount of Title IV loans for students in (2)	Continuous	-1.19E-08	6.56E-09	3.2612	0.0709	0.98
4) Number of first time, first year students withdrawing within 30 days of enrollment	Continuous	-0.00649	0.000541	143.8558	<.0001	0.938
5) Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (4)	Continuous	0.000017	1.39E-06	145.9584	<.0001	1.091
Number of loans for first time, first year borrowers	Continuous	0.000064	0.000015	18.012	<.0001	1.153
Volume of loans for first year, first time borrowers	Continuous	-1.66E-09	6.23E-09	0.0708	0.7902	0.992
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	-3.08E-06	3.45E-06	0.7971	0.372	0.982
Number of direct loans	Continuous	8.31E-06	7.09E-06	1.3756	0.2409	1.064
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00004	6.96E-06	36.8657	<.0001	0.866
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00028	0.000011	666.8827	<.0001	0.276
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-1.65E-10	4.77E-10	0.1197	0.7294	0.997
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	2.00E-08	9.80E-10	416.7381	<.0001	1.78
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	0.000885	0.000031	821.8805	<.0001	7.748
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	-2.74E-07	9.69E-09	799.1229	<.0001	0.156
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-1.74E-06	1.38E-06	1.6037	0.2054	0.99
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.2966	0.0298	99.1142	<.0001	1.05
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-2.0208	0.1074	353.7274	<.0001	0.886
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00008	2.69E-06	792.7329	<.0001	0.76
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	-0.00746	0.00259	8.286	0.004	0.981
Percent of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00028	0.000191	2.1219	0.1452	0.994
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-8.12E-06	7.36E-07	121.7542	<.0001	0.932
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.000809	0.000247	10.7016	0.0011	1.012
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0017	0.00672	0.0637	0.8007	0.997
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	-0.0135	0.00709	3.5975	0.0579	0.973
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.1053	0.0237	19.7184	<.0001	1.234

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Institution was not statutorily exempt from requirement	Dummy	0.015	0.00534	7.9253	0.0049	1.031
New England vs. West	Dummy	-0.074	0.0135	29.8842	<.0001	0.751
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.2292	0.009	648.1524	<.0001	0.643
South vs. West	Dummy	-0.0144	0.00778	3.4384	0.0637	0.797
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.00278	0.00702	0.1571	0.6918	0.807
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.1084	0.0105	107.4062	<.0001	0.902
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0544	0.00698	60.6546	<.0001	0.88
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0195	0.00528	13.698	0.0002	0.911
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0163	0.0122	1.78	0.1822	0.933
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0266	0.0121	4.8365	0.0279	0.923
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0106	0.0082	1.686	0.1941	0.938
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00492	0.00792	0.3857	0.5345	0.943
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.00523	0.0116	0.2019	0.6532	0.953
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0126	0.0106	1.4209	0.2333	1.026
Did not participate in 30-day delay experiment	Dummy	0.1227	0.0172	50.8963	<.0001	1.278
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0464	0.00539	74.2544	<.0001	0.911
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	0.00204	0.000196	108.3639	<.0001	1.079
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	0.00269	0.000287	87.8777	<.0001	1.056

Likelihood Ratio = 22339.20

Rescaled R-square = 0.0439

Number of Institutions = 1695

p<.0001

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 19922.11

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 17.63

Table AI.7.14 - Thirty Day Delay - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Withdrawal Rates for First Time, First Year Borrowers

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	109444	3627	3020.21	105817	106423.8	120.09%	99.43%
2	111335	4128	4923.1	107207	106411.9	83.85%	100.75%
3	112294	6014	6407.75	106280	105886.3	93.86%	100.37%
4	111148	7257	7724.56	103891	103423.4	93.95%	100.45%
5	114847	10148	9643.58	104699	105203.4	105.23%	99.52%
6	110162	10997	10679.66	99165	99482.34	102.97%	99.68%
7	110886	12977	11898.73	97909	98987.27	109.06%	98.91%
8	111765	13119	13343.3	98646	98421.7	98.32%	100.23%
9	111110	14349	14805.09	96761	96304.91	96.92%	100.47%
10	109081	17228	17368.11	91853	91712.89	99.19%	100.15%

Chi-Square = 486.33
df = 8

p<.0001

Table AI.7.15. Thirty Day Delay - Logistic Regression for Experimental Retention Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		0.8179	0.0397	423.516	<.0001	
2) Number of first time, first year borrowers	Continuous	-0.00013	7.40E-06	287.9778	<.0001	0.926
3) Total amount of Title IV loans for students in (2)	Continuous	4.32E-08	1.97E-09	479.798	<.0001	1.083
4) Number of first time, first year students withdrawing within 30 days of enrollment	Continuous	-0.00504	0.000248	411.0146	<.0001	0.959
5) Total amount returned to Title IV for students in (4)	Continuous	0.000022	6.18E-07	1278.1953	<.0001	1.098
Number of loans for first time, first year borrowers	Continuous	-0.00006	8.81E-06	50.2146	<.0001	0.885
Volume of loans for first year, first time borrowers	Continuous	2.26E-08	3.60E-09	39.3113	<.0001	1.106
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	6.93E-06	1.48E-06	22.0497	<.0001	1.05
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000044	2.31E-06	370.4856	<.0001	1.39
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-1.92E-06	2.87E-06	0.4498	0.5024	0.992
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00006	3.60E-06	288.7121	<.0001	0.755
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-1.23E-09	1.44E-10	72.6291	<.0001	0.972
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	-5.84E-10	3.19E-10	3.3598	0.0668	0.983
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.0002	0.000013	262.5396	<.0001	0.62
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	6.24E-08	4.03E-09	239.7341	<.0001	1.528
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-5.60E-06	6.58E-07	72.3843	<.0001	0.971
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.331	0.0145	521.563	<.0001	1.058
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-0.6364	0.0515	152.7219	<.0001	0.963
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	0.000074	1.09E-06	4563.8742	<.0001	1.324
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	-0.0333	0.00124	721.5434	<.0001	0.923
Percent of students with State grants	Continuous	0.000908	0.000088	106.8678	<.0001	1.019
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	0.000011	4.14E-07	697.4495	<.0001	1.1
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	-0.00178	0.000106	281.2078	<.0001	0.971
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.065	0.00287	512.0083	<.0001	0.878
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	-0.1494	0.00403	1371.2803	<.0001	0.742
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.0573	0.00893	41.2358	<.0001	1.122
Institution was not statutorily exempt from requirement	Dummy	-0.0376	0.00346	117.4874	<.0001	0.928

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.0991	0.00562	310.6872	<.0001	1.245
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	0.1373	0.00389	1243.6934	<.0001	1.294
South vs. West	Dummy	-0.00839	0.00365	5.2902	0.0214	1.118
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0883	0.00324	743.2476	<.0001	1.033
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0194	0.00503	14.8134	0.0001	1.106
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.0316	0.00317	99.0243	<.0001	1.03
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.034	0.00239	202.5507	<.0001	0.964
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0447	0.00523	72.9506	<.0001	1.241
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0119	0.00545	4.7402	0.0295	1.201
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0513	0.00388	174.7954	<.0001	1.249
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0347	0.00378	84.4628	<.0001	1.228
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0285	0.00549	26.9696	<.0001	1.221
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	-0.0329	0.00363	81.9692	<.0001	0.936
Did not participate in 30-day delay experiment	Dummy	0.0495	0.00569	75.5666	<.0001	1.104
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	0.0161	0.00329	23.8505	<.0001	1.033
Percent of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	-0.00296	0.000089	1098.7268	<.0001	0.91
Percent of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00098	0.000118	69.3394	<.0001	0.978

Likelihood Ratio = 102394.99

Rescaled R-square = 0.066

Number of Institutions = 1714

p<.0001

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 94671.72 (p<.0001)

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 16.87

Table AI.7.16. Thirty Day Delay - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Retention Rate

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	208436	91128	89977.16	117308	118458.8	101.28%	99.03%
2	208990	107936	110440.1	101054	98549.86	97.73%	102.54%
3	208290	121737	120811.2	86553	87478.83	100.77%	98.94%
4	208510	131034	128947.1	77476	79562.87	101.62%	97.38%
5	205242	132730	133623.6	72512	71618.38	99.33%	101.25%
6	206629	138369	139113.2	68260	67515.81	99.47%	101.10%
7	208949	143675	145704.3	65274	63244.65	98.61%	103.21%
8	208246	149599	149937.4	58647	58308.63	99.77%	100.58%
9	209388	158794	157065.8	50594	52322.17	101.10%	96.70%
10	209161	168198	167550.3	40963	41610.68	100.39%	98.44%

Chi-Square = 465.81
df = 8

p<.0001

Table AI.7.17. Thirty Day Delay

Thirty Day Delay Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2444	3098028.5	3079440	6203.2064	1267.6058
Yes	75	75911.5	94500	6203.2064	1012.1533

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	75911.5
Normal Approximation	
Z	-2.9965
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0014
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0027
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0014
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0028

Table AI.7.18. Thirty Day Delay

Thirty Day Delay Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Default Measure					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2356	2906975	2864896	5983.685	1233.8604
Yes	75	49121	91200	5983.685	654.94667

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	49121
Normal Approximation	
Z	-7.0322
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001

Table AI.7.19. Thirty Day Delay

Thirty Day Delay Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Withdrawal Rate for First Time, First Year Borrowers					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2160	2447451.5	2412720	5418.0012	1133.0794
Yes	73	46809.5	81541	5418.0012	641.22603

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	46809.5
Normal Approximation	
Z	-6.4103
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001

Table AI.7.20. Thirty Day Delay

Thirty Day Delay Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Retention Rate (Borrowers Only)					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2262	2623452	2643147	5709.5327	1159.7931
Yes	74	106164	86469	5709.5327	1434.64865

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	106164
Normal Approximation	
Z	3.4494
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0003
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0006
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0003
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0006

APPENDIX TABLE AI.8—ENTRANCE LOAN COUNSELING

Table AI.8.1. Experimental Sites Initiatives Reporting Template for Entrance Loan Counseling

Experimental Sites Initiative

Institution

Experiment

Reporting Year

Goal of the Experiment: To evaluate alternatives to the current models and timetables for targeting and educating borrowers most likely to default.

Target Student Population: FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan borrowers.



Reporting Items

1. Provide description and brief rationale on how the institution is conducting this experiment. Please select one of the description worksheets at the bottom of the status bar.
 2. Number of first time borrowers.
 3. Total loan funds for students in (2).
 4. Has the institution exempted certain groups?
- If certain groups were exempted, please *specify*.
-

Supplemental Items (Optional)

1.
2.

Table AI.8.2. Alternative Entrance Loan Counseling Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region

	Number	Percentage
Total Participation	54	100
Institution Type		
Two Year, Lower	1	1.85
Two Year, Upper	1	1.85
Four Year	52	96.3
Control		
Public	42	77.78
Private	12	22.22
Region		
New England	1	1.85
Mid-Atlantic	6	11.11
South	8	14.81
Midwest	24	44.44
Southwest	1	1.85
West	14	25.93

Table AI.8.3. Entrance Loan Counseling: Number of First-Time Borrowers (Q9_2)

Entrance Loan Counseling: Number of First-Time Borrowers (Q9_2)								
	Reporting	Not Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	10	0	2,890	289.00	295.50	105.86	100	421
2nd Quintile	11	0	9,781	889.18	878.00	291.17	430	1,331
3rd Quintile	11	0	20,835	1,894.09	1,910.00	222.06	1,451	2,164
4th Quintile	11	0	29,087	2,644.27	2,566.00	335.77	2,197	3,213
Highest 20%	11	0	65,382	5,943.82	5,688.00	2,757.76	3,385	13,294
Total	54	0	127,975	2,369.91	1,928.00	2,338.60	100	13,294

Table AI.8.4. Entrance Loan Counseling: Total Loan Funds for Students in (2) (Q9_3)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	10	\$8,758,223	\$875,822	\$939,489	\$273,637	\$446,345	\$1,201,663
2nd Quintile	11	\$32,625,669	\$2,965,970	\$3,037,227	\$984,076	\$1,348,037	\$4,221,760
3rd Quintile	11	\$66,549,773	\$6,049,979	\$6,015,989	\$983,812	\$4,449,852	\$7,544,974
4th Quintile	11	\$130,802,939	\$11,891,176	\$13,025,435	\$2,481,354	\$8,645,869	\$14,940,993
Highest 20%	11	\$298,310,970	\$27,119,179	\$21,230,993	\$14,221,704	\$16,258,791	\$60,612,362
Total	54	\$537,047,573	\$9,945,325	\$6,142,296	\$11,422,813	\$446,345	\$60,612,362

Table AI.8.5. Entrance Loan Counseling: Has the Institution Exempted Certain Groups? (Q9_4)

	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percentage
All	1	1.82	1	1.82
No	42	76.36	43	78.18
Yes	12	21.82	55	100

Table AI.8.6. Entrance Loan Counseling: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours Per Borrower (Q9_O1)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	2	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.00	0.08
2 nd Quintile	2	0.38	0.19	0.19	0.15	0.08	0.30
3 rd Quintile	3	1.50	0.50	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.50
4 th Quintile	4	3.68	0.92	1.00	0.16	0.68	1.00
Highest 20%	1	10.00	10.00	10.00		10.00	10.00
Total	12	15.64	1.30	0.50	2.76	0.00	10.00

Table AI.8.7. Entrance Loan Counseling: Estimated Savings in Administrative Cost Per Borrower (Q9_O2)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	2	\$1.39	\$0.70	\$0.70	\$0.98	\$0.00	\$1.39
2nd Quintile	2	\$11.95	\$5.98	\$5.98	\$5.62	\$2.00	\$9.95
3rd Quintile	2	\$20.80	\$10.40	\$10.40	\$0.57	\$10.00	\$10.80
4th Quintile	2	\$30.25	\$15.13	\$15.13	\$5.83	\$11.00	\$19.25
Highest 20%	2	\$221.74	\$110.87	\$110.87	\$14.27	\$100.78	\$120.96
Total	10	\$286.13	\$28.61	\$10.40	\$43.99	\$0.00	\$120.96

Table AI.8.8. Entrance Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-1.022	0.1041	96.3303	<.0001	
2) Number of first time borrowers	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000026	1.3336	0.2482	0.97
3) Total loan funds for students in (2)	Continuous	7.812E-09	4.566E-09	2.9275	0.0871	1.04
4) Institution has not exempted certain groups	Dummy	-0.0201	0.0173	1.349	0.2455	0.96
Number of Loans for First-Time, First Year Borrowers	Continuous	0.000003154	0.000018	0.0302	0.862	1.01
Volume of Loans for First-Time, First Year Borrowers	Continuous	2.899E-08	7.542E-09	14.7722	0.0001	1.14
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000024	0.00000349	48.8839	<.0001	1.18
Number of direct loans	Continuous	-0.0000036	0.000006882	0.2735	0.601	0.97
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00005	0.000007113	40.7713	<.0001	0.84
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	0.000019	0.000011	3.2305	0.0723	1.09
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-2.49E-09	4.72E-10	27.8129	<.0001	0.95
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	-2.31E-09	1.01E-09	5.2318	0.0222	0.93
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00018	0.000032	30.6068	<.0001	0.65
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	5.831E-08	9.982E-09	34.1265	<.0001	1.51
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000001573	446.9838	<.0001	0.83
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	-0.0303	0.0338	0.8053	0.3695	1.00
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-1.0372	0.126	67.7568	<.0001	0.94
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00005	0.000003138	253.4081	<.0001	0.825
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.00602	0.00306	3.8777	0.0489	1.015
Percent of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00111	0.00022	25.4338	<.0001	0.976
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	8.758E-07	8.528E-07	1.0548	0.3044	1.008
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.00252	0.000247	103.8936	<.0001	1.045
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0285	0.00787	13.1428	0.0003	0.945
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.1096	0.00783	195.7925	<.0001	1.245
Institution does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.0194	0.0269	0.5235	0.4694	0.962
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.0733	0.0164	20.0725	<.0001	1.249
Mid-Atlantic vs. West Region	Dummy	-0.032	0.0107	8.9237	0.0028	1.124
South vs. West Region	Dummy	0.034	0.00891	14.5159	0.0001	1.201

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Midwest vs. West region	Dummy	-0.0151	0.00881	2.948	0.086	1.143
Southwest vs. West region	Dummy	0.0887	0.0118	56.2283	<.0001	1.268
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0246	0.00828	8.7985	0.003	0.963
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.0117	0.00635	3.3952	0.0654	0.999
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0683	0.0138	24.6344	<.0001	0.873
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00311	0.0136	0.0519	0.8197	0.932
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0179	0.01	3.2178	0.0728	0.918
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00301	0.00985	0.0935	0.7598	0.932
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0246	0.0147	2.8108	0.0936	0.958
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0331	0.00909	13.2336	0.0003	1.068
Did not participate in entrance loan counseling experiment	Dummy	0.0274	0.0179	2.3469	0.1255	1.056
Does not use the Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0192	0.00665	8.3489	0.0039	0.962
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	0.00282	0.00023	150.3757	<.0001	1.104
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00071	0.00035	4.0816	0.0434	0.985

Likelihood Ratio = 18362.61
(p<.0001)

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 17944.62
(p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.0396

Number of Institutions = 1716

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 65.83

**Table AI.8.9. Entrance Loan Counseling - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition
for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate**

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	143842	2523	2488	141319	141354	101.41%	99.98%
2	143410	3676	3666.28	139734	139743.7	100.27%	99.99%
3	139571	4234	4349.1	135337	135221.9	97.35%	100.09%
4	138855	4603	4804.23	134252	134050.8	95.81%	100.15%
5	147052	5580	5706.64	141472	141345.4	97.78%	100.09%
6	143455	6612	6379.91	136843	137075.1	103.64%	99.83%
7	144997	7407	7251.55	137590	137745.5	102.14%	99.89%
8	143821	8564	8444.14	135257	135376.9	101.42%	99.91%
9	142863	10751	10819.87	132112	132043.1	99.36%	100.05%
10	148373	15360	15352.45	133013	133020.5	100.05%	99.99%

Chi-Square =29.9558

p< 0.0002

df = 8

Table AI.8.10. Entrance Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Measure

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-1.3142	0.1018	166.6333	<.0001	
2) Number of first time borrowers	Continuous	0.000549	0.000036	230.2675	<.0001	1.76
3) Total loan funds for students in (2)	Continuous	-0.000000072	6.457E-09	124.4685	<.0001	0.69
4) Institution has not exempted certain groups	Dummy	0.1869	0.0244	58.5932	<.0001	1.45
Number of loans for first-time, first year borrowers	Continuous	0.000106	0.000018	36.1817	<.0001	1.23
Volume of loans for first-time, first year borrowers	Continuous	-7.69E-09	7.612E-09	1.0216	0.3122	0.97
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000014	0.000003034	21.9296	<.0001	1.10
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000016	0.000015	1.0419	0.3074	1.12
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000006202	24.5538	<.0001	0.89
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00056	0.000022	633.817	<.0001	0.08
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	7.03E-10	3.97E-10	3.1394	0.0764	1.02
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	4.108E-08	1.723E-09	568.7259	<.0001	3.38
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	0.00012	0.000033	12.9588	0.0003	1.34
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	-3.06E-08	1.044E-08	8.5916	0.0034	0.81
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000001452	384.6709	<.0001	0.85
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.2521	0.0318	62.9947	<.0001	1.05
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-1.5367	0.1174	171.3763	<.0001	0.91
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00005	0.000002938	323.4494	<.0001	0.816
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.0241	0.0028	74.0862	<.0001	1.063
Percent of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00318	0.000212	224.9521	<.0001	0.934
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-0.00000389	7.825E-07	24.7147	<.0001	0.966
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.00196	0.000237	68.3019	<.0001	1.035
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.1072	0.00735	212.4567	<.0001	0.807
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.1625	0.00737	486.5819	<.0001	1.384
Institution does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.2686	0.0375	51.2603	<.0001	0.584
New England vs. West	Dummy	-0.0199	0.0158	1.5857	0.2079	1.093
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.1269	0.0101	156.996	<.0001	0.982
South vs. West	Dummy	0.011	0.00848	1.6769	0.1953	1.128

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0406	0.00834	23.7401	<.0001	1.071
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.2855	0.0101	806.79	<.0001	1.484
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0416	0.00773	28.9511	<.0001	0.934
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.0146	0.00606	5.8327	0.0157	0.988
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0451	0.0128	12.4421	0.0004	0.842
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0497	0.0132	14.2511	0.0002	0.838
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0191	0.00937	4.1587	0.0414	0.864
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0273	0.00916	8.9165	0.0028	0.857
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0145	0.0138	1.1035	0.2935	0.894
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0528	0.01	27.641	<.0001	1.111
Did not participate in entrance loan counseling experiment	Dummy	0.1398	0.0273	26.1287	<.0001	1.323
Does not use the Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0134	0.00607	4.8598	0.0275	0.974
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	0.000852	0.000218	15.3213	<.0001	1.03
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00356	0.00033	116.3298	<.0001	0.925

Likelihood Ratio = 52434.73
(p<.0001)

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 48462.51
(p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.1042

Number of Institutions = 1716

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 17.35

**Table AI.8.11. Entrance Loan Counseling - Hosmer and Lemeshow
Partition for Experimental Default Measure**

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	143483	988	279.75	142495	143203.2	353.17%	99.51%
2	143501	1059	1113.62	142442	142387.4	95.10%	100.04%
3	142587	1914	2868.62	140673	139718.4	66.72%	100.68%
4	143003	4458	4781.95	138545	138221	93.23%	100.23%
5	140183	5735	6279.59	134448	133903.4	91.33%	100.41%
6	143960	7224	7662.48	136736	136297.5	94.28%	100.32%
7	145296	9648	9262.31	135648	136033.7	104.16%	99.72%
8	142200	11133	10985.35	131067	131214.6	101.34%	99.89%
9	143024	14348	14532.6	128676	128491.4	98.73%	100.14%
10	140616	21684	20389.26	118932	120226.7	106.35%	98.92%

Chi-Square =2340.20

p <.0001

df = 8

Table AI.8.12. Entrance Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for Experimental Withdrawal Rate for First-Year, First-Time Borrowers

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-0.6955	0.0862	65.0709	<.0001	
2) Number of first time borrowers	Continuous	0.000075	0.000025	8.9776	0.0027	1.08
3) Total loan funds for students in (2)	Continuous	1.43E-10	4.625E-09	0.001	0.9754	1.00
4) Institution has not exempted certain groups	Dummy	-0.093	0.0162	33.1211	<.0001	0.83
Number of loans for first-time, first year borrowers	Continuous	0.000092	0.000015	38.2063	<.0001	1.23
Volume of loans for first-time, first year borrowers	Continuous	-1.32E-08	6.184E-09	4.5307	0.0333	0.94
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00000797	0.000003447	5.3524	0.0207	0.96
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000016	0.000007417	4.3995	0.0359	1.12
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00004	0.000006992	29.8196	<.0001	0.88
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00027	0.000011	602.0625	<.0001	0.29
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	7.87E-10	4.85E-10	2.6342	0.1046	1.02
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	1.732E-08	1.051E-09	271.2918	<.0001	1.65
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	0.000917	0.00003	906.9898	<.0001	8.37
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	-0.000000283	9.55E-09	878.3958	<.0001	0.15
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00000263	0.000001353	3.7867	0.0517	0.99
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.3649	0.0295	152.4881	<.0001	1.06
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-2.121	0.1073	391.002	<.0001	0.88
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00008	0.000002701	782.8462	<.0001	0.761
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	-0.00502	0.00259	3.7571	0.0526	0.987
Percent of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00029	0.00019	2.3373	0.1263	0.994
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-0.00000845	7.317E-07	133.2876	<.0001	0.929
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.00129	0.000244	27.8094	<.0001	1.019
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0112	0.00673	2.754	0.097	0.978
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	-0.00599	0.00676	0.7863	0.3752	0.988
Institution does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.0286	0.025	1.3092	0.2525	1.059
New England vs. West	Dummy	-0.0606	0.0135	20.0659	<.0001	0.769
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.2256	0.009	629.1847	<.0001	0.652
South vs. West	Dummy	-0.0201	0.00781	6.6381	0.01	0.801

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.00493	0.00703	0.4917	0.4831	0.813
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.1089	0.0105	108.1705	<.0001	0.911
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0551	0.00697	62.4941	<.0001	0.878
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0198	0.00531	13.9671	0.0002	0.91
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0283	0.0122	5.4035	0.0201	0.919
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.035	0.0121	8.4127	0.0037	0.913
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00766	0.00817	0.8792	0.3484	0.938
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00145	0.00791	0.0337	0.8544	0.944
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0163	0.0116	1.9681	0.1607	0.961
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0133	0.00815	2.6654	0.1026	1.027
Did not participate in entrance loan experiment	Dummy	0.0685	0.0185	13.6625	0.0002	1.147
Does not use the Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0443	0.00538	67.8532	<.0001	0.915
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	0.00221	0.000197	126.0916	<.0001	1.086
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	0.00301	0.000287	109.3719	<.0001	1.063

Likelihood Ratio = 21914.35
(p<.0001)

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 19708.28
(p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.0432 Number of Institutions = 1693

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 20.7

Table AI.8.13. Entrance Loan Counseling - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Withdrawal Rate for First-Year, First-Time Borrowers

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	112544	3592	3280.48	108952	109263.5	109.50%	99.71%
2	109632	4534	4983.97	105098	104648	90.97%	100.43%
3	111030	5758	6364.64	105272	104665.4	90.47%	100.58%
4	110882	7362	7732.28	103520	103149.7	95.21%	100.36%
5	112348	10284	9360.85	102064	102987.1	109.86%	99.10%
6	109493	10793	10554.82	98700	98938.18	102.26%	99.76%
7	111523	12582	11960.84	98941	99562.16	105.19%	99.38%
8	109257	12977	13080.2	96280	96176.8	99.21%	100.11%
9	110324	14570	14700.31	95754	95623.69	99.11%	100.14%
10	110055	17179	17585.35	92876	92469.65	97.69%	100.44%

Chi-Square =308.26

p <.0001

df = 8

Table AI.8.14. Entrance Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for Retention Rate (All Borrowers)

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		0.9446	0.0403	550.4056	<.0001	
2) Number of first time borrowers	Continuous	0.000278	0.00000947	860.1961	<.0001	1.332
3) Total loan funds for students in (2)	Continuous	-5.99E-08	1.647E-09	1320.8687	<.0001	0.74
4) Institution has not exempted certain groups	Dummy	-0.0566	0.0057	98.516	<.0001	0.89
Number of loans for first-time, first year borrowers	Continuous	-0.00006	0.000008742	51.798	<.0001	0.88
Volume of loans for first-time, first year borrowers	Continuous	1.911E-08	3.58E-09	28.4947	<.0001	1.09
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00000338	0.000001451	5.4432	0.0196	0.98
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000014	0.00000243	33.8488	<.0001	1.11
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000019	0.000002838	46.6906	<.0001	1.08
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00001	0.000003665	10.2827	0.0013	0.95
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-5.11E-10	1.5E-10	11.6698	0.0006	0.99
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	1.174E-09	3.43E-10	11.7187	0.0006	1.04
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00016	0.000013	152.2983	<.0001	0.69
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	4.805E-08	4.034E-09	141.9059	<.0001	1.39
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00000279	6.476E-07	18.6105	<.0001	0.99
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.3236	0.0144	505.3923	<.0001	1.06
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-0.8415	0.0518	264.0684	<.0001	0.95
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	0.000067	0.000001093	3719.1996	<.0001	1.288
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	-0.0318	0.00124	658.1934	<.0001	0.926
Percent of students with State grants	Continuous	0.000971	0.000088	122.0274	<.0001	1.021
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	0.000007301	4.091E-07	318.5411	<.0001	1.066
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	-0.00158	0.000104	227.6856	<.0001	0.974
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0669	0.00288	538.7688	<.0001	0.875
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	-0.174	0.00373	2177.8201	<.0001	0.706
Institution participates in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	0.0631	0.00952	43.9933	<.0001	1.135
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.0881	0.00563	245.1389	<.0001	1.189
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	0.1308	0.00388	1135.054	<.0001	1.241
South vs. West	Dummy	-0.0151	0.00366	17.0958	<.0001	1.072

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.1012	0.00327	958.7492	<.0001	0.984
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0175	0.00504	12.0525	0.0005	1.07
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.0372	0.00317	137.6392	<.0001	1.044
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0317	0.0024	174.2151	<.0001	0.974
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0281	0.00523	28.8549	<.0001	1.192
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.012	0.00543	4.8716	0.0273	1.145
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0482	0.00387	154.7139	<.0001	1.216
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0408	0.00377	117.1533	<.0001	1.207
Small town vs. Rural	Dummy	0.0423	0.00547	59.8795	<.0001	1.209
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	-0.00277	0.00307	0.8131	0.3672	0.994
Did not participate in multiple disbursements experiment	Dummy	0.0308	0.006	26.2949	<.0001	1.063
Does not use the Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	0.0131	0.00329	15.9618	<.0001	1.027
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	-0.00236	0.000089	698.6336	<.0001	0.928
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00018	0.000118	2.2919	0.1301	0.996

Likelihood Ratio = 101229.49
(p<.0001)

Rescaled R-square = 0.0657

Number of Institutions = 1712

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model Cannot be Calculated - Unable to Fit Reduced Model

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square Cannot be Calculated - Unable to Fit Reduced Model

Table AI.8.15. Entrance Loan Counseling - Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Retention Rate (All Borrowers)

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	206209	89583	88709.11	116626	117499.9	100.99%	99.26%
2	206826	107384	108836.7	99442	97989.3	98.67%	101.48%
3	206494	119622	119175	86872	87319.02	100.38%	99.49%
4	206159	127881	127817.2	78278	78341.81	100.05%	99.92%
5	204401	130881	132782.4	73520	71618.63	98.57%	102.65%
6	205813	142008	138417.8	63805	67395.24	102.59%	94.67%
7	211246	143473	147287.3	67773	63958.74	97.41%	105.96%
8	206643	148129	148594.4	58514	58048.58	99.69%	100.80%
9	206377	155907	154636.5	50470	51740.53	100.82%	97.54%
10	203634	164337	162919.5	39297	40714.48	100.87%	96.52%

Chi-Square = 856.92

p < .0001

df = 8

Table AI.8.16. Entrance Loan Counseling

Entrance Loan Counseling Experiment – Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Cohort Default Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2462	3122283.5	3102120	5427.7077	1268.18989
Yes	57	51656.5	71820	5427.7077	906.25439

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	51656.5
Normal Approximation	
Z	-3.7148
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0002
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0002

Table AI.8.17. Entrance Loan Counseling

Entrance Loan Counseling Experiment – Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Default Measure					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2374	2922442	2886784	5236.3448	1231.02022
Yes	57	33654	69312	5236.3448	590.42105

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	33654
Normal Approximation	
Z	-6.8096
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001

Table AI.8.18. Entrance Loan Counseling

Entrance Loan Counseling Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Withdrawal Rate for First Time, First Year Borrowers					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2160	2447451.5	2412720	5418.0012	1133.0794
Yes	73	46809.5	81541	5418.0012	641.22603

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	46809.5
Normal Approximation	
Z	-6.4103
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001

Table AI.8.19. Entrance Loan Counseling

Entrance Loan Counseling Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Retention Rate (Borrowers Only)					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2262	2623452	2643147	5709.5327	1159.7931
Yes	74	106164	86469	5709.5327	1434.64865

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	106164
Normal Approximation	
Z	3.4494
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0003
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0006
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0003
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0006

APPENDIX TABLE AI.9—EXIT LOAN COUNSELING

Table AI.9.1. Experimental Sites Initiative Reporting Template for Exit Loan Counseling

Experimental Sites Initiative

Institution

Experiment

Reporting Year

Goal of the Experiment: To evaluate alternatives to the current models and timetables for targeting and educating borrowers most likely to default.

Target Student Population: FFEL/Direct Stafford Loan borrowers.



Reporting Items

1. Provide description and brief rationale on how the institution is conducting this experiment. Please select one of the description worksheets at the bottom of the status bar.
2. Number of final term borrowers.
3. Total amount of Title IV loans for students in (2).
4. Number of students in (2) attending in-person counseling sessions.
5. Surveys on student knowledge of repayment obligations. *Please elaborate.*

Supplemental Items (Optional)

1.
2.

Table AI.9.2. Alternative Exit Loan Counseling Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region

	Number	Percentage
Total Participation	45	100
Institution Type		
Two Year, Lower	1	2.22
Four Year	44	97.78
Control		
Public	36	80
Private	9	20
Region		
Mid-Atlantic	5	11.11
South	8	17.78
Midwest	22	48.89
Southwest	1	2.22
West	9	20

Table AI.9.3. Exit Loan Counseling: Number of Final-Term Borrowers (Q10_2)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	8	1,778	222.25	154.50	143.04	74	414
2nd Quintile	9	9,683	1,075.89	1,180.00	326.30	469	1,418
3rd Quintile	9	14,645	1,627.22	1,593.00	163.19	1,443	1,983
4th Quintile	9	24,494	2,721.56	2,778.00	393.36	2,097	3,238
Highest 20%	9	51,889	5,765.44	4,933.00	3,762.90	3,300	15,451
Total	44	102,489	2,329.30	1,607.00	2,540.20	74	15,451

Table AI.9.4. Exit Loan Counseling: Total Amount of Title IV Loans for Students in (2) (Q10_3)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	8	\$11,253,734	\$1,406,717	\$1,294,821	\$1,008,128	\$327,623	\$3,193,845
2nd Quintile	9	\$61,866,713	\$6,874,079	\$6,814,154	\$1,187,166	\$5,400,649	\$8,975,467
3rd Quintile	9	\$108,070,143	\$12,007,794	\$10,254,516	\$2,732,152	\$9,373,891	\$16,256,504
4th Quintile	9	\$281,766,488	\$31,307,388	\$32,453,118	\$8,522,840	\$18,894,641	\$47,000,000
Highest 20%	8	\$688,340,997	\$86,042,625	\$71,028,599	\$48,283,529	\$55,620,155	\$201,724,531
Total	43	\$1,151,298,075	\$26,774,374	\$10,254,516	\$36,495,224	\$327,623	\$201,724,531

Table AI.9.5. Exit Loan Counseling: Number of Students in (2) Attending In-Person Counseling Sessions (Q10_4)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	20	0	0	0	0.00	0	0
2 nd Quartile	6	275	46	36	34.72	5	90
3 rd Quartile	9	2,109	234	250	100.63	91	379
Highest 20%	8	7,581	948	597	815.82	384	2,805
Total	43	9,965	232	23	491.05	0	2,805

Table AI.9.6. Exit Loan Counseling: Estimated Savings in Administrative Work Hours Per Borrower (Q10_O1)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	2	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.00	0.05
2 nd Quintile	2	0.17	0.08	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.09
3 rd Quintile	2	0.71	0.36	0.36	0.08	0.30	0.41
4 th Quintile	3	2.50	0.83	1.00	0.29	0.50	1.00
Highest 20%	1	10.00	10.00	10.00		10.00	10.00
Total	10	13.43	1.34	0.36	3.06	0.00	10.00

Table AI.9.7. Exit Loan Counseling: Estimated Savings in Administrative Costs (Q10_O2)

	Reporting	Sum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	Minimum	Maximum
Lowest 20%	1	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00
2nd Quintile	2	\$3.39	\$1.70	\$1.70	\$0.43	\$1.39	\$2.00
3rd Quintile	2	\$20.80	\$10.40	\$10.40	\$0.57	\$10.00	\$10.80
4th Quintile	2	\$3,795.82	\$1,897.91	\$1,897.91	\$2,407.12	\$195.82	\$3,600.00
Highest 20%	2	\$67,601.25	\$33,800.63	\$33,800.63	\$20,788.06	\$19,101.25	\$48,500.00
Total	9	\$71,421.26	\$7,935.70	\$10.80	\$16,444.33	\$0.00	\$48,500.00

Table AI.9.8. Exit Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-0.8041	0.1027	61.2519	<.0001	
2) Number of final term borrowers	Continuous	-0.00003	0.000016	2.5869	0.1078	0.978
3) Total amount of Title IV loans for students in (2)	Continuous	6.33E-10	7.91E-10	0.64	0.4237	1.008
4) Number students in (2) attending in-person counseling sessions	Continuous	-0.00004	0.000059	0.5305	0.4664	0.995
Volume of loans for students potentially eligible to graduate	Continuous	2.76E-08	4.14E-09	44.3261	<.0001	1.219
Number of loans for students potentially eligible to graduate	Continuous	-0.00014	0.000015	87.9378	<.0001	0.751
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000056	4.49E-06	155.0837	<.0001	1.471
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000037	7.64E-06	23.3838	<.0001	1.308
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00007	8.34E-06	74.4821	<.0001	0.752
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	0.000027	0.000011	6.1264	0.0133	1.133
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-2.02E-09	4.76E-10	17.9486	<.0001	0.955
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	-8.03E-09	9.22E-10	75.9164	<.0001	0.788
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00014	0.000032	19.5848	<.0001	0.714
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	5.43E-08	9.88E-09	30.2028	<.0001	1.464
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	1.57E-06	478.5625	<.0001	0.827
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.0439	0.0332	1.7506	0.1858	1.008
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-1.3421	0.1211	122.7709	<.0001	0.922
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00005	3.11E-06	288.592	<.0001	0.815
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.00544	0.00306	3.1724	0.0749	1.014
Percent of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00124	0.000219	31.9604	<.0001	0.974
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	6.67E-07	8.44E-07	0.625	0.4292	1.006
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.00179	0.000254	49.7031	<.0001	1.032
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0221	0.00778	8.0938	0.0044	0.957
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.1335	0.00797	280.67	<.0001	1.306
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.0109	0.0263	0.1735	0.677	0.978
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.0836	0.0164	26.0726	<.0001	1.275
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.0218	0.0107	4.1767	0.041	1.147
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0309	0.009	11.7978	0.0006	1.209

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	0.00194	0.00861	0.0507	0.8218	1.175
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.0646	0.0118	30.1505	<.0001	1.251
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0229	0.00825	7.6846	0.0056	0.969
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.0142	0.0063	5.0467	0.0247	1.005
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0627	0.0136	21.3743	<.0001	0.881
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.00591	0.0136	0.1886	0.6641	0.944
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0119	0.0099	1.4487	0.2287	0.927
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00793	0.00984	0.6491	0.4204	0.931
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0131	0.0146	0.7997	0.3712	0.951
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.056	0.00853	43.0247	<.0001	1.118
Did Not participate in exit counseling experiment	Dummy	-0.0328	0.0189	3.0078	0.0829	0.936
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0158	0.00664	5.6492	0.0175	0.969
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	0.00253	0.000232	119.8292	<.0001	1.093
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.0009	0.000349	6.669	0.0098	0.98

Likelihood Ratio = 18496.3396 Rescaled R-square = 0.0396 Number of Institutions = 1719

p<.0001

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 17916.9145 Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 49.25

(p<.0001)

Table AI.9.9. Exit Loan Counseling- Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	145330	2488	2488.19	142842	142841.8	99.99%	100.00%
2	143217	3606	3582.12	139611	139634.9	100.67%	99.98%
3	142876	4363	4400.69	138513	138475.3	99.14%	100.03%
4	144817	4959	5037.71	139858	139779.3	98.44%	100.06%
5	144477	5515	5625.45	138962	138851.6	98.04%	100.08%
6	149257	6529	6646.09	142728	142610.9	98.24%	100.08%
7	144933	7563	7285.85	137370	137647.1	103.80%	99.80%
8	144279	8548	8575.26	135731	135703.7	99.68%	100.02%
9	144512	10966	10982.32	133546	133529.7	99.85%	100.01%
10	146119	15207	15071.42	130912	131047.6	100.90%	99.90%

Chi-Square = 18.7646

p < 0.0162

df = 8

Table AI.9.10. Exit Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for Experimental Default Measure

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		-0.5879	0.0961	37.4275	<.0001	
2) Number of final term borrowers	Continuous	0.000037	0.000019	3.8665	0.0493	1.033
3) Total amount of Title IV loans for students in (2)	Continuous	-6.09E-09	1.08E-09	31.9999	<.0001	0.929
4) Number students in (2) attending in-person counseling sessions	Continuous	0.00168	0.000118	202.6478	<.0001	1.213
Volume of loans for students potentially eligible to graduate	Continuous	3.98E-08	4.70E-09	71.7512	<.0001	1.331
Number of loans for students potentially eligible to graduate	Continuous	-0.00014	0.000015	94.2794	<.0001	0.74
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000054	4.24E-06	161.1728	<.0001	1.451
Number of direct loans	Continuous	0.000021	0.000016	1.6959	0.1928	1.162
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00009	8.05E-06	115.6168	<.0001	0.709
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00051	0.000023	513.7872	<.0001	0.097
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	1.56E-09	4.16E-10	14.0349	0.0002	1.036
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	3.54E-08	1.69E-09	436.0186	<.0001	2.867
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	0.000106	0.000034	10.0018	0.0016	1.291
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	-1.56E-08	1.04E-08	2.2651	0.1323	0.896
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00003	1.44E-06	358.4432	<.0001	0.86
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.3413	0.0313	118.9825	<.0001	1.062
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-2.0981	0.1139	339.1859	<.0001	0.881
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00006	2.95E-06	424.9642	<.0001	0.791
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	0.0242	0.00282	73.699	<.0001	1.063
Percent of students with state grants	Continuous	-0.00355	0.000211	282.4894	<.0001	0.927
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	-3.67E-06	7.93E-07	21.391	<.0001	0.968
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	0.00103	0.00024	18.2364	<.0001	1.018
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0883	0.00732	145.298	<.0001	0.838
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	0.1846	0.00751	604.6013	<.0001	1.447
Institution does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.2023	0.037	29.8839	<.0001	0.667
New England vs. West	Dummy	-0.00926	0.0158	0.3449	0.557	1.121
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	-0.1161	0.0102	130.3665	<.0001	1.008

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0209	0.0085	6.064	0.0138	1.156
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0299	0.0082	13.3133	0.0003	1.099
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.2582	0.01	663.7114	<.0001	1.465
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0185	0.00767	5.8024	0.016	0.97
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.00672	0.00609	1.2208	0.2692	0.995
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0462	0.0126	13.4566	0.0002	0.853
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0372	0.0132	8.0011	0.0047	0.861
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.00283	0.00938	0.0914	0.7624	0.891
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0258	0.00915	7.9406	0.0048	0.871
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0004	0.0138	0.0008	0.9769	0.893
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.065	0.00973	44.6535	<.0001	1.139
Did not participate in exit counseling experiment	Dummy	-0.0565	0.0249	5.1564	0.0232	0.893
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	-0.0027	0.00605	0.1984	0.656	0.995
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	0.000024	0.00022	0.0123	0.9117	1.001
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00386	0.00033	136.7073	<.0001	0.918

Likelihood Ratio = 52519.245

Rescaled R-square =0.1038

Number of Institutions = 1718

p<.0001

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs. Reduced Model = 49180.6853

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 21.97872

(p<.0001)

Table AI.9.11. Exit Loan Counseling- Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Default Measure

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	149949	976	282.45	148973	149666.6	345.55%	99.54%
2	142198	1092	1167.49	141106	141030.5	93.53%	100.05%
3	142763	2016	2852.78	140747	139910.2	70.67%	100.60%
4	144424	4235	4778.7	140189	139645.3	88.62%	100.39%
5	145146	6065	6401.34	139081	138744.7	94.75%	100.24%
6	145435	7554	7765.52	137881	137669.5	97.28%	100.15%
7	142234	9403	9109.03	132831	133125	103.23%	99.78%
8	143158	10409	11137.24	132749	132020.8	93.46%	100.55%
9	143526	14869	14649.29	128657	128876.7	101.50%	99.83%
10	142380	21825	20264.51	120555	122115.5	107.70%	98.72%

Chi-Square = 2255.683

p<.0001

df = 8

Table AI.9.12. Exit Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for Experimental Graduation Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		2.2922	0.0815	790.0953	<.0001	
2) Number of final term borrowers	Continuous	-0.00005	0.000011	21.9315	<.0001	0.958
3) Total amount of Title IV loans for students in (2)	Continuous	-1.08E-08	5.90E-10	336.8155	<.0001	0.883
4) Number students in (2) attending in-person counseling sessions	Continuous	-0.00037	0.000036	110.1932	<.0001	0.954
Volume of loans for students potentially eligible to graduate	Continuous	1.05E-08	3.34E-09	9.9187	0.0016	1.084
Number of loans for students potentially eligible to graduate	Continuous	-0.00029	0.000012	604.9318	<.0001	0.521
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000156	3.55E-06	1938.2302	<.0001	3.075
Number of Direct loans	Continuous	0.000218	5.38E-06	1637.3344	<.0001	5.122
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	-0.00021	6.44E-06	1013.5463	<.0001	0.431
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00025	7.87E-06	1024.0721	<.0001	0.311
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	1.48E-09	3.02E-10	23.9738	<.0001	1.034
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	-8.14E-09	6.22E-10	170.9177	<.0001	0.784
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	0.000661	0.000026	628.4706	<.0001	5.17
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	-2.15E-07	8.58E-09	628.1325	<.0001	0.209
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-0.00001	1.32E-06	66.5664	<.0001	0.945
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.6692	0.03	497.9076	<.0001	1.117
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-3.8211	0.1005	1444.6528	<.0001	0.797
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	0.000076	2.12E-06	1296.329	<.0001	1.311
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	-0.0521	0.00254	422.2409	<.0001	0.882
Percentage of students with State grants	Continuous	-0.00041	0.000172	5.5711	0.0183	0.991
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	0.000013	9.43E-07	195.354	<.0001	1.127
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	-0.00483	0.000248	379.8366	<.0001	0.912
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.1764	0.00555	1011.2687	<.0001	0.703
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	-0.1795	0.00804	498.3292	<.0001	0.698
Institution does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.0473	0.0171	7.6117	0.0058	0.91
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.1318	0.011	142.5406	<.0001	1.593
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	0.0451	0.00755	35.6645	<.0001	1.461

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
South vs. West	Dummy	0.0442	0.00714	38.2016	<.0001	1.459
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.2518	0.00647	1513.1187	<.0001	1.086
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	0.3647	0.00937	1516.4909	<.0001	2.011
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0245	0.00618	15.7165	<.0001	0.954
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.00241	0.00466	0.2674	0.6051	0.98
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0339	0.0105	10.4894	0.0012	0.984
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.2383	0.0111	464.0286	<.0001	0.749
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0228	0.00758	9.0176	0.0027	0.929
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	0.00267	0.00747	0.1274	0.7211	0.953
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.1741	0.0103	287.1901	<.0001	1.132
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.0318	0.00573	30.7596	<.0001	1.066
Did not participate in exit counseling experiment	Dummy	-0.3842	0.0121	1004.4183	<.0001	0.464
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	0.0928	0.0067	191.8166	<.0001	1.204
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	-0.00068	0.000189	12.9555	0.0003	0.977
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	0.000068	0.000229	0.089	0.7655	1.001

Likelihood Ratio = 59317.6399

Rescaled R-square = 0.1124

Number of Institutions = 1513

p<.0001

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs.

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 14.63158

Reduced Model = 53774.7072

(p<.0001)

Table AI.9.13. Exit Loan Counseling- Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Graduation Rate

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	81229	2604	3537.72	78625	77691.28	73.61%	101.20%
2	81807	5945	6884.66	75862	74922.34	86.35%	101.25%
3	82093	11618	9298.42	70475	72794.58	124.95%	96.81%
4	82058	11190	11398.26	70868	70659.74	98.17%	100.29%
5	82092	13373	13152.2	68719	68939.8	101.68%	99.68%
6	82304	14969	15156.44	67335	67147.56	98.76%	100.28%
7	82418	17717	17637.65	64701	64780.35	100.45%	99.88%
8	81638	20953	20470.29	60685	61167.71	102.36%	99.21%
9	81855	24826	24223.68	57029	57631.32	102.49%	98.95%
10	81582	32326	33750.79	49256	47831.21	95.78%	102.98%

Chi-Square = 1201.4324

p<.0001

df = 8

Table AI.9.14. Exit Loan Counseling - Logistic Regression for Experimental Retention Rate

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
Intercept		1.0301	0.0401	660.0999	<.0001	
2) Number of final term borrowers	Continuous	-0.00005	5.40E-06	80.8374	<.0001	0.96
3) Total amount of Title IV loans for students in (2)	Continuous	-2.38E-09	2.79E-10	72.9423	<.0001	0.974
4) Number students in (2) attending in-person counseling sessions	Continuous	-0.00026	0.000019	186.05	<.0001	0.969
Volume of loans for students potentially eligible to graduate	Continuous	-5.50E-09	1.58E-09	12.061	0.0005	0.962
Number of loans for students potentially eligible to graduate	Continuous	-0.00004	5.74E-06	55.1528	<.0001	0.916
Number of FFELP loans	Continuous	0.000013	1.75E-06	54.7595	<.0001	1.095
Number of Direct loans	Continuous	0.000062	2.76E-06	514.0371	<.0001	1.589
Number of students with FFELP loans	Continuous	0.00001	3.16E-06	10.2355	0.0014	1.042
Number of students with direct loans	Continuous	-0.00006	3.97E-06	244.4187	<.0001	0.752
Total FFELP volume	Continuous	-1.52E-09	1.52E-10	99.9482	<.0001	0.966
Total direct loan volume	Continuous	-1.74E-09	3.12E-10	31.23	<.0001	0.949
Number of students with Pell grants	Continuous	-0.00017	0.000012	182.4453	<.0001	0.674
Total volume of Pell grants	Continuous	5.41E-08	4.02E-09	181.2251	<.0001	1.443
Average adjusted gross income for students at institution	Continuous	-2.76E-06	6.49E-07	18.1203	<.0001	0.985
Average family size for students at institution	Continuous	0.2892	0.0141	419.8146	<.0001	1.051
Average number of family members in college for students at institution	Continuous	-0.4491	0.0494	82.6206	<.0001	0.974
Average family investment value for students at institution	Continuous	0.00007	1.09E-06	4130.197	<.0001	1.305
Average age of students at institution	Continuous	-0.0382	0.00123	961.0795	<.0001	0.912
Percentage of students with State grants	Continuous	0.000906	0.000088	106.2167	<.0001	1.019
Total undergraduate enrollment	Continuous	9.44E-06	4.06E-07	538.9172	<.0001	1.086
Maximum number of months participating in any initiative	Continuous	-0.00115	0.000109	111.5142	<.0001	0.981
Public institution vs. private institution	Dummy	-0.0701	0.00284	608.1614	<.0001	0.869
Two-year college vs. four-year college	Dummy	-0.1719	0.00376	2089.0676	<.0001	0.709
Does not participate in all experiments except ATB	Dummy	-0.00108	0.00946	0.013	0.9092	0.998
New England vs. West	Dummy	0.0928	0.00563	271.3462	<.0001	1.215
Mid-Atlantic vs. West	Dummy	0.123	0.00388	1007.0873	<.0001	1.253

ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL SITES INITIATIVES

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE TYPE	PARAMETER ESTIMATE	STANDARD ERROR	WALD CHI-SQUARE	PROBABILITY CHI-SQUARE	CHANGE IN PROB/ORIGINAL PROB*
South vs. West	Dummy	-0.00691	0.00368	3.5282	0.0603	1.1
Midwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0945	0.00322	860.7416	<.0001	1.008
Southwest vs. West	Dummy	-0.0122	0.00503	5.8574	0.0155	1.094
Urban vs. rural campus	Dummy	0.0369	0.00316	136.1205	<.0001	1.041
Suburban vs. rural campus	Dummy	-0.0335	0.00239	196.512	<.0001	0.97
Very large city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0325	0.00519	39.1598	<.0001	1.201
Large city vs. rural	Dummy	-0.0103	0.00543	3.6113	0.0574	1.151
Small city vs. rural	Dummy	0.0433	0.00386	125.801	<.0001	1.214
Large town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0388	0.00377	106.034	<.0001	1.209
Small town vs. rural	Dummy	0.0467	0.00546	73.2576	<.0001	1.219
Does not participate in at least one experiment	Dummy	0.000714	0.0028	0.0649	0.7989	1.001
Did not participate in exit counseling experiment	Dummy	-0.1525	0.00666	524.8749	<.0001	0.737
Student Loan Clearinghouse	Dummy	0.0156	0.00328	22.5068	<.0001	1.032
Percentage of freshmen of campus/commute	Continuous	-0.00275	0.00009	934.8373	<.0001	0.916
Percentage of out-of-state freshmen	Continuous	-0.00114	0.000118	92.675	<.0001	0.974

Likelihood Ratio = 102054.896

Rescaled R-square = 0.0657

Number of Institutions = 1717

p<.0001

Likelihood Ratio for Full vs.

Ratio of Rescaled R-Square to Reduced Rescaled R-Square = 13.95745

Reduced Model = 92915.1885

(p<.0001)

Table AI.9.15. Exit Loan Counseling- Hosmer and Lemeshow Partition for Experimental Retention Rate

Decile	Total	Event		Nonevent		Ratio of Observed to Expected	
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Event	NonEvent
1	208431	91122	90530.44	117309	117900.6	100.65%	99.50%
2	208708	107849	109825.9	100859	98882.1	98.20%	102.00%
3	206464	119000	119561	87464	86902.95	99.53%	100.65%
4	205444	127242	126983.2	78202	78460.81	100.20%	99.67%
5	208001	138112	134906	69889	73095.02	102.38%	95.61%
6	207132	139295	139401.4	67837	67730.63	99.92%	100.16%
7	205510	143019	143059.8	62491	62450.21	99.97%	100.07%
8	208157	144407	149628.9	63750	58528.13	96.51%	108.92%
9	208736	157882	156529	50854	52206.96	100.86%	97.41%
10	216602	175970	173445.3	40632	43156.66	101.46%	94.15%

Chi-Square = 1186.0039 p<.0001
df = 8

Table AI.9.16. Exit Loan Counseling

Exit Loan Counseling Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for FY2000 Cohort Default Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2474	3130317	3117240	4834.3835	1265.28577
Yes	45	43623	56700	4834.3835	969.4

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	43623
Normal Approximation	
Z	-2.7049
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0034
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0068
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.0034
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.0069

Table AI.9.17. Exit Loan Counseling

Exit Loan Counseling Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Default Measure					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2386	2926115.5	2901376	4664.3586	1226.36861
Yes	45	29980.5	54720	4664.3586	666.23333

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	29980.5
Normal Approximation	
Z	-5.3038
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001

Table AI.9.18. Exit Loan Counseling

Exit Loan Counseling Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Experimental Graduation Rate					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2000	2040301	2045000	3866.1134	1020.1505
Yes	44	49689	44990	3866.1134	1129.29545

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	49689
Normal Approximation	
Z	1.2153
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.1121
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.2243
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	0.1122
Two-Sided Pr > Z	0.2244

Table AI.9.19. Exit Loan Counseling

Exit Loan Counseling Experiment - Comparing Participating and Non-Participating Institutions					
Wilcoxon Scores (Rank Sums) for Retention Rate (Borrowers Only)					
Participated in Experiment	N	Sum of Scores	Expected Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score
No	2292	2660683	2678202	4431.7173	1160.85646
Yes	44	68933	51414	4431.7173	1566.65909

Wilcoxon Two-Sample Test	
Statistic	68933
Normal Approximation	
Z	3.953
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001
t Approximation	
One-Sided Pr < Z	<.0001
Two-Sided Pr > Z	<.0001

ABILITY TO BENEFIT

Table AI.10.1. Experimental Sites Initiative Reporting Template for Ability to Benefit

Experimental Sites Initiative
ATB DATA MATRIX



Institution

Reporting Year

Proposed Goal of the Experiment To evaluate the validity of successful completion of at least 6 college units as an equivalent to passing an ATB test for Title IV eligibility.

Target Students Federal student aid applicants who took and failed an ATB test but have shown "ability to benefit" by successfully completing at least 6 units of college degree applicable courses.

Data to be reported:

Group	# Students In Group	Avg. # Units Attempted	Avg. # Units Completed	Average Cum. GPA
Students enrolled in degree or certificate applicable classes				
Random sample of FA recipients with HS diplomas/OR total # of FA recipients with HS diplomas				
All Students required to take ATB test				
All students who failed ATB test				
All Students who passed ATB test				
Students who failed ATB test but successfully completed 6 college units				

Table AI.10.2. Ability to Benefit Experiment Participants by Type, Control, and Geographic Region

Ability to Benefit—Institution Type, Geographic Region, and Participation		
	Number	Percentage
Total Participation	14	100
Institution Type		
Two-Year, Lower	14	100
Control		
Public	14	100
Region		
Western	14	100

Table AI.10.3. Ability to Benefit Experiment Participants' Self-Reported Values

Group	# Students In Group	Avg. # Units Attempted	Avg. # Units Completed	Average Cum. GPA
Students enrolled in degree or certificate applicable classes	280,061	12.96	11.10	2.56
Random sample of FA recipients with HS diplomas/OR total # of FA recipients with HS diplomas	36,606	19.91	17.35	2.56
All Students required to take ATB test	3,751	14.10	11.67	2.36
All students who failed ATB test	1,039	12.61	8.65	2.15
All Students who passed ATB test	1,681	15.32	13.00	2.53
Students who failed ATB test but successfully completed 6 college units	262	19.13	15.77	2.61

Table AI.10.4. Statistical Comparison of Students Who Failed the ATB Exam but Successfully Completed at Least Six College Units with All Other Groups

T-tests Comparing Average Units Attempted	Pooled t-test Assumes equal variances	Satterthwaite t-test Assumes unequal variances	Cochran's t-test Assumes unequal variances
Students who failed ATB test, but completed 6 college units vs. all students enrolled in degree or certificate applicable classes	t = -1.27 p = 0.21275	t = -1.30 p = 0.2052	t = -1.30 p = 0.2164
Students who failed ATB test, but completed 6 college units vs. Random sample of FA recipients with HS diplomas/OR total number of FA recipients with HS diplomas	t = .14 p = .8864	t = .14 p = .8863	t = .14 p = .8874
Students who failed ATB test but successfully completed 6 college units vs. all students required to take ATB test	t = -1.23 p = .2308	t = -1.23 p = .2364	t = -1.23 p = .2416
All students who failed ATB test but successfully completed 6 college units vs. all students who failed the ATB test	t = -1.52 p = .1411	t = -1.63 p = .1237	t = -1.63 p = .1284
All students who failed ATB test but successfully completed 6 college units vs. all students who passed ATB test	t = -0.89 p = .3801	t = -0.89 p = .3829	t = -0.89 p = .3881

Table AI.10.5. Statistical Comparison of Students Who Failed the ATB Exam but Successfully Completed at Least Six College Units with All Other Groups Average Units Completed

T-tests Comparing Average Units Completed	Pooled t-test Assumes equal variances	Satterthwaite t-test Assumes unequal variances	Cochran's t-test Assumes unequal variances
Students who failed ATB test, but completed 6 college units vs. all students enrolled in degree or certificate applicable classes	t = -1.14 p = 0.2656	t = -1.15 p = 0.2613	t = -1.15 p = 0.2725
Students who failed ATB test, but completed 6 college units vs. Random sample of FA recipients with HS diplomas/OR total number of FA recipients with HS diplomas	t = .33 p = .7410	t = .33 p = .7433	t = .33 p = .7458
Students who failed ATB test but successfully completed 6 college units vs. all students required to take ATB test	t = -1.28 p = .2104	t = -1.28 p = .2155	t = -1.28 p = .2215
All students who failed ATB test but successfully completed 6 college units vs. all students who failed the ATB test	t = -2.05 p = .0510	t = -2.16 p = .0436	t = -2.16 p = .0508
All students who failed ATB test but successfully completed 6 college units vs. all students who passed ATB test	t = -0.83 p = .4142	t = -0.83 p = .4164	t = -0.83 p = .4217

Table AI.10.6. Statistical Comparison of Students Who Failed the ATB Exam but Successfully Completed at Least Six College Units with All Other Groups Average Cumulative GPA

T-tests Comparing Average Cumulative GPA	Pooled t-test Assumes equal variances	Satterthwaite t-test Assumes unequal variances	Cochran's t-test Assumes unequal variances
Students who failed ATB test, but completed 6 college units vs. all students enrolled in degree or certificate applicable classes	t = -0.59 p = .5595	t = -0.58 p = .5652	t = -0.58 p = .5702
Students who failed ATB test, but completed 6 college units vs. Random sample of FA recipients with HS diplomas/OR total number of FA recipients with HS diplomas	t = -0.65 p = .5214	t = -0.65 p = .5247	t = -0.65 p = .5302
Students who failed ATB test but successfully completed 6 college units vs. all students required to take ATB test	t = -2.20 p = .0368	t = -2.20 p = .0403	t = -2.20 p = .0464
All students who failed ATB test but successfully completed 6 college units vs. all students who failed the ATB test	t = -3.07 p = .0053	t = -2.89 p = .0123	t = -2.89 p = .0146
All students who failed ATB test but successfully completed 6 college units vs. all students who passed ATB test	t = -0.83 p = .4117	t = -0.83 p = .4132	t = -0.83 p = .4191