AGENDA

❖ ❖ ❖

GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORKGROUP AND MEETING

❖ ❖

August 16, 2007

❖ ❖ ❖

CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION

GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MARY T. LINDSEY – CHAIR
PROPRIETARY INSTITUTION REPRESENTATIVE

SHARON BOWLES – VICE CHAIR
HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELOR REPRESENTATIVE

LOUISE MCCLAIN
COMMISSION LIAISON

Kate Jeffery
University of California System Representative

Lora Jo Bossio
University of California Representative

Gregory Allan Cendana
University of California Student Representative

Mary L. Robinson
California State University System Representative

Susan Gutierrez
California State University Representative

Vacant
California State University Student Representative

Timothy P. Bonnel
California Community Colleges System Representative

Marco De La Garza
California Community Colleges Representative

Vacant
California Community Colleges Student Representative

Vacant
Independent California Colleges and Universities System Representative

Vacant
Independent California Colleges and Universities Representative

Ricardo Tejeda
Independent California Colleges and Universities Student Representative

Mary T. Lindsey
Proprietary Institution Representative

Laura Cunha
Proprietary Institution Representative

Vacant
Proprietary Institution Student Representative

Sally Mae Pace
K-12 Schools Representative

Vacant
K-12 Schools Representative

Vacant
California Postsecondary Education Commission Representative

Noelia Gonzalez
California Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (CASFAA) Executive Council Representative

Sharon Bowles
High School Counselor Representative

GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MISSION STATEMENT

"The Committee advises the Commission on program funding and policy issues related to the provision of state administered grants and specialized programs for California students."

GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mary T. Lindsey, Chair
Sharon Bowles, Vice-Chair

AGENDA FOR SELECTION CRITERIA WORKSHOP OF AUGUST 16, 2007, 9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

California Student Aid Commission
EDFund Boardroom
3300 Zinfandel Drive
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

TAB	ITEM	
	Introductions/Call to Order	9:00 a.m.
1.	Consideration of Cal Grant Selection Criteria	9:15
	Lunch	12:00 p.m.
	Consideration of Cal Grant Selection Criteria Continued	1:00
	Adjournment	2:00

Times are subject to change

1

Information/Action Item

SELECTION CRITERIA WORKGROUP

Consideration of Cal Grant Selection Criteria

The Selection Criteria is used to select the statutorily authorized 22,500 Cal Grant A and B competitive award recipients. It is also used to select the 2% of new Cal Grant B entitlement recipients who receive tuition and fees in addition to the access grant in their first year of enrollment.

The award selection criteria consist of the following elements: grade point average, parent's educational level, access equalizer, household status, and family income and household size matrices.

The data provided looks at the Competitive Cal Grant Program recipients and eligible non-recipients since its inception in 2001-02.

Recommended Action: Review data to determine if the current Selection Criteria is an effective way to select new recipients.

Responsible Staff: Mary Robinson,
Office of the Chancellor,
California State University

Karen Henderson, Research Analyst II
Research & Policy Analysis Branch

List of Tables in this Excel Workbook

TABLE	DESCRIPTION
All (High School Entitlement and Competitive) Recipients and Competitive Eligible Non-recipients	
1	Program, Dependency Status, and Segment
	Award Year 2001-02 as of December 31, 2001 [1]
	Award Year 2002-03 as of December 31, 2002 [1]
	Award Year 2003-04 as of December 31, 2003 [1]
	Award Year 2004-05 as of December 31, 2004 [1]
	Award Year 2005-06 as of December 31, 2005 [1]
	Award Year 2006-07 as of February 13, 2007 [1]
	Award Year 2007-08 as of July 30, 2007
Competitive Recipients and Eligible Non-recipients	
2	Averages: Income, GPA, Family Size, and Age
	Award Year 2001-02 as of December 31, 2001
	Award Year 2002-03 as of December 31, 2002
	Award Year 2003-04 as of December 31, 2003
	Award Year 2004-05 as of December 31, 2004 [1]
	Award Year 2005-06 as of December 31, 2005 [1]
	Award Year 2006-07 as of February 13, 2007 [1]
3	Program, Age, and Dependency Status
	Award Year 2001-02 as of December 31, 2001 [1]
	Award Year 2002-03 as of December 31, 2002 [1]
	Award Year 2004-05 as of December 31, 2004 [1]
	Award Year 2004-05 as of December 31, 2004 [1]
	Award Year 2005-06 as of December 31, 2005 [1]
	Award Year 2006-07 as of February 13, 2007 [1]
	Award Year 2007-08 as of July 30, 2007
4	Program, Age, and Student Educational Level
	Award Year 2001-02 as of December 31, 2001 [1]
	Award Year 2002-03 as of December 31, 2002 [1]
	Award Year 2003-04 as of December 31, 2003 [1]
	Award Year 2004-05 as of December 31, 2004 [1]
	Award Year 2005-06 as of December 31, 2005 [1]
	Award Year 2006-07 as of February 13, 2007 [1]
	Award Year 2007-08 as of July 30, 2007

[1] September eligible non-recipients who met the March FAFSA filing deadline were placed in the March Competitive pool for this analysis.

TABLE 1 - AWARD YEAR 2001-02 - SEGMENT
ALL (HIGH SCHOOL ENTITLEMENT AND COMPETITIVE) RECIPIENTS AND COMPETITIVE ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, DEPENDENCY STATUS, AND SEGMENT
December 31, 2001

		Segment	Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total	
					With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents			
					Married		Single								Married		Single								Married		Single					
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High School Entitlement Recipients		CCC	1,545	10.5%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1,546	10.5%	12,777	38.0%	81	0.2%	277	0.8%	699	2.1%	13,834	41.1%	14,322	29.6%	82	0.2%	277	0.6%	699	1.4%	15,380	31.8%
		UC	4,267	28.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	4,268	28.9%	6,838	20.3%	3	0.0%	16	0.0%	117	0.3%	6,974	20.7%	11,105	22.9%	3	0.0%	16	0.0%	118	0.2%	11,242	23.2%
		CSU	3,165	21.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3,165	21.5%	10,564	31.4%	17	0.1%	67	0.2%	413	1.2%	11,061	32.9%	13,729	28.4%	17	0.0%	67	0.1%	413	0.9%	14,226	29.4%
		ICU	5,095	34.5%	2	0.0%	13	0.1%	77	0.5%	5,187	35.2%	927	2.8%	11	0.0%	9	0.0%	46	0.1%	993	2.9%	6,022	12.4%	13	0.0%	22	0.0%	123	0.3%	6,180	12.8%
		PCC	549	3.7%	3	0.0%	15	0.1%	21	0.1%	588	4.0%	716	2.1%	11	0.0%	32	0.1%	42	0.1%	801	2.4%	1,265	2.6%	14	0.0%	47	0.1%	63	0.1%	1,389	2.9%
		Total	14,621	99.1%	6	0.0%	28	0.2%	99	0.7%	14,754	100.0%	31,822	94.5%	123	0.4%	401	1.2%	1,317	3.9%	33,663	100.0%	46,443	95.9%	129	0.3%	429	0.9%	1,416	2.9%	48,417	100.0%
March Competition	Recipients	CCC	60	6.7%	3	0.3%	33	3.7%	0	0.0%	96	10.8%	1,920	18.6%	287	2.8%	1,632	15.8%	100	1.0%	3,939	38.1%	1,980	17.6%	290	2.6%	1,665	14.8%	100	0.9%	4,035	35.9%
		UC	145	16.3%	1	0.1%	8	0.9%	0	0.0%	154	17.3%	1,219	11.8%	32	0.3%	186	1.8%	55	0.5%	1,492	14.4%	1,364	12.1%	33	0.3%	194	1.7%	55	0.5%	1,646	14.6%
		CSU	140	15.7%	6	0.7%	27	3.0%	0	0.0%	173	19.5%	1,909	18.4%	164	1.6%	1,025	9.9%	90	0.9%	3,188	30.8%	2,049	18.2%	170	1.5%	1,052	9.4%	90	0.8%	3,361	29.9%
		ICU	195	21.9%	16	1.8%	53	6.0%	4	0.4%	268	30.1%	491	4.7%	50	0.5%	380	3.7%	28	0.3%	949	9.2%	686	6.1%	66	0.6%	433	3.9%	32	0.3%	1,217	10.8%
		PCC	121	13.6%	16	1.8%	53	6.0%	8	0.9%	198	22.3%	482	4.7%	32	0.3%	239	2.3%	27	0.3%	780	7.5%	603	5.4%	48	0.4%	292	2.6%	35	0.3%	978	8.7%
		Total	661	74.4%	42	4.7%	174	19.6%	12	1.3%	889	100.0%	6,021	58.2%	565	5.5%	3,462	33.5%	300	2.9%	10,348	100.0%	6,682	59.5%	607	5.4%	3,636	32.4%	312	2.8%	11,237	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	CCC																					7,841	16.6%	3,226	6.8%	3,649	7.7%	10,266	21.8%	24,982	53.0%
		UC																					2,541	5.4%	184	0.4%	115	0.2%	2,015	4.3%	4,855	10.3%
		CSU																					2,713	5.8%	912	1.9%	827	1.8%	6,625	14.1%	11,077	23.5%
		ICU																					1,527	3.2%	462	1.0%	349	0.7%	1,661	3.5%	3,999	8.5%
		PCC																					597	1.3%	238	0.5%	256	0.5%	1,124	2.4%	2,215	4.7%
		Total																					15,219	32.3%	5,022	44.7%	5,196	11.0%	21,691	46.0%	47,128	100.0%
	Recipients																						6,682	11.4%	607	1.0%	3,636	6.2%	312	0.5%	11,237	19.3%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						15,219	26.1%	5,022	8.6%	5,196	8.9%	21,691	37.2%	47,128	80.7%
	Total																						21,901	37.5%	5,629	9.6%	8,832	15.1%	22,003	37.7%	58,365	100.0%
September Competition	Recipients	CCC	82	34.6%	43	18.1%	111	46.8%	0	0.0%	236	99.6%	4,221	38.3%	1,048	9.5%	5,394	48.9%	347	3.1%	11,010	99.9%	4,303	38.2%	1,091	9.7%	5,505	48.9%	347	3.1%	11,246	99.8%
		UC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	0.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	0.0%
		CSU	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	0.1%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	0.1%
		ICU	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.0%
		PCC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%
		Total	82	34.6%	43	18.1%	112	47.3%	0	0.0%	237	100.0%	4,229	38.4%	1,048	9.5%	5,402	49.0%	347	3.1%	11,026	100.0%	4,311	38.3%	1,091	9.7%	5,514	49.0%	347	3.1%	11,263	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	CCC																					9,120	31.6%	4,179	14.5%	4,921	17.0%	10,682	37.0%	28,902	100.0%
		UC																					0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		CSU																					0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		ICU																					2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%
		PCC																					0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Total																					9,122	31.6%	4,179	14.5%	4,921	17.0%	10,682	37.0%	28,904	100.0%
	Recipients																						4,311	10.7%	1,091	2.7%	5,514	13.7%	347	0.9%	11,263	28.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						9,122	22.7%	4,179	10.4%	4,921	12.3%	10,682	26.6%	28,904	72.0%
	Total																						13,433	33.4%	5,270	13.1%	10,435	26.0%	11,029	27.5%	40,167	100.0%

TABLE 1 - AWARD YEAR 2002-03 - SEGMENT
ALL (HIGH SCHOOL ENTITLEMENT AND COMPETITIVE) RECIPIENTS AND COMPETITIVE ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, DEPENDENCY STATUS, AND SEGMENT
December 31, 2002

		Segment	Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total	
					With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents			
					Married		Single								Married		Single								Married		Single					
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High School Entitlement Recipients		CCC	2,506	13.8%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2,511	13.9%	17,316	40.6%	131	0.3%	503	1.2%	1,123	2.6%	19,073	44.7%	19,822	32.6%	136	0.2%	503	0.8%	1,123	1.8%	21,584	35.5%
		UC	5,166	28.5%	2	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	5,169	28.5%	7,449	17.5%	7	0.0%	15	0.0%	166	0.4%	7,637	17.9%	12,615	20.8%	9	0.0%	16	0.0%	166	0.3%	12,806	21.1%
		CSU	4,547	25.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4,547	25.1%	12,117	28.4%	32	0.1%	102	0.2%	552	1.3%	12,803	30.0%	16,664	27.4%	32	0.1%	102	0.2%	552	0.9%	17,350	28.6%
		ICU	5,032	27.8%	5	0.0%	12	0.1%	66	0.4%	5,115	28.2%	1,261	3.0%	6	0.0%	46	0.1%	115	0.3%	1,428	3.3%	6,293	10.4%	11	0.0%	58	0.1%	181	0.3%	6,543	10.8%
		PCC	735	4.1%	3	0.0%	16	0.1%	19	0.1%	773	4.3%	1,438	3.4%	18	0.0%	97	0.2%	134	0.3%	1,687	4.0%	2,173	3.6%	21	0.0%	113	0.2%	153	0.3%	2,460	4.0%
		Total	17,986	99.3%	15	0.1%	29	0.2%	85	0.5%	18,115	100.0%	39,581	92.9%	194	0.5%	763	1.8%	2,090	4.9%	42,628	100.0%	57,567	94.8%	209	0.3%	792	1.3%	2,175	3.6%	60,743	100.0%
March Competition	Recipients	CCC	24	3.0%	31	3.8%	65	8.1%	0	0.0%	120	14.9%	865	7.6%	708	6.2%	3,604	31.6%	858	7.5%	6,035	52.9%	889	7.3%	739	6.1%	3,669	30.1%	858	7.0%	6,155	50.4%
		UC	19	2.4%	2	0.2%	7	0.9%	0	0.0%	28	3.5%	377	3.3%	23	0.2%	193	1.7%	175	1.5%	768	6.7%	396	3.2%	25	0.2%	200	1.6%	175	1.4%	796	6.5%
		CSU	18	2.2%	5	0.6%	40	5.0%	0	0.0%	63	7.8%	597	5.2%	132	1.2%	1,364	12.0%	298	2.6%	2,391	21.0%	615	5.0%	137	1.1%	1,404	11.5%	298	2.4%	2,454	20.1%
		ICU	51	6.3%	18	2.2%	101	12.5%	23	2.9%	193	23.9%	267	2.3%	67	0.6%	559	4.9%	134	1.2%	1,027	9.0%	318	2.6%	85	0.7%	660	5.4%	157	1.3%	1,220	10.0%
		PCC	85	10.5%	41	5.1%	245	30.4%	32	4.0%	403	49.9%	274	2.4%	111	1.0%	662	5.8%	130	1.1%	1,177	10.3%	359	2.9%	152	1.2%	907	7.4%	162	1.3%	1,580	12.9%
		Total	197	24.4%	97	12.0%	458	56.8%	55	6.8%	807	100.0%	2,380	20.9%	1,041	9.1%	6,382	56.0%	1,595	14.0%	11,398	100.0%	2,577	21.1%	1,138	9.3%	6,840	56.0%	1,650	13.5%	12,205	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	CCC																					10,844	16.0%	4,266	6.3%	4,180	6.2%	14,375	21.2%	33,665	49.6%
		UC																					3,342	4.9%	258	0.4%	175	0.3%	3,108	4.6%	6,883	10.1%
		CSU																					4,443	6.5%	1,600	2.4%	1,587	2.3%	11,179	16.5%	18,809	27.7%
		ICU																					1,614	2.4%	548	0.8%	412	0.6%	2,437	3.6%	5,011	7.4%
		PCC																					747	1.1%	540	0.8%	451	0.7%	1,824	2.7%	3,562	5.2%
		Total																					20,990	30.9%	7,212	59.1%	6,805	10.0%	32,923	48.5%	67,930	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,577	3.2%	1,138	1.4%	6,840	8.5%	1,650	2.1%	12,205	15.2%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						20,990	26.2%	7,212	9.0%	6,805	8.5%	32,923	41.1%	67,930	84.8%
	Total																						23,567	29.4%	8,350	10.4%	13,645	17.0%	34,573	43.1%	80,135	100.0%
September Competition	Recipients	CCC	58	18.7%	62	20.0%	185	59.7%	1	0.3%	306	98.7%	2,737	24.1%	1,209	10.6%	6,336	55.8%	1,024	9.0%	11,306	99.5%	2,795	23.9%	1,271	10.9%	6,521	55.9%	1,025	8.8%	11,612	99.5%
		UC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	3	0.0%	6	0.1%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	3	0.0%	6	0.1%
		CSU	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.6%	0	0.0%	2	0.6%	11	0.1%	5	0.0%	15	0.1%	5	0.0%	36	0.3%	11	0.1%	5	0.0%	17	0.1%	5	0.0%	38	0.3%
		ICU	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	0.1%	0	0.0%	11	0.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	10	0.1%	0	0.0%	11	0.1%
		PCC	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	2	0.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	2	0.0%	4	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.0%	2	0.0%	6	0.1%
		Total	59	19.0%	62	20.0%	188	60.6%	1	0.3%	310	100.0%	2,751	24.2%	1,214	10.7%	6,364	56.0%	1,034	9.1%	11,363	100.0%	2,810	24.1%	1,276	10.9%	6,552	56.1%	1,035	8.9%	11,673	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	CCC																					13,293	33.5%	5,547	14.0%	5,758	14.5%	15,057	38.0%	39,655	100.0%
		UC																					0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		CSU																					0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		ICU																					0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%
		PCC																					0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Total																					13,293	33.5%	5,547	14.0%	5,758	14.5%	15,058	38.0%	39,656	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,810	5.5%	1,276	2.5%	6,552	12.8%	1,035	2.0%	11,673	22.7%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						13,293	25.9%	5,547	10.8%	5,758	11.2%	15,058	29.3%	39,656	77.3%
	Total																						16,103	31.4%	6,823	13.3%	12,310	24.0%	16,093	31.4%	51,329	100.0%

TABLE 1 - AWARD YEAR 2003-04 - SEGMENT
ALL (HIGH SCHOOL ENTITLEMENT AND COMPETITIVE) RECIPIENTS AND COMPETITIVE ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, DEPENDENCY STATUS, AND SEGMENT
December 31, 2003

Segment		Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total	
				With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents			
				Married		Single								Married		Single								Married		Single					
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High School Entitlement Recipients	CCC	2,781	15.1%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	2,786	15.1%	17,868	42.6%	113	0.3%	480	1.1%	1,032	2.5%	19,493	46.5%	20,649	34.2%	117	0.2%	480	0.8%	1,033	1.7%	22,279	36.9%
	UC	5,109	27.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5,109	27.7%	7,400	17.6%	3	0.0%	30	0.1%	135	0.3%	7,568	18.0%	12,509	20.7%	3	0.0%	30	0.0%	135	0.2%	12,677	21.0%
	CSU	4,724	25.7%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	4,726	25.7%	11,196	26.7%	28	0.1%	107	0.3%	499	1.2%	11,830	28.2%	15,920	26.4%	29	0.0%	108	0.2%	499	0.8%	16,556	27.4%
	ICU	4,817	26.2%	4	0.0%	9	0.0%	87	0.5%	4,917	26.7%	1,132	2.7%	11	0.0%	37	0.1%	98	0.2%	1,278	3.0%	5,949	9.9%	15	0.0%	46	0.1%	185	0.3%	6,195	10.3%
	PCC	821	4.5%	4	0.0%	16	0.1%	32	0.2%	873	4.7%	1,525	3.6%	20	0.0%	99	0.2%	135	0.3%	1,779	4.2%	2,346	3.9%	24	0.0%	115	0.2%	167	0.3%	2,652	4.4%
	Total	18,252	99.1%	13	0.1%	26	0.1%	120	0.7%	18,411	100.0%	39,121	93.3%	175	0.4%	753	1.8%	1,899	4.5%	41,948	100.0%	57,373	95.1%	188	0.3%	779	1.3%	2,019	3.3%	60,359	100.0%
March Competition – Recipients	CCC	13	1.4%	25	2.7%	88	9.5%	1	0.1%	127	13.7%	844	8.0%	742	7.0%	3,269	30.9%	821	7.8%	5,676	53.7%	857	7.5%	767	6.7%	3,357	29.2%	822	7.1%	5,803	50.5%
	UC	20	2.2%	0	0.0%	6	0.6%	0	0.0%	26	2.8%	345	3.3%	17	0.2%	183	1.7%	136	1.3%	681	6.4%	365	3.2%	17	0.1%	189	1.6%	136	1.2%	707	6.1%
	CSU	14	1.5%	3	0.3%	55	5.9%	0	0.0%	72	7.7%	459	4.3%	108	1.0%	1,048	9.9%	225	2.1%	1,840	17.4%	473	4.1%	111	1.0%	1,103	9.6%	225	2.0%	1,912	16.6%
	ICU	36	3.9%	30	3.2%	108	11.6%	22	2.4%	196	21.1%	215	2.0%	62	0.6%	518	4.9%	108	1.0%	903	8.5%	251	2.2%	92	0.8%	626	5.4%	130	1.1%	1,099	9.6%
	PCC	78	8.4%	77	8.3%	304	32.7%	50	5.4%	509	54.7%	230	2.2%	114	1.1%	949	9.0%	176	1.7%	1,469	13.9%	308	2.7%	191	1.7%	1,253	10.9%	226	2.0%	1,978	17.2%
	Total	161	17.3%	135	14.5%	561	60.3%	73	7.8%	930	100.0%	2,093	19.8%	1,043	9.9%	5,967	56.5%	1,466	13.9%	10,569	100.0%	2,254	19.6%	1,178	10.2%	6,528	56.8%	1,539	13.4%	11,499	100.0%
March Competition – Eligible Non-recipients	CCC																					10,114	14.4%	4,600	6.6%	4,307	6.1%	15,002	21.4%	34,023	48.6%
	UC																					3,452	4.9%	281	0.4%	168	0.2%	3,509	5.0%	7,410	10.6%
	CSU																					4,272	6.1%	1,873	2.7%	1,677	2.4%	12,019	17.2%	19,841	28.3%
	ICU																					1,430	2.0%	553	0.8%	402	0.6%	2,433	3.5%	4,818	6.9%
	PCC																					756	1.1%	664	0.9%	572	0.8%	1,959	2.8%	3,951	5.6%
	Total																					20,024	28.6%	7,971	69.3%	7,126	10.2%	34,922	49.9%	70,043	100.0%
March Competition	Recipients																					2,254	2.8%	1,178	1.4%	6,528	8.0%	1,539	1.9%	11,499	14.1%
	Eligible Non-recipients																					20,024	24.6%	7,971	9.8%	7,126	8.7%	34,922	42.8%	70,043	85.9%
	Total																					22,278	27.3%	9,149	11.2%	13,654	16.7%	36,461	44.7%	81,542	100.0%
September Competition – Recipients	CCC	56	18.4%	50	16.4%	181	59.3%	1	0.3%	288	94.4%	2,361	22.3%	1,082	10.2%	6,059	57.2%	968	9.1%	10,470	98.9%	2,417	22.2%	1,132	10.4%	6,240	57.3%	969	8.9%	10,758	98.8%
	UC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	2	0.0%	6	0.1%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	2	0.0%	7	0.1%
	CSU	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	1.0%	0	0.0%	3	1.0%	20	0.2%	2	0.0%	36	0.3%	6	0.1%	64	0.6%	20	0.2%	2	0.0%	39	0.4%	6	0.1%	67	0.6%
	ICU	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	2.0%	0	0.0%	6	2.0%	3	0.0%	2	0.0%	17	0.2%	4	0.0%	26	0.2%	3	0.0%	2	0.0%	23	0.2%	4	0.0%	32	0.3%
	PCC	2	0.7%	0	0.0%	5	1.6%	0	0.0%	7	2.3%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	19	0.2%	0	0.0%	21	0.2%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	24	0.2%	0	0.0%	28	0.3%
	Total	58	19.0%	50	16.4%	196	64.3%	1	0.3%	305	100.0%	2,389	22.6%	1,086	10.3%	6,132	57.9%	980	9.3%	10,587	100.0%	2,447	22.5%	1,136	10.4%	6,328	58.1%	981	9.0%	10,892	100.0%
September Competition – Eligible Non-recipients	CCC																					14,923	34.1%	6,144	14.0%	6,414	14.7%	16,287	37.2%	43,768	100.0%
	UC																					0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	CSU																					1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%
	ICU																					0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	PCC																					0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Total																					14,924	34.1%	6,144	14.0%	6,414	14.7%	16,287	37.2%	43,769	100.0%
September Competition	Recipients																					2,447	4.5%	1,136	2.1%	6,328	11.6%	981	1.8%	10,892	19.9%
	Eligible Non-recipients																					14,924	27.3%	6,144	11.2%	6,414	11.7%	16,287	29.8%	43,769	80.1%
	Total																					17,371	31.8%	7,280	13.3%	12,742	23.3%	17,268	31.6%	54,661	100.0%

TABLE 1 - AWARD YEAR 2004-05 - SEGMENT
ALL (HIGH SCHOOL ENTITLEMENT AND MARCH COMPETITIVE) RECIPIENTS AND COMPETITIVE ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, DEPENDENCY STATUS, AND SEGMENT
December 31, 2004

Segment		Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total	
				With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents			
				Married		Single								Married		Single								Married		Single					
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High School Entitlement Recipients	CCC	3,071	16.3%	7	0.0%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	3,080	16.3%	19,699	44.4%	113	0.3%	554	1.2%	1,288	2.9%	21,654	48.9%	22,770	36.0%	120	0.2%	555	0.9%	1,289	2.0%	24,734	39.1%
	UC	4,810	25.5%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4,812	25.5%	6,966	15.7%	2	0.0%	32	0.1%	127	0.3%	7,127	16.1%	11,776	18.6%	4	0.0%	32	0.1%	127	0.2%	11,939	18.9%
	CSU	4,997	26.4%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	4,999	26.5%	11,350	25.6%	23	0.1%	125	0.3%	465	1.0%	11,963	27.0%	16,347	25.9%	24	0.0%	126	0.2%	465	0.7%	16,962	26.8%
	ICU	4,984	26.4%	7	0.0%	17	0.1%	86	0.5%	5,094	27.0%	1,224	2.8%	13	0.0%	50	0.1%	114	0.3%	1,401	3.2%	6,208	9.8%	20	0.0%	67	0.1%	200	0.3%	6,495	10.3%
	PCC	863	4.6%	7	0.0%	13	0.1%	30	0.2%	913	4.8%	1,904	4.3%	23	0.1%	104	0.2%	145	0.3%	2,176	4.9%	2,767	4.4%	30	0.0%	117	0.2%	175	0.3%	3,089	4.9%
	Total	18,725	99.1%	24	0.1%	32	0.2%	117	0.6%	18,898	100.0%	41,143	92.8%	174	0.4%	865	2.0%	2,139	4.8%	44,321	100.0%	59,868	94.7%	198	0.3%	897	1.4%	2,256	3.6%	63,219	100.0%
March Competition – Recipients	CCC	28	2.9%	36	3.7%	113	11.6%	2	0.2%	179	18.4%	868	8.3%	701	6.7%	3,310	31.7%	705	6.7%	5,584	53.4%	896	7.8%	737	6.4%	3,423	29.9%	707	6.2%	5,763	50.4%
	UC	24	2.5%	1	0.1%	12	1.2%	0	0.0%	37	3.8%	297	2.8%	27	0.3%	144	1.4%	125	1.2%	593	5.7%	321	2.8%	28	0.2%	156	1.4%	125	1.1%	630	5.5%
	CSU	15	1.5%	2	0.2%	45	4.6%	0	0.0%	62	6.4%	468	4.5%	96	0.9%	946	9.0%	201	1.9%	1,711	16.4%	483	4.2%	98	0.9%	991	8.7%	201	1.8%	1,773	15.5%
	ICU	31	3.2%	24	2.5%	120	12.3%	21	2.2%	196	20.2%	197	1.9%	57	0.5%	522	5.0%	114	1.1%	890	8.5%	228	2.0%	81	0.7%	642	5.6%	135	1.2%	1,086	9.5%
	PCC	79	8.1%	55	5.7%	314	32.3%	50	5.1%	498	51.2%	298	2.8%	141	1.3%	1,052	10.1%	189	1.8%	1,680	16.1%	377	3.3%	196	1.7%	1,366	12.0%	239	2.1%	2,178	19.1%
	Total	177	18.2%	118	12.1%	604	62.1%	73	7.5%	972	100.0%	2,128	20.3%	1,022	9.8%	5,974	57.1%	1,334	12.8%	10,458	100.0%	2,305	20.2%	1,140	10.0%	6,578	57.6%	1,407	12.3%	11,430	100.0%
March Competition – Eligible Non-recipients	CCC																					10,281	14.4%	4,987	7.0%	4,563	6.4%	16,177	22.7%	36,008	50.5%
	UC																					2,693	3.8%	213	0.3%	146	0.2%	3,659	5.1%	6,711	9.4%
	CSU																					3,761	5.3%	1,716	2.4%	1,558	2.2%	12,167	17.1%	19,202	26.9%
	ICU																					1,120	1.6%	489	0.7%	380	0.5%	2,443	3.4%	4,432	6.2%
	PCC																					908	1.3%	739	1.0%	669	0.9%	2,629	3.7%	4,945	6.9%
	Total																					18,763	26.3%	8,144	11.4%	7,316	10.3%	37,075	52.0%	71,298	100.0%
Recipients																						10,281	11.3%	1,140	1.3%	6,578	7.3%	1,407	1.6%	19,406	21.4%
Eligible Non-recipients																						18,763	20.7%	8,144	9.0%	7,316	8.1%	37,075	40.9%	71,298	78.6%
Total																						29,044	32.0%	9,284	10.2%	13,894	15.3%	38,482	42.4%	90,704	100.0%
September Competition – Recipients	CCC	68	17.4%	61	15.6%	238	60.9%	3	0.8%	370	94.6%	2,651	23.9%	1,188	10.7%	6,039	54.5%	1,035	9.3%	10,913	98.5%	2,719	23.7%	1,249	10.9%	6,277	54.7%	1,038	9.0%	11,283	98.4%
	UC	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.0%	3	0.0%	11	0.1%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.0%	3	0.0%	11	0.1%
	CSU	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	2	0.5%	0	0.0%	3	0.8%	32	0.3%	7	0.1%	56	0.5%	12	0.1%	107	1.0%	33	0.3%	7	0.1%	58	0.5%	12	0.1%	110	1.0%
	ICU	2	0.5%	2	0.5%	6	1.5%	0	0.0%	10	2.6%	6	0.1%	2	0.0%	22	0.2%	1	0.0%	31	0.3%	8	0.1%	4	0.0%	28	0.2%	1	0.0%	41	0.4%
	PCC	2	0.5%	0	0.0%	4	1.0%	2	0.5%	8	2.0%	6	0.1%	1	0.0%	12	0.1%	0	0.0%	19	0.2%	8	0.1%	1	0.0%	16	0.1%	2	0.0%	27	0.2%
	Total	73	18.7%	63	16.1%	250	63.9%	5	1.3%	391	100.0%	2,700	24.4%	1,198	10.8%	6,132	55.3%	1,051	9.5%	11,081	100.0%	2,773	24.2%	1,261	11.0%	6,382	55.6%	1,056	9.2%	11,472	100.0%
September Competition – Eligible Non-recipients	CCC																					15,295	33.3%	6,446	14.0%	6,558	14.3%	17,619	38.4%	45,918	100.0%
	UC																					0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	CSU																					0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	ICU																					0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	PCC																					0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Total																					15,295	33.3%	6,446	14.0%	6,558	14.3%	17,619	38.4%	45,918	100.0%
Recipients																						2,773	4.8%	1,261	2.2%	6,382	11.1%	1,056	1.8%	11,472	20.0%
Eligible Non-recipients																						15,295	26.7%	6,446	11.2%	6,558	11.4%	17,619	30.7%	45,918	80.0%
Total																						18,068	31.5%	7,707	13.4%	12,940	22.5%	18,675	32.5%	57,390	100.0%

TABLE 1 - AWARD YEAR 2005-06 - SEGMENT
ALL (HIGH SCHOOL ENTITLEMENT AND MARCH COMPETITIVE) RECIPIENTS AND COMPETITIVE ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, DEPENDENCY STATUS, AND SEGMENT
January 3, 2006

			Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total	
					With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents			
					Married		Single								Married		Single								Married		Single					
		Segment	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High School Entitlement Recipients		CCC	2,923	15.5%	6	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2,929	15.6%	20,415	43.8%	99	0.2%	642	1.4%	1,343	2.9%	22,499	48.3%	23,338	35.7%	105	0.2%	642	1.0%	1,343	2.1%	25,428	38.9%
		UC	5,205	27.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5,205	27.7%	7,258	15.6%	2	0.0%	40	0.1%	125	0.3%	7,425	15.9%	12,463	19.1%	2	0.0%	40	0.1%	125	0.2%	12,630	19.3%
		CSU	5,098	27.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5,098	27.1%	12,381	26.6%	20	0.0%	152	0.3%	529	1.1%	13,082	28.1%	17,479	26.7%	20	0.0%	152	0.2%	529	0.8%	18,180	27.8%
		ICU	4,577	24.3%	9	0.0%	14	0.1%	74	0.4%	4,674	24.8%	1,128	2.4%	13	0.0%	76	0.2%	124	0.3%	1,341	2.9%	5,705	8.7%	22	0.0%	90	0.1%	198	0.3%	6,015	9.2%
		PCC	839	4.5%	14	0.1%	16	0.1%	36	0.2%	905	4.8%	1,979	4.2%	29	0.1%	116	0.2%	135	0.3%	2,259	4.8%	2,818	4.3%	43	0.1%	132	0.2%	171	0.3%	3,164	4.8%
		Total	18,642	99.1%	29	0.2%	30	0.2%	110	0.6%	18,811	100.0%	43,161	92.6%	163	0.3%	1,026	2.2%	2,256	4.8%	46,606	100.0%	61,803	94.5%	192	0.3%	1,056	1.6%	2,366	3.6%	65,417	100.0%
March Competition	Recipients	CCC	28	2.6%	49	4.6%	99	9.3%	2	0.2%	178	16.7%	852	8.2%	1,055	10.1%	2,662	25.6%	827	7.9%	5,396	51.8%	880	7.7%	1,104	9.6%	2,761	24.1%	829	7.2%	5,574	48.6%
		UC	17	1.6%	2	0.2%	10	0.9%	0	0.0%	29	2.7%	220	2.1%	35	0.3%	136	1.3%	130	1.2%	521	5.0%	237	2.1%	37	0.3%	146	1.3%	130	1.1%	550	4.8%
		CSU	13	1.2%	13	1.2%	50	4.7%	0	0.0%	76	7.1%	348	3.3%	244	2.3%	866	8.3%	209	2.0%	1,667	16.0%	361	3.1%	257	2.2%	916	8.0%	209	1.8%	1,743	15.2%
		ICU	39	3.7%	31	2.9%	109	10.2%	30	2.8%	209	19.6%	142	1.4%	144	1.4%	479	4.6%	121	1.2%	886	8.5%	181	1.6%	175	1.5%	588	5.1%	151	1.3%	1,095	9.5%
		PCC	87	8.2%	113	10.6%	318	29.8%	57	5.3%	575	53.9%	328	3.2%	337	3.2%	1,051	10.1%	222	2.1%	1,938	18.6%	415	3.6%	450	3.9%	1,369	11.9%	279	2.4%	2,513	21.9%
		Total	184	17.2%	208	19.5%	586	54.9%	89	8.3%	1,067	100.0%	1,890	18.2%	1,815	17.4%	5,194	49.9%	1,509	14.5%	10,408	100.0%	2,074	18.1%	2,023	17.6%	5,780	50.4%	1,598	13.9%	11,475	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	CCC																					942	2.4%	950	2.4%	680	1.7%	3,627	9.3%	6,199	15.8%
		UC																					2,171	5.5%	227	0.6%	84	0.2%	3,422	8.7%	5,904	15.1%
		CSU																					2,820	7.2%	1,665	4.3%	1,241	3.2%	12,206	31.2%	17,932	45.8%
		ICU																					983	2.5%	543	1.4%	351	0.9%	2,367	6.0%	4,244	10.8%
		PCC																					850	2.2%	808	2.1%	547	1.4%	2,653	6.8%	4,858	12.4%
		Total																					7,766	19.8%	4,193	10.7%	2,903	7.4%	24,275	62.0%	39,137	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,074	4.1%	2,023	4.0%	5,780	11.4%	1,598	3.2%	11,475	22.7%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						7,766	15.3%	4,193	8.3%	2,903	5.7%	24,275	48.0%	39,137	77.3%
	Total																						9,840	19.4%	6,216	12.3%	8,683	17.2%	25,873	51.1%	50,612	100.0%

TABLE 1 - AWARD YEAR 2006-07 - SEGMENT
ALL (HIGH SCHOOL ENTITLEMENT AND MARCH COMPETITIVE) RECIPIENTS AND COMPETITIVE ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, DEPENDENCY STATUS, AND SEGMENT
February 13, 2007

Segment		Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total	
				With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents			
				Married		Single								Married		Single								Married		Single					
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High School Entitlement Recipients	CCC	2,659	14.2%	6	0.0%	3	0.0%	1	0.0%	2,669	14.3%	18,183	40.0%	57	0.1%	603	1.3%	1,166	2.6%	20,009	44.1%	20,842	32.5%	63	0.1%	606	0.9%	1,167	1.8%	22,678	35.4%
	UC	5,507	29.5%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	2	0.0%	5,510	29.5%	8,137	17.9%	1	0.0%	51	0.1%	158	0.3%	8,347	18.4%	13,644	21.3%	1	0.0%	52	0.1%	160	0.2%	13,857	21.6%
	CSU	5,137	27.5%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	5,139	27.5%	12,986	28.6%	17	0.0%	187	0.4%	558	1.2%	13,748	30.3%	18,123	28.3%	18	0.0%	187	0.3%	559	0.9%	18,887	29.5%
	ICU	4,433	23.7%	5	0.0%	16	0.1%	81	0.4%	4,535	24.3%	1,164	2.6%	12	0.0%	64	0.1%	65	0.1%	1,305	2.9%	5,597	8.7%	17	0.0%	80	0.1%	146	0.2%	5,840	9.1%
	PCC	795	4.3%	8	0.0%	22	0.1%	20	0.1%	845	4.5%	1,750	3.9%	24	0.1%	114	0.3%	119	0.3%	2,007	4.4%	2,545	4.0%	32	0.0%	136	0.2%	139	0.2%	2,852	4.4%
	Total	18,531	99.1%	20	0.1%	42	0.2%	105	0.6%	18,698	100.0%	42,220	93.0%	111	0.2%	1,019	2.2%	2,066	4.5%	45,416	100.0%	60,751	94.8%	131	0.2%	1,061	1.7%	2,171	3.4%	64,114	100.0%
March Competition – Recipients	CCC	35	2.9%	46	3.9%	116	9.7%	2	0.2%	199	16.7%	953	8.3%	669	5.8%	3,311	28.8%	867	7.6%	5,800	50.5%	988	7.8%	715	5.6%	3,427	27.0%	869	6.9%	5,999	47.3%
	UC	27	2.3%	0	0.0%	13	1.1%	0	0.0%	40	3.4%	312	2.7%	24	0.2%	166	1.4%	158	1.4%	660	5.7%	339	2.7%	24	0.2%	179	1.4%	158	1.2%	700	5.5%
	CSU	25	2.1%	7	0.6%	70	5.9%	0	0.0%	102	8.5%	367	3.2%	123	1.1%	1,069	9.3%	244	2.1%	1,803	15.7%	392	3.1%	130	1.0%	1,139	9.0%	244	1.9%	1,905	15.0%
	ICU	39	3.3%	21	1.8%	121	10.1%	14	1.2%	195	16.3%	174	1.5%	52	0.5%	579	5.0%	117	1.0%	922	8.0%	213	1.7%	73	0.6%	700	5.5%	131	1.0%	1,117	8.8%
	PCC	106	8.9%	87	7.3%	409	34.3%	55	4.6%	657	55.1%	315	2.7%	176	1.5%	1,572	13.7%	233	2.0%	2,296	20.0%	421	3.3%	263	2.1%	1,981	15.6%	288	2.3%	2,953	23.3%
	Total	232	19.4%	161	13.5%	729	61.1%	71	6.0%	1,193	100.0%	2,121	18.5%	1,044	9.1%	6,697	58.3%	1,619	14.1%	11,481	100.0%	2,353	18.6%	1,205	9.5%	7,426	58.6%	1,690	13.3%	12,674	100.0%
March Competition – Eligible Non-recipients	CCC																					967	2.3%	658	1.6%	659	1.6%	2,366	5.6%	4,650	11.0%
	UC																					2,679	6.3%	282	0.7%	98	0.2%	3,906	9.2%	6,965	16.5%
	CSU																					3,071	7.3%	1,769	4.2%	1,466	3.5%	14,166	33.5%	20,472	48.4%
	ICU																					1,176	2.8%	539	1.3%	363	0.9%	2,595	6.1%	4,673	11.1%
	PCC																					796	1.9%	1,003	2.4%	785	1.9%	2,924	6.9%	5,508	13.0%
	Total																					8,689	20.6%	4,251	10.1%	3,371	8.0%	25,957	61.4%	42,268	100.0%
Recipients																						2,353	4.3%	1,205	2.2%	7,426	13.5%	1,690	3.1%	12,674	23.1%
Eligible Non-recipients																						8,689	15.8%	4,251	7.7%	3,371	6.1%	25,957	47.2%	42,268	76.9%
Total																						11,042	20.1%	5,456	9.9%	10,797	19.7%	27,647	50.3%	54,942	100.0%

TABLE 1 - AWARD YEAR 2007-08 - SEGMENT
ALL (HIGH SCHOOL ENTITLEMENT AND MARCH COMPETITIVE) RECIPIENTS AND COMPETITIVE ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, DEPENDENCY STATUS, AND SEGMENT
July 30, 2007

Segment			Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total	
					With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents			
					Married		Single								Married		Single								Married		Single					
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
High School Entitlement Recipients		CCC	2,380	12.6%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2,382	12.7%	16,228	36.0%	77	0.2%	618	1.4%	1,067	2.4%	17,990	40.0%	18,608	29.1%	79	0.1%	618	1.0%	1,067	1.7%	20,372	31.9%
		UC	5,732	30.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5,732	30.5%	8,923	19.8%	0	0.0%	57	0.1%	147	0.3%	9,127	20.3%	14,655	23.0%	0	0.0%	57	0.1%	147	0.2%	14,859	23.3%
		CSU	5,267	28.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5,267	28.0%	14,016	31.1%	11	0.0%	219	0.5%	591	1.3%	14,837	32.9%	19,283	30.2%	11	0.0%	219	0.3%	591	0.9%	20,104	31.5%
		ICU	4,574	24.3%	1	0.0%	22	0.1%	82	0.4%	4,679	24.9%	1,133	2.5%	13	0.0%	36	0.1%	70	0.2%	1,252	2.8%	5,707	8.9%	14	0.0%	58	0.1%	152	0.2%	5,931	9.3%
		PCC	721	3.8%	2	0.0%	17	0.1%	19	0.1%	759	4.0%	1,578	3.5%	20	0.0%	119	0.3%	107	0.2%	1,824	4.1%	2,299	3.6%	22	0.0%	136	0.2%	126	0.2%	2,583	4.0%
		Total	18,674	99.2%	5	0.0%	39	0.2%	101	0.5%	18,819	100.0%	41,878	93.0%	121	0.3%	1,049	2.3%	1,982	4.4%	45,030	100.0%	60,552	94.8%	126	0.2%	1,088	1.7%	2,083	3.3%	63,849	100.0%
March Competition	Recipients	CCC	17	1.2%	62	4.4%	112	8.0%	2	0.1%	193	13.8%	1,099	9.7%	1,158	10.2%	2,704	23.8%	987	8.7%	5,948	52.3%	1,116	8.7%	1,220	9.6%	2,816	22.1%	989	7.7%	6,141	48.1%
		UC	10	0.7%	4	0.3%	10	0.7%	0	0.0%	24	1.7%	266	2.3%	50	0.4%	128	1.1%	153	1.3%	597	5.3%	276	2.2%	54	0.4%	138	1.1%	153	1.2%	621	4.9%
		CSU	12	0.9%	14	1.0%	53	3.8%	0	0.0%	79	5.6%	304	2.7%	263	2.3%	873	7.7%	261	2.3%	1,701	15.0%	316	2.5%	277	2.2%	926	7.3%	261	2.0%	1,780	13.9%
		ICU	34	2.4%	43	3.1%	92	6.6%	12	0.9%	181	12.9%	147	1.3%	137	1.2%	409	3.6%	111	1.0%	804	7.1%	181	1.4%	180	1.4%	501	3.9%	123	1.0%	985	7.7%
		PCC	116	8.3%	176	12.6%	527	37.7%	103	7.4%	922	65.9%	363	3.2%	378	3.3%	1,312	11.5%	262	2.3%	2,315	20.4%	479	3.8%	554	4.3%	1,839	14.4%	365	2.9%	3,237	25.4%
		Total	189	13.5%	299	21.4%	794	56.8%	117	8.4%	1,399	100.0%	2,179	19.2%	1,986	17.5%	5,426	47.7%	1,774	15.6%	11,365	100.0%	2,368	18.6%	2,285	17.9%	6,220	48.7%	1,891	14.8%	12,764	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	CCC																					5,373	10.5%	2,598	5.1%	1,898	3.7%	7,808	15.3%	17,677	34.6%
		UC																					2,801	5.5%	252	0.5%	76	0.1%	2,866	5.6%	5,995	11.7%
		CSU																					3,267	6.4%	1,958	3.8%	1,208	2.4%	10,628	20.8%	17,061	33.4%
		ICU																					934	1.8%	679	1.3%	403	0.8%	1,890	3.7%	3,906	7.6%
		PCC																					1,064	2.1%	1,277	2.5%	810	1.6%	3,318	6.5%	6,469	12.7%
		Total																					13,439	26.3%	6,764	13.2%	4,395	8.6%	26,510	51.9%	51,108	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,368	3.7%	2,285	3.6%	6,220	9.7%	1,891	3.0%	12,764	20.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						13,439	21.0%	6,764	10.6%	4,395	6.9%	26,510	41.5%	51,108	80.0%
	Total																						15,807	24.7%	9,049	14.2%	10,615	16.6%	28,401	44.5%	63,872	100.0%

TABLE 2 - ALL SEGMENTS
NEW COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS and ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
AVERAGES: INCOME, GPA, FAMILY SIZE, AND AGE
AWARD YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2006-07

Award Year	Program	Competition		
		March	September	Total
2001-02	**Cal Grant A recipients**	889	237	1,126
	Average income	$32,285	$37,669	$33,419
	Average GPA	3.52	3.59	3.54
	Average family size	4.0	3.5	3.9
	Average age	24	31	25
	Cal Grant B recipients	10,348	11,026	21,374
	Average income	$14,868	$13,619	$14,224
	Average GPA	3.16	3.14	3.15
	Average family size	3.8	3.3	3.6
	Average age	26	28	27
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	11,237	11,263	22,500
	Average income	$16,246	$14,125	$15,184
	Average GPA	3.19	3.14	3.17
	Average family size	3.8	3.4	3.6
	Average age	25	28	27
	Eligible Non-recipients			76,032
	Average income			$17,289
	Average GPA			2.89
	Average family size			2.7
	Average age			27
2002-03	**Cal Grant A recipients**	807	310	1,117
	Average income	$26,005	$36,513	$28,921
	Average GPA	3.58	3.61	3.59
	Average family size	3.0	3.3	3.1
	Average age	31	33	32
	Cal Grant B recipients	11,398	11,363	22,761
	Average income	$12,156	$13,562	$12,858
	Average GPA	3.29	3.26	3.28
	Average family size	2.9	3.1	3.0
	Average age	31	30	31
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	12,205	11,673	23,878
	Average income	$13,072	$14,172	$13,610
	Average GPA	3.31	3.27	3.29
	Average family size	2.9	3.1	3.0
	Average age	31	31	31
	Eligible Non-recipients			107,586
	Average income			$17,268
	Average GPA			2.91
	Average family size			2.6
	Average age			27
2003-04	**Cal Grant A recipients**	930	305	1,235
	Average income	$26,235	$35,512	$28,526
	Average GPA	3.58	3.63	3.59
	Average family size	3.0	3.1	3.1
	Average age	32	34	33
	Cal Grant B recipients	10,569	10,587	21,156
	Average income	$12,405	$13,838	$13,122
	Average GPA	3.28	3.29	3.28
	Average family size	2.9	3.0	3.0
	Average age	31	30	31
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	11,499	10,892	22,391
	Average income	$13,524	$14,445	$13,972
	Average GPA	3.30	3.30	3.30
	Average family size	2.9	3.1	3.0
	Average age	31	30	31
	Eligible Non-recipients			113,812
	Average income			$17,413
	Average GPA			2.92
	Average family size			2.6
	Average age			27

TABLE 2 - ALL SEGMENTS
NEW COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS and ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
AVERAGES: INCOME, GPA, FAMILY SIZE, AND AGE
AWARD YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2006-07

Award Year	Program	Competition		
		March	September	Total
2004-05	**Cal Grant A recipients**	972	391	1,363
	Average income	$28,112	$36,327	$30,468
	Average GPA	3.59	3.60	3.59
	Average family size	3.0	3.1	3.0
	Average age	32	34	32
	Cal Grant B recipients	10,458	11,081	21,539
	Average income	$12,684	$13,796	$13,256
	Average GPA	3.27	3.26	3.27
	Average family size	2.9	3.1	3.0
	Average age	31	30	31
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	11,430	11,472	22,902
	Average income	$13,996	$14,564	$14,280
	Average GPA	3.30	3.27	3.29
	Average family size	2.9	3.1	3.0
	Average age	31	31	31
	Eligible Non-recipients			117,216
	Average income			$16,862
	Average GPA			2.91
	Average family size			2.6
	Average age			27
2005-06	**Cal Grant A recipients**	1,067	475	1,542
	Average income	$27,877	$38,438	$31,130
	Average GPA	3.57	3.61	3.58
	Average family size	3.0	3.3	0.0
	Average age	32	34	32
	Cal Grant B recipients	10,408	11,712	22,120
	Average income	$13,275	$13,929	$13,622
	Average GPA	3.26	3.27	3.27
	Average family size	2.9	3.0	0.0
	Average age	31	30	31
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	11,475	12,187	23,662
	Average income	$14,633	$14,884	$14,762
	Average GPA	3.29	3.28	3.29
	Average family size	2.9	3.0	0.0
	Average age	31	30	31
	Eligible Non-recipients			112,238
	Average income			$16,551
	Average GPA			2.98
	Average family size			2.2
	Average age			28
2006-07	**Cal Grant A recipients**	1,193	518	1,711
	Average income	$31,254	$40,170	$33,953
	Average GPA	3.56	3.58	3.56
	Average family size	3.0	3.1	3.1
	Average age	32	33	32
	Cal Grant B recipients	11,481	12,189	23,670
	Average income	$13,873	$14,744	$14,322
	Average GPA	3.26	3.24	3.25
	Average family size	2.9	3.0	3.0
	Average age	31	29	30
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	12,674	12,707	25,381
	Average income	$15,509	$15,781	$15,645
	Average GPA	3.29	3.25	3.27
	Average family size	2.9	3.0	3.0
	Average age	31	30	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			114,100
	Average income			$18,659
	Average GPA			2.91
	Average family size			2.5
	Average age			27

TABLE 2 - CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
NEW COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS and ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
AVERAGES: INCOME, GPA, FAMILY SIZE, AND AGE
AWARD YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2006-07

Award Year	Program	Competition		
		March	September	Total
2001-02	**Cal Grant A recipients**	96	236	332
	Average income	$38,205	$37,632	$37,797
	Average GPA	3.51	3.59	3.57
	Average family size	4.1	3.5	3.6
	Average age	26	31	30
	Cal Grant B recipients	3,939	11,010	14,949
	Average income	$13,742	$13,623	$13,654
	Average GPA	3.14	3.14	3.14
	Average family size	3.8	3.3	3.5
	Average age	27	28	28
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	4,035	11,246	15,281
	Average income	$14,324	$14,126	$14,178
	Average GPA	3.15	3.14	3.15
	Average family size	3.8	3.4	3.5
	Average age	27	28	28
	Eligible Non-recipients			53,884
	Average income			$16,570
	Average GPA			2.85
	Average family size			2.8
	Average age			28
2002-03	**Cal Grant A recipients**	120	306	426
	Average income	$35,996	$36,596	$36,427
	Average GPA	3.60	3.61	3.61
	Average family size	3.4	3.3	3.3
	Average age	36	33	34
	Cal Grant B recipients	6,035	11,306	17,341
	Average income	$11,720	$13,563	$12,922
	Average GPA	3.25	3.26	3.25
	Average family size	2.9	3.1	3.0
	Average age	33	30	31
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	6,155	11,612	17,767
	Average income	$12,193	$14,170	$13,485
	Average GPA	3.25	3.27	3.26
	Average family size	2.9	3.1	3.0
	Average age	33	31	31
	Eligible Non-recipients			73,320
	Average income			$17,101
	Average GPA			2.85
	Average family size			2.8
	Average age			27
2003-04	**Cal Grant A recipients**	127	288	415
	Average income	$36,628	$36,114	$36,271
	Average GPA	3.58	3.64	3.62
	Average family size	3.2	3.1	3.2
	Average age	35	34	34
	Cal Grant B recipients	5,676	10,470	16,146
	Average income	$11,974	$13,836	$13,182
	Average GPA	3.23	3.29	3.27
	Average family size	3.0	3.1	3.0
	Average age	33	30	31
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	5,803	10,758	16,561
	Average income	$12,514	$14,432	$13,760
	Average GPA	3.24	3.30	3.28
	Average family size	3.0	3.1	3.0
	Average age	33	30	31
	Eligible Non-recipients			77,791
	Average income			$17,365
	Average GPA			2.86
	Average family size			2.8
	Average age			28

TABLE 2 - CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
NEW COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS and ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
AVERAGES: INCOME, GPA, FAMILY SIZE, AND AGE
AWARD YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2006-07

Award Year	Program	Competition		
		March	September	Total
2004-05	**Cal Grant A recipients**	179	370	549
	Average income	$38,656	$36,897	$37,470
	Average GPA	3.63	3.59	3.61
	Average family size	3.3	3.2	3.2
	Average age	35	34	34
	Cal Grant B recipients	5,584	10,913	16,497
	Average income	$12,070	$13,782	$13,203
	Average GPA	3.22	3.26	3.25
	Average family size	3.0	3.1	3.0
	Average age	32	30	31
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	5,763	11,283	17,046
	Average income	$12,895	$14,540	$13,984
	Average GPA	3.23	3.27	3.26
	Average family size	3.0	3.1	3.0
	Average age	32	31	31
	Eligible Non-recipients			81,926
	Average income			$17,424
	Average GPA			2.85
	Average family size			2.7
	Average age			28
2005-06	**Cal Grant A recipients**	178	452	630
	Average income	$37,630	$38,457	$38,224
	Average GPA	3.56	3.61	3.60
	Average family size	3.1	3.3	3.2
	Average age	35	34	34
	Cal Grant B recipients	5,396	11,569	16,965
	Average income	$12,749	$13,946	$13,565
	Average GPA	3.21	3.27	3.25
	Average family size	2.9	3.0	3.0
	Average age	32	30	31
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	5,574	12,021	17,595
	Average income	$13,543	$14,867	$14,448
	Average GPA	3.22	3.28	3.26
	Average family size	2.9	3.0	3.0
	Average age	32	30	31
	Eligible Non-recipients			79,298
	Average income			$18,098
	Average GPA			2.85
	Average family size			2.7
	Average age			27
2006-07	**Cal Grant A recipients**	199	499	698
	Average income	$40,858	$40,260	$40,430
	Average GPA	3.57	3.57	3.57
	Average family size	3.2	3.1	3.1
	Average age	34	33	33
	Cal Grant B recipients	5,800	11,974	17,774
	Average income	$13,215	$14,736	$14,240
	Average GPA	3.22	3.24	3.23
	Average family size	2.9	3.0	3.0
	Average age	32	29	30
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	5,999	12,473	18,472
	Average income	$14,132	$15,757	$15,229
	Average GPA	3.23	3.25	3.25
	Average family size	2.9	3.0	3.0
	Average age	32	30	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			76,481
	Average income			$19,129
	Average GPA			2.84
	Average family size			2.7
	Average age			27

TABLE 2 - UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
NEW COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS and ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
AVERAGES: INCOME, GPA, FAMILY SIZE, AND AGE
AWARD YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2006-07

Award Year	Program	Competition		
		March	September	Total
2001-02	**Cal Grant A recipients**	154	0	154
	Average income	$42,433		$42,433
	Average GPA	3.69		3.69
	Average family size	4.2		4.2
	Average age	21		21
	Cal Grant B recipients	1,492	5	1,497
	Average income	$16,096	$7,696	$16,068
	Average GPA	3.41	3.17	3.41
	Average family size	3.8	3.2	3.8
	Average age	22	21	22
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	1,646	5	1,651
	Average income	$18,561	$7,696	$18,528
	Average GPA	3.44	3.17	3.44
	Average family size	3.9	3.2	3.9
	Average age	22	21	22
	Eligible Non-recipients			4,855
	Average income			$22,739
	Average GPA			3.20
	Average family size			2.7
	Average age			24
2002-03	**Cal Grant A recipients**	28	0	28
	Average income	$35,276		$35,276
	Average GPA	3.74		3.74
	Average family size	3.0		3.0
	Average age	25		25
	Cal Grant B recipients	768	6	774
	Average income	$11,141	$11,344	$11,142
	Average GPA	3.57	3.82	3.57
	Average family size	2.5	2.2	2.5
	Average age	26	31	26
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	796	6	802
	Average income	$11,990	$11,344	$11,985
	Average GPA	3.58	3.82	3.58
	Average family size	2.6	2.2	2.6
	Average age	26	31	26
	Eligible Non-recipients			6,883
	Average income			$20,188
	Average GPA			3.24
	Average family size			2.6
	Average age			24
2003-04	**Cal Grant A recipients**	26	1	27
	Average income	$36,678	$7,409	$35,594
	Average GPA	3.76	3.96	3.77
	Average family size	3.2	2.0	3.1
	Average age	26	28	26
	Cal Grant B recipients	681	6	687
	Average income	$10,760	$8,831	$10,743
	Average GPA	3.53	3.69	3.53
	Average family size	2.7	2.2	2.7
	Average age	26	23	26
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	707	7	714
	Average income	$11,713	$8,628	$11,683
	Average GPA	3.54	3.73	3.54
	Average family size	2.7	2.1	2.7
	Average age	26	24	26
	Eligible Non-recipients			7,410
	Average income			$19,625
	Average GPA			3.26
	Average family size			2.5
	Average age			25

TABLE 2 - UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
NEW COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS and ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
AVERAGES: INCOME, GPA, FAMILY SIZE, AND AGE
AWARD YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2006-07

Award Year	Program	Competition		
		March	September	Total
2004-05	**Cal Grant A recipients**	37	0	37
	Average income	$36,013		$36,013
	Average GPA	3.70		3.70
	Average family size	2.9		2.9
	Average age	26		26
	Cal Grant B recipients	593	11	604
	Average income	$11,569	$9,922	$11,539
	Average GPA	3.55	3.52	3.55
	Average family size	2.6	2.6	2.6
	Average age	25	26	25
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	630	11	641
	Average income	$13,004	$9,922	$12,951
	Average GPA	3.56	3.52	3.56
	Average family size	2.6	2.6	2.6
	Average age	25	26	25
	Eligible Non-recipients			6,711
	Average income			$16,709
	Average GPA			3.29
	Average family size			2.4
	Average age			25
2005-06	**Cal Grant A recipients**	29	1	30
	Average income	$38,250	$30,629	$37,996
	Average GPA	3.66	3.66	3.66
	Average family size	3.1	2.0	3.1
	Average age	28	29	28
	Cal Grant B recipients	521	15	536
	Average income	$10,958	$10,583	$10,948
	Average GPA	3.57	3.52	3.56
	Average family size	2.5	2.7	2.5
	Average age	27	28	27
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	550	16	566
	Average income	$12,397	$11,836	$12,381
	Average GPA	3.57	3.53	3.57
	Average family size	2.6	2.6	2.6
	Average age	27	28	27
	Eligible Non-recipients			5,904
	Average income			$18,696
	Average GPA			3.29
	Average family size			2.3
	Average age			25
2006-07	**Cal Grant A recipients**	40	3	43
	Average income	$41,500	$43,790	$41,660
	Average GPA	3.71	3.75	3.72
	Average family size	3.2	2.7	3.2
	Average age	23	21	26
	Cal Grant B recipients	660	15	675
	Average income	$11,162	$9,495	$11,125
	Average GPA	3.57	3.54	3.57
	Average family size	2.6	2.8	2.6
	Average age	26	24	25
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	700	18	718
	Average income	$12,896	$15,211	$12,954
	Average GPA	3.58	3.58	3.58
	Average family size	2.7	2.8	2.7
	Average age	26	24	26
	Eligible Non-recipients			6,965
	Average income			$19,825
	Average GPA			3.30
	Average family size			2.3
	Average age			25

TABLE 2 - CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
NEW COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS and ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
AVERAGES: INCOME, GPA, FAMILY SIZE, AND AGE
AWARD YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2006-07

Award Year	Program	Competition		
		March	September	Total
2001-02	**Cal Grant A recipients**	173	1	174
	Average income	$42,102	$46,540	$42,127
	Average GPA	3.47	3.83	3.47
	Average family size	4.4	5.0	4.4
	Average age	24	40	24
	Cal Grant B recipients	3,188	7	3,195
	Average income	$15,329	$14,302	$15,327
	Average GPA	3.12	3.19	3.12
	Average family size	3.8	2.7	3.8
	Average age	25	23	25
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	3,361	8	3,369
	Average income	$16,707	$18,332	$16,711
	Average GPA	3.13	3.27	3.13
	Average family size	3.8	3.0	3.8
	Average age	25	26	25
	Eligible Non-recipients			11,077
	Average income			$16,119
	Average GPA			2.89
	Average family size			2.1
	Average age			27
2002-03	**Cal Grant A recipients**	63	2	65
	Average income	$34,979	$29,943	$34,824
	Average GPA	3.62	3.43	3.62
	Average family size	3.1	2.5	3.1
	Average age	34	40	34
	Cal Grant B recipients	2,391	36	2,427
	Average income	$11,817	$13,851	$11,847
	Average GPA	3.30	3.32	3.30
	Average family size	2.9	3.0	2.9
	Average age	30	29	30
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	2,454	38	2,492
	Average income	$12,412	$14,698	$12,446
	Average GPA	3.31	3.32	3.31
	Average family size	2.9	2.9	2.9
	Average age	30	30	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			18,809
	Average income			$15,395
	Average GPA			2.94
	Average family size			2.2
	Average age			27
2003-04	**Cal Grant A recipients**	72	3	75
	Average income	$35,744	$35,536	$35,735
	Average GPA	3.61	3.75	3.61
	Average family size	2.8	2.3	2.8
	Average age	36	30	36
	Cal Grant B recipients	1,840	64	1,904
	Average income	$12,007	$13,636	$12,062
	Average GPA	3.30	3.38	3.30
	Average family size	2.8	2.8	2.8
	Average age	30	28	30
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	1,912	67	1,979
	Average income	$12,901	$14,617	$12,959
	Average GPA	3.31	3.39	3.31
	Average family size	2.8	2.7	2.8
	Average age	30	28	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			19,842
	Average income			$15,570
	Average GPA			2.96
	Average family size			2.1
	Average age			27

TABLE 2 - CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
NEW COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS and ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
AVERAGES: INCOME, GPA, FAMILY SIZE, AND AGE
AWARD YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2006-07

Award Year	Program	Competition		
		March	September	Total
2004-05	**Cal Grant A recipients**	62	3	65
	Average income	$36,946	$38,105	$36,999
	Average GPA	3.55	3.80	3.56
	Average family size	3.0	2.7	3.0
	Average age	35	35	35
	Cal Grant B recipients	1,711	107	1,818
	Average income	$12,448	$13,966	$12,538
	Average GPA	3.30	3.28	3.30
	Average family size	2.9	2.8	2.9
	Average age	29	30	29
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	1,773	110	1,883
	Average income	$13,305	$14,624	$13,382
	Average GPA	3.31	3.29	3.30
	Average family size	2.9	2.8	2.9
	Average age	30	30	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			19,202
	Average income			$14,155
	Average GPA			2.97
	Average family size			2.0
	Average age			27
2005-06	**Cal Grant A recipients**	76	12	88
	Average income	$37,896	$40,632	$38,269
	Average GPA	3.55	3.62	3.56
	Average family size	3.2	3.2	3.2
	Average age	34	31	34
	Cal Grant B recipients	1,667	82	1,749
	Average income	$12,982	$13,036	$12,985
	Average GPA	3.28	3.34	3.29
	Average family size	2.8	2.7	2.8
	Average age	30	30	30
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	1,743	94	1,837
	Average income	$14,069	$16,559	$14,196
	Average GPA	3.30	3.37	3.30
	Average family size	2.8	2.7	2.8
	Average age	30	30	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			17,932
	Average income			$14,955
	Average GPA			2.96
	Average family size			1.9
	Average age			28
2006-07	**Cal Grant A recipients**	102	5	107
	Average income	$39,730	$42,337	$39,851
	Average GPA	3.56	3.44	3.55
	Average family size	2.8	3.8	2.9
	Average age	33	34	33
	Cal Grant B recipients	1,803	137	1,940
	Average income	$13,392	$14,023	$13,436
	Average GPA	3.27	3.30	3.27
	Average family size	2.8	2.8	2.8
	Average age	30	29	30
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	1,905	142	2,047
	Average income	$14,802	$15,020	$14,817
	Average GPA	3.29	3.31	3.29
	Average family size	2.8	2.8	2.8
	Average age	30	29	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			20,473
	Average income			$15,290
	Average GPA			2.98
	Average family size			1.9
	Average age			28

TABLE 2 - INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS
NEW COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS and ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
AVERAGES: INCOME, GPA, FAMILY SIZE, AND AGE
AWARD YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2006-07

Award Year	Program	Competition		
		March	September	Total
2001-02	**Cal Grant A recipients**	268	0	268
	Average income	$26,492		$26,492
	Average GPA	3.54		3.54
	Average family size	3.9		3.9
	Average age	24		24
	Cal Grant B recipients	949	3	952
	Average income	$15,643	$6,805	$15,615
	Average GPA	3.23	3.40	3.24
	Average family size	3.6	3.3	3.6
	Average age	26	33	26
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	1,217	3	1,220
	Average income	$18,032	$6,805	$18,004
	Average GPA	3.30	3.40	3.30
	Average family size	3.7	3.3	3.7
	Average age	26	33	26
	Eligible Non-recipients			4,001
	Average income			$23,823
	Average GPA			3.10
	Average family size			2.7
	Average age			26
2002-03	**Cal Grant A recipients**	193	0	193
	Average income	$21,785		$21,785
	Average GPA	3.54		3.54
	Average family size	2.9		2.9
	Average age	30		30
	Cal Grant B recipients	1,027	11	1,038
	Average income	$13,784	$15,738	$13,804
	Average GPA	3.36	3.20	3.36
	Average family size	2.9	3.8	2.9
	Average age	30	35	30
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	1,220	11	1,231
	Average income	$15,049	$15,738	$15,056
	Average GPA	3.39	3.20	3.39
	Average family size	2.9	3.8	2.9
	Average age	30	35	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			5,012
	Average income			$20,831
	Average GPA			3.13
	Average family size			2.5
	Average age			27
2003-04	**Cal Grant A recipients**	196	6	202
	Average income	$23,054	$26,990	$23,171
	Average GPA	3.58	3.66	3.58
	Average family size	3.0	2.7	3.0
	Average age	32	31	32
	Cal Grant B recipients	903	26	929
	Average income	$13,520	$16,124	$13,593
	Average GPA	3.35	3.29	3.35
	Average family size	2.8	2.8	2.8
	Average age	30	36	30
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	1,099	32	1,131
	Average income	$15,220	$18,161	$15,304
	Average GPA	3.39	3.36	3.39
	Average family size	2.9	2.8	2.9
	Average age	30	35	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			4,818
	Average income			$20,367
	Average GPA			3.14
	Average family size			2.4
	Average age			27

TABLE 2 - INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS
NEW COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS and ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
AVERAGES: INCOME, GPA, FAMILY SIZE, AND AGE
AWARD YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2006-07

Award Year	Program	Competition		
		March	September	Total
2004-05	**Cal Grant A recipients**	196	10	206
	Average income	$23,347	$31,594	$23,748
	Average GPA	3.55	3.63	3.55
	Average family size	2.9	4.0	2.9
	Average age	32	36	32
	Cal Grant B recipients	890	31	921
	Average income	$13,563	$16,505	$13,662
	Average GPA	3.33	3.31	3.33
	Average family size	2.9	3.0	2.9
	Average age	30	32	30
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	1,086	41	1,127
	Average income	$15,329	$20,185	$15,506
	Average GPA	3.37	3.39	3.37
	Average family size	2.9	3.3	2.9
	Average age	30	33	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			4,432
	Average income			$17,476
	Average GPA			3.11
	Average family size			2.3
	Average age			27
2005-06	**Cal Grant A recipients**	209	9	218
	Average income	$23,845	$35,874	$24,342
	Average GPA	3.57	3.60	3.57
	Average family size	2.9	3.7	2.9
	Average age	31	41	31
	Cal Grant B recipients	886	28	914
	Average income	$13,429	$12,900	$13,412
	Average GPA	3.28	3.39	3.29
	Average family size	2.8	2.6	2.8
	Average age	31	34	31
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	1,095	37	1,132
	Average income	$15,417	$18,488	$15,517
	Average GPA	3.34	3.44	3.34
	Average family size	2.8	2.9	2.8
	Average age	31	35	31
	Eligible Non-recipients			4,244
	Average income			$19,632
	Average GPA			3.13
	Average family size			2.3
	Average age			28
2006-07	**Cal Grant A recipients**	195	9	204
	Average income	$27,221	$33,516	$27,499
	Average GPA	3.49	3.59	3.50
	Average family size	3.0	2.6	3.0
	Average age	31	39	31
	Cal Grant B recipients	922	38	960
	Average income	$14,454	$21,152	$14,719
	Average GPA	3.26	3.23	3.26
	Average family size	2.8	3.2	2.8
	Average age	30	34	30
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	1,117	47	1,164
	Average income	$16,682	$23,519	$16,958
	Average GPA	3.30	3.30	3.30
	Average family size	2.8	3.0	2.9
	Average age	30	35	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			4,673
	Average income			$21,057
	Average GPA			3.13
	Average family size			2.3
	Average age			28

TABLE 2 - PRIVATE CAREER COLLEGES
NEW COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS and ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
AVERAGES: INCOME, GPA, FAMILY SIZE, AND AGE
AWARD YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2006-07

Award Year	Program	Competition		
		March	September	Total
2001-02	**Cal Grant A recipients**	198	0	198
	Average income	$20,788		$20,788
	Average GPA	3.42		3.42
	Average family size	3.7		3.7
	Average age	24		24
	Cal Grant B recipients	780	1	781
	Average income	$15,383	$14,681	$15,382
	Average GPA	2.94	2.29	2.94
	Average family size	3.8	3.0	3.8
	Average age	23	43	23
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	978	1	979
	Average income	$16,477	$14,681	$16,475
	Average GPA	3.04	2.29	3.04
	Average family size	3.7	3.0	3.7
	Average age	24	43	24
	Eligible Non-recipients			2,215
	Average income			$16,873
	Average GPA			2.82
	Average family size			2.3
	Average age			26
2002-03	**Cal Grant A recipients**	403	2	405
	Average income	$23,003	$30,279	$23,039
	Average GPA	3.58	3.36	3.58
	Average family size	2.9	3.5	2.9
	Average age	30	21	30
	Cal Grant B recipients	1,177	4	1,181
	Average income	$14,327	$5,208	$14,296
	Average GPA	3.27	3.47	3.27
	Average family size	2.9	1.5	2.9
	Average age	29	26	29
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	1,580	6	1,586
	Average income	$16,540	$13,565	$16,528
	Average GPA	3.35	3.44	3.35
	Average family size	2.9	2.2	2.9
	Average age	29	24	29
	Eligible Non-recipients			3,562
	Average income			$19,930
	Average GPA			3.01
	Average family size			2.4
	Average age			28
2003-04	**Cal Grant A recipients**	509	7	516
	Average income	$22,989	$22,038	$22,976
	Average GPA	3.56	3.28	3.56
	Average family size	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Average age	32	33	32
	Cal Grant B recipients	1,469	21	1,490
	Average income	$14,646	$14,093	$14,638
	Average GPA	3.28	3.13	3.28
	Average family size	2.9	2.9	2.9
	Average age	30	33	30
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	1,978	28	2,006
	Average income	$16,793	$16,079	$16,783
	Average GPA	3.35	3.17	3.35
	Average family size	2.9	2.9	2.9
	Average age	30	33	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			3,951
	Average income			$19,881
	Average GPA			3.03
	Average family size			2.4
	Average age			28

TABLE 2 - PRIVATE CAREER COLLEGES
NEW COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS and ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
AVERAGES: INCOME, GPA, FAMILY SIZE, AND AGE
AWARD YEARS 2001-02 THROUGH 2006-07

Award Year	Program	Competition		
		March	September	Total
2004-05	**Cal Grant A recipients**	498	8	506
	Average income	$24,510	$15,245	$24,363
	Average GPA	3.59	3.63	3.59
	Average family size	2.9	2.0	2.9
	Average age	30	27	30
	Cal Grant B recipients	1,680	19	1,699
	Average income	$14,892	$18,364	$14,931
	Average GPA	3.28	3.07	3.28
	Average family size	3.0	3.5	3.0
	Average age	30	30	30
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	2,178	27	2,205
	Average income	$17,091	$17,440	$17,096
	Average GPA	3.35	3.23	3.35
	Average family size	2.9	3.1	3.0
	Average age	30	29	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			4,945
	Average income			$17,722
	Average GPA			2.99
	Average family size			2.3
	Average age			28
2005-06	**Cal Grant A recipients**	575	1	576
	Average income	$24,475	$33,971	$24,492
	Average GPA	3.57	3.38	3.57
	Average family size	3.0	4.0	3.0
	Average age	30	21	30
	Cal Grant B recipients	1,938	18	1,956
	Average income	$15,547	$11,608	$15,511
	Average GPA	3.31	3.47	3.31
	Average family size	2.9	2.9	2.9
	Average age	30	31	30
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	2,513	19	2,532
	Average income	$17,590	$12,785	$17,554
	Average GPA	3.37	3.46	3.37
	Average family size	2.9	3.0	2.9
	Average age	30	30	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			4,860
	Average income			$19,563
	Average GPA			3.01
	Average family size			2.3
	Average age			28
2006-07	**Cal Grant A recipients**	657	2	659
	Average income	$27,602	$36,650	$27,630
	Average GPA	3.57	3.60	3.57
	Average family size	3.0	2.0	3.0
	Average age	31	34	31
	Cal Grant B recipients	2,296	25	2,321
	Average income	$16,460	$16,153	$16,457
	Average GPA	3.26	3.23	3.26
	Average family size	2.9	3.1	2.9
	Average age	30	30	30
	Cal Grant A & B recipients	2,953	27	2,980
	Average income	$18,939	$17,671	$18,928
	Average GPA	3.33	3.26	3.33
	Average family size	2.9	3.0	2.9
	Average age	30	30	30
	Eligible Non-recipients			5,508
	Average income			$21,145
	Average GPA			3.00
	Average family size			2.3
	Average age			29

TABLE 3 - AWARD YEAR 2001-02
MARCH AND SEPTEMBER COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, AGE, AND DEPENDENCY STATUS

CAL GRANT A AND B RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
December 31, 2001

		Age	Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total	
					With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents			
					Married		Single								Married		Single								Married		Single					
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
March Competition	Recipients	19 and under	252	28.3%	0	0.0%	4	0.4%	2	0.2%	258	29.0%	1,609	15.5%	5	0.0%	56	0.5%	62	0.6%	1,732	16.7%	1,861	16.6%	5	0.0%	60	0.5%	64	0.6%	1,990	17.7%
		20-23	409	46.0%	7	0.8%	24	2.7%	5	0.6%	445	50.1%	4,412	42.6%	44	0.4%	546	5.3%	116	1.1%	5,118	49.5%	4,821	42.9%	51	0.5%	570	5.1%	121	1.1%	5,563	49.5%
		24-29	0	0.0%	10	1.1%	39	4.4%	3	0.3%	52	5.8%	0	0.0%	104	1.0%	994	9.6%	64	0.6%	1,162	11.2%	0	0.0%	114	1.0%	1,033	9.2%	67	0.6%	1,214	10.8%
		30-34	0	0.0%	6	0.7%	29	3.3%	1	0.1%	36	4.0%	0	0.0%	99	1.0%	576	5.6%	20	0.2%	695	6.7%	0	0.0%	105	0.9%	605	5.4%	21	0.2%	731	6.5%
		35-39	0	0.0%	12	1.3%	24	2.7%	0	0.0%	36	4.0%	0	0.0%	107	1.0%	464	4.5%	10	0.1%	581	5.6%	0	0.0%	119	1.1%	488	4.3%	10	0.1%	617	5.5%
		40-49	0	0.0%	5	0.6%	41	4.6%	1	0.1%	47	5.3%	0	0.0%	156	1.5%	681	6.6%	22	0.2%	859	8.3%	0	0.0%	161	1.4%	722	6.4%	23	0.2%	906	8.1%
		50-59	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	13	1.5%	0	0.0%	15	1.7%	0	0.0%	41	0.4%	134	1.3%	6	0.1%	181	1.7%	0	0.0%	43	0.4%	147	1.3%	6	0.1%	196	1.7%
		60-98	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	0.1%	11	0.1%	0	0.0%	20	0.2%	0	0.0%	9	0.1%	11	0.1%	0	0.0%	20	0.2%
		Total	661	74.4%	42	4.7%	174	19.6%	12	1.3%	889	100.0%	6,021	58.2%	565	5.5%	3,462	33.5%	300	2.9%	10,348	100.0%	6,682	59.5%	607	5.4%	3,636	32.4%	312	2.8%	11,237	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					4,230	9.0%	32	0.1%	102	0.2%	157	0.3%	4,521	9.6%
		20-23																					10,989	23.3%	635	1.3%	898	1.9%	1,192	2.5%	13,714	29.1%
		24-29																					0	0.0%	1,448	3.1%	1,722	3.7%	13,655	29.0%	16,825	35.7%
		30-34																					0	0.0%	1,023	2.2%	911	1.9%	2,797	5.9%	4,731	10.0%
		35-39																					0	0.0%	740	1.6%	654	1.4%	1,281	2.7%	2,675	5.7%
		40-49																					0	0.0%	916	1.9%	767	1.6%	1,623	3.4%	3,306	7.0%
		50-59																					0	0.0%	205	0.4%	134	0.3%	709	1.5%	1,048	2.2%
		60-98																					0	0.0%	23	0.0%	8	0.0%	277	0.6%	308	0.7%
		Total																					15,219	32.3%	5,022	10.7%	5,196	11.0%	21,691	46.0%	47,128	100.0%
	Recipients																						6,682	11.4%	607	1.0%	3,636	6.2%	312	0.5%	11,237	19.3%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						15,219	26.1%	5,022	8.6%	5,196	8.9%	21,691	37.2%	47,128	80.7%
	Total																						21,901	37.5%	5,629	9.6%	8,832	15.1%	22,003	37.7%	58,365	100.0%
September Competition	Recipients	19 and under	33	13.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	33	13.9%	1,428	13.0%	11	0.1%	116	1.1%	102	0.9%	1,657	15.0%	1,461	13.0%	11	0.1%	116	1.0%	102	0.9%	1,690	15.0%
		20-23	49	20.7%	1	0.4%	5	2.1%	0	0.0%	55	23.2%	2,801	25.4%	86	0.8%	918	8.3%	123	1.1%	3,928	35.6%	2,850	25.3%	87	0.8%	923	8.2%	123	1.1%	3,983	35.4%
		24-29	0	0.0%	8	3.4%	18	7.6%	0	0.0%	26	11.0%	0	0.0%	156	1.4%	1,408	12.8%	54	0.5%	1,618	14.7%	0	0.0%	164	1.5%	1,426	12.7%	54	0.5%	1,644	14.6%
		30-34	0	0.0%	9	3.8%	23	9.7%	0	0.0%	32	13.5%	0	0.0%	181	1.6%	943	8.6%	24	0.2%	1,148	10.4%	0	0.0%	190	1.7%	966	8.6%	24	0.2%	1,180	10.5%
		35-39	0	0.0%	14	5.9%	19	8.0%	0	0.0%	33	13.9%	0	0.0%	206	1.9%	785	7.1%	7	0.1%	998	9.1%	0	0.0%	220	2.0%	804	7.1%	7	0.1%	1,031	9.2%
		40-49	0	0.0%	10	4.2%	36	15.2%	0	0.0%	46	19.4%	0	0.0%	305	2.8%	1,017	9.2%	18	0.2%	1,340	12.2%	0	0.0%	315	2.8%	1,053	9.3%	18	0.2%	1,386	12.3%
		50-59	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	11	4.6%	0	0.0%	12	5.1%	0	0.0%	92	0.8%	202	1.8%	13	0.1%	307	2.8%	0	0.0%	93	0.8%	213	1.9%	13	0.1%	319	2.8%
		60-98	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	0.1%	13	0.1%	6	0.1%	30	0.3%	0	0.0%	11	0.1%	13	0.1%	6	0.1%	30	0.3%
		Total	82	34.6%	43	18.1%	112	47.3%	0	0.0%	237	100.0%	4,229	38.4%	1,048	9.5%	5,402	49.0%	347	3.1%	11,026	100.0%	4,311	38.3%	1,091	9.7%	5,514	49.0%	347	3.1%	11,263	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					3,296	11.4%	21	0.1%	108	0.4%	210	0.7%	3,635	12.6%
		20-23																					5,826	20.2%	551	1.9%	993	3.4%	971	3.4%	8,341	28.9%
		24-29																					0	0.0%	1,245	4.3%	1,608	5.6%	5,651	19.6%	8,504	29.4%
		30-34																					0	0.0%	841	2.9%	846	2.9%	1,322	4.6%	3,009	10.4%
		35-39																					0	0.0%	601	2.1%	596	2.1%	769	2.7%	1,966	6.8%
		40-49																					0	0.0%	736	2.5%	650	2.2%	1,088	3.8%	2,474	8.6%
		50-59																					0	0.0%	173	0.6%	113	0.4%	542	1.9%	828	2.9%
		60-98																					0	0.0%	11	0.0%	7	0.0%	129	0.4%	147	0.5%
		Total																					9,122	31.6%	4,179	14.5%	4,921	17.0%	10,682	37.0%	28,904	100.0%
	Recipients																						4,311	10.7%	1,091	2.7%	5,514	13.7%	347	0.9%	11,263	28.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						9,122	22.7%	4,179	10.4%	4,921	12.3%	10,682	26.6%	28,904	72.0%
	Total																						13,433	33.4%	5,270	13.1%	10,435	26.0%	11,029	27.5%	40,167	100.0%

TABLE 3 - AWARD YEAR 2002-03
MARCH AND SEPTEMBER COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, AGE, AND DEPENDENCY STATUS

CAL GRANT A AND B RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
December 31, 2002

		Age	Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total	
					With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents			
					Married		Single								Married		Single								Married		Single					
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
March Competition	Recipients	19 and under	17	2.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	19	2.4%	140	1.2%	0	0.0%	14	0.1%	6	0.1%	160	1.4%	157	1.3%	1	0.0%	14	0.1%	7	0.1%	179	1.5%
		20-23	180	22.3%	6	0.7%	40	5.0%	7	0.9%	233	28.9%	2,240	19.7%	50	0.4%	760	6.7%	153	1.3%	3,203	28.1%	2,420	19.8%	56	0.5%	800	6.6%	160	1.3%	3,436	28.2%
		24-29	0	0.0%	19	2.4%	118	14.6%	26	3.2%	163	20.2%	0	0.0%	165	1.4%	1,990	17.5%	555	4.9%	2,710	23.8%	0	0.0%	184	1.5%	2,108	17.3%	581	4.8%	2,873	23.5%
		30-34	0	0.0%	26	3.2%	88	10.9%	9	1.1%	123	15.2%	0	0.0%	228	2.0%	1,156	10.1%	295	2.6%	1,679	14.7%	0	0.0%	254	2.1%	1,244	10.2%	304	2.5%	1,802	14.8%
		35-39	0	0.0%	17	2.1%	68	8.4%	3	0.4%	88	10.9%	0	0.0%	195	1.7%	910	8.0%	159	1.4%	1,264	11.1%	0	0.0%	212	1.7%	978	8.0%	162	1.3%	1,352	11.1%
		40-49	0	0.0%	24	3.0%	116	14.4%	7	0.9%	147	18.2%	0	0.0%	287	2.5%	1,279	11.2%	250	2.2%	1,816	15.9%	0	0.0%	311	2.5%	1,395	11.4%	257	2.1%	1,963	16.1%
		50-59	0	0.0%	4	0.5%	27	3.3%	1	0.1%	32	4.0%	0	0.0%	106	0.9%	254	2.2%	124	1.1%	484	4.2%	0	0.0%	110	0.9%	281	2.3%	125	1.0%	516	4.2%
		60-84	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	10	0.1%	19	0.2%	53	0.5%	82	0.7%	0	0.0%	10	0.1%	20	0.2%	54	0.4%	84	0.7%
		Total	197	24.4%	97	12.0%	458	56.8%	55	6.8%	807	100.0%	2,380	20.9%	1,041	9.1%	6,382	56.0%	1,595	14.0%	11,398	100.0%	2,577	21.1%	1,138	9.3%	6,840	56.0%	1,650	13.5%	12,205	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					2,457	3.6%	18	0.0%	63	0.1%	106	0.2%	2,644	3.9%
		20-23																					18,533	27.3%	820	1.2%	1,561	2.3%	1,867	2.7%	22,781	33.5%
		24-29																					0	0.0%	2,243	3.3%	2,294	3.4%	21,421	31.5%	25,958	38.2%
		30-34																					0	0.0%	1,495	2.2%	1,144	1.7%	4,169	6.1%	6,808	10.0%
		35-39																					0	0.0%	1,021	1.5%	715	1.1%	1,779	2.6%	3,515	5.2%
		40-49																					0	0.0%	1,282	1.9%	850	1.3%	2,266	3.3%	4,398	6.5%
		50-59																					0	0.0%	303	0.4%	168	0.2%	1,006	1.5%	1,477	2.2%
		60-84																					0	0.0%	30	0.0%	10	0.0%	309	0.5%	349	0.5%
		Total																					20,990	30.9%	7,212	10.6%	6,805	10.0%	32,923	48.5%	67,930	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,577	3.2%	1,138	1.4%	6,840	8.5%	1,650	2.1%	12,205	15.2%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						20,990	26.2%	7,212	9.0%	6,805	8.5%	32,923	41.1%	67,930	84.8%
	Total																						23,567	29.4%	8,350	10.4%	13,645	17.0%	34,573	43.1%	80,135	100.0%
September Competition	Recipients	19 and under	12	3.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	3.9%	926	8.1%	1	0.0%	66	0.6%	54	0.5%	1,047	9.2%	938	8.0%	1	0.0%	66	0.6%	54	0.5%	1,059	9.1%
		20-23	47	15.2%	0	0.0%	2	0.6%	0	0.0%	49	15.8%	1,825	16.1%	48	0.4%	815	7.2%	91	0.8%	2,779	24.5%	1,872	16.0%	48	0.4%	817	7.0%	91	0.8%	2,828	24.2%
		24-29	0	0.0%	6	1.9%	49	15.8%	0	0.0%	55	17.7%	0	0.0%	231	2.0%	1,818	16.0%	293	2.6%	2,342	20.6%	0	0.0%	237	2.0%	1,867	16.0%	293	2.5%	2,397	20.5%
		30-34	0	0.0%	19	6.1%	45	14.5%	1	0.3%	65	21.0%	0	0.0%	254	2.2%	1,209	10.6%	153	1.3%	1,616	14.2%	0	0.0%	273	2.3%	1,254	10.7%	154	1.3%	1,681	14.4%
		35-39	0	0.0%	14	4.5%	23	7.4%	0	0.0%	37	11.9%	0	0.0%	235	2.1%	942	8.3%	118	1.0%	1,295	11.4%	0	0.0%	249	2.1%	965	8.3%	118	1.0%	1,332	11.4%
		40-49	0	0.0%	20	6.5%	54	17.4%	0	0.0%	74	23.9%	0	0.0%	355	3.1%	1,223	10.8%	187	1.6%	1,765	15.5%	0	0.0%	375	3.2%	1,277	10.9%	187	1.6%	1,839	15.8%
		50-59	0	0.0%	3	1.0%	15	4.8%	0	0.0%	18	5.8%	0	0.0%	79	0.7%	262	2.3%	102	0.9%	443	3.9%	0	0.0%	82	0.7%	277	2.4%	102	0.9%	461	3.9%
		60-84	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	0.1%	29	0.3%	36	0.3%	76	0.7%	0	0.0%	11	0.1%	29	0.2%	36	0.3%	76	0.7%
		Total	59	19.0%	62	20.0%	188	60.6%	1	0.3%	310	100.0%	2,751	24.2%	1,214	10.7%	6,364	56.0%	1,034	9.1%	11,363	100.0%	2,810	24.1%	1,276	10.9%	6,552	56.1%	1,035	8.9%	11,673	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					3,752	9.5%	36	0.1%	122	0.3%	242	0.6%	4,152	10.5%
		20-23																					9,541	24.1%	714	1.8%	1,571	4.0%	1,497	3.8%	13,323	33.6%
		24-29																					0	0.0%	1,664	4.2%	1,918	4.8%	8,159	20.6%	11,741	29.6%
		30-34																					0	0.0%	1,118	2.8%	858	2.2%	1,915	4.8%	3,891	9.8%
		35-39																					0	0.0%	842	2.1%	581	1.5%	987	2.5%	2,410	6.1%
		40-49																					0	0.0%	937	2.4%	603	1.5%	1,378	3.5%	2,918	7.4%
		50-59																					0	0.0%	204	0.5%	99	0.2%	678	1.7%	981	2.5%
		60-84																					0	0.0%	32	0.1%	6	0.0%	202	0.5%	240	0.6%
		Total																					13,293	33.5%	5,547	14.0%	5,758	14.5%	15,058	38.0%	39,656	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,810	5.5%	1,276	2.5%	6,552	12.8%	1,035	2.0%	11,673	22.7%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						13,293	25.9%	5,547	10.8%	5,758	11.2%	15,058	29.3%	39,656	77.3%
	Total																						16,103	31.4%	6,823	13.3%	12,310	24.0%	16,093	31.4%	51,329	100.0%

TABLE 3 - AWARD YEAR 2003-04
MARCH AND SEPTEMBER COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, AGE, AND DEPENDENCY STATUS

CAL GRANT A AND B RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
December 31, 2003

		Age	Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total	
					With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents			
					Married		Single								Married		Single								Married		Single					
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
March Competition	Recipients	19 and under	10	1.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	1.2%	127	1.2%	0	0.0%	14	0.1%	17	0.2%	158	1.5%	137	1.2%	1	0.0%	14	0.1%	17	0.1%	169	1.5%
		20-23	151	16.2%	5	0.5%	53	5.7%	5	0.5%	214	23.0%	1,966	18.6%	54	0.5%	741	7.0%	135	1.3%	2,896	27.4%	2,117	18.4%	59	0.5%	794	6.9%	140	1.2%	3,110	27.0%
		24-29	0	0.0%	43	4.6%	140	15.1%	23	2.5%	206	22.2%	0	0.0%	199	1.9%	1,822	17.2%	535	5.1%	2,556	24.2%	0	0.0%	242	2.1%	1,962	17.1%	558	4.9%	2,762	24.0%
		30-34	0	0.0%	27	2.9%	94	10.1%	17	1.8%	138	14.8%	0	0.0%	224	2.1%	1,123	10.6%	243	2.3%	1,590	15.0%	0	0.0%	251	2.2%	1,217	10.6%	260	2.3%	1,728	15.0%
		35-39	0	0.0%	20	2.2%	105	11.3%	6	0.6%	131	14.1%	0	0.0%	199	1.9%	786	7.4%	114	1.1%	1,099	10.4%	0	0.0%	219	1.9%	891	7.7%	120	1.0%	1,230	10.7%
		40-49	0	0.0%	34	3.7%	135	14.5%	17	1.8%	186	20.0%	0	0.0%	268	2.5%	1,184	11.2%	238	2.3%	1,690	16.0%	0	0.0%	302	2.6%	1,319	11.5%	255	2.2%	1,876	16.3%
		50-59	0	0.0%	5	0.5%	33	3.5%	5	0.5%	43	4.6%	0	0.0%	90	0.9%	273	2.6%	134	1.3%	497	4.7%	0	0.0%	95	0.8%	306	2.7%	139	1.2%	540	4.7%
		60-84	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	9	0.1%	24	0.2%	50	0.5%	83	0.8%	0	0.0%	9	0.1%	25	0.2%	50	0.4%	84	0.7%
		Total	161	17.3%	135	14.5%	561	60.3%	73	7.8%	930	100.0%	2,093	19.8%	1,043	9.9%	5,967	56.5%	1,466	13.9%	10,569	100.0%	2,254	19.6%	1,178	10.2%	6,528	56.8%	1,539	13.4%	11,499	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					2,348	3.4%	13	0.0%	61	0.1%	110	0.2%	2,532	3.6%
		20-23																					17,676	25.2%	932	1.3%	1,579	2.3%	1,918	2.7%	22,105	31.6%
		24-29																					0	0.0%	2,395	3.4%	2,499	3.6%	22,934	32.7%	27,828	39.7%
		30-34																					0	0.0%	1,566	2.2%	1,148	1.6%	4,314	6.2%	7,028	10.0%
		35-39																					0	0.0%	1,213	1.7%	768	1.1%	1,888	2.7%	3,869	5.5%
		40-49																					0	0.0%	1,467	2.1%	896	1.3%	2,289	3.3%	4,652	6.6%
		50-59																					0	0.0%	355	0.5%	172	0.2%	1,123	1.6%	1,650	2.4%
		60-84																					0	0.0%	30	0.0%	3	0.0%	346	0.5%	379	0.5%
		Total																					20,024	28.6%	7,971	11.4%	7,126	10.2%	34,922	49.9%	70,043	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,254	2.8%	1,178	1.4%	6,528	8.0%	1,539	1.9%	11,499	14.1%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						20,024	24.6%	7,971	9.8%	7,126	8.7%	34,922	42.8%	70,043	85.9%
	Total																						22,278	27.3%	9,149	11.2%	13,654	16.7%	36,461	44.7%	81,542	100.0%
September Competition	Recipients	19 and under	28	9.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	28	9.2%	837	7.9%	4	0.0%	75	0.7%	53	0.5%	969	9.2%	865	7.9%	4	0.0%	75	0.7%	53	0.5%	997	9.2%
		20-23	30	9.8%	1	0.3%	2	0.7%	0	0.0%	33	10.8%	1,552	14.7%	36	0.3%	767	7.2%	102	1.0%	2,457	23.2%	1,582	14.5%	37	0.3%	769	7.1%	102	0.9%	2,490	22.9%
		24-29	0	0.0%	7	2.3%	47	15.4%	1	0.3%	55	18.0%	0	0.0%	205	1.9%	1,891	17.9%	294	2.8%	2,390	22.6%	0	0.0%	212	1.9%	1,938	17.8%	295	2.7%	2,445	22.4%
		30-34	0	0.0%	8	2.6%	34	11.1%	0	0.0%	42	13.8%	0	0.0%	242	2.3%	1,142	10.8%	144	1.4%	1,528	14.4%	0	0.0%	250	2.3%	1,176	10.8%	144	1.3%	1,570	14.4%
		35-39	0	0.0%	15	4.9%	34	11.1%	0	0.0%	49	16.1%	0	0.0%	214	2.0%	836	7.9%	96	0.9%	1,146	10.8%	0	0.0%	229	2.1%	870	8.0%	96	0.9%	1,195	11.0%
		40-49	0	0.0%	13	4.3%	64	21.0%	0	0.0%	77	25.2%	0	0.0%	298	2.8%	1,167	11.0%	169	1.6%	1,634	15.4%	0	0.0%	311	2.9%	1,231	11.3%	169	1.6%	1,711	15.7%
		50-59	0	0.0%	5	1.6%	15	4.9%	0	0.0%	20	6.6%	0	0.0%	78	0.7%	237	2.2%	94	0.9%	409	3.9%	0	0.0%	83	0.8%	252	2.3%	94	0.9%	429	3.9%
		60-84	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	9	0.1%	17	0.2%	28	0.3%	54	0.5%	0	0.0%	10	0.1%	17	0.2%	28	0.3%	55	0.5%
		Total	58	19.0%	50	16.4%	196	64.3%	1	0.3%	305	100.0%	2,389	22.6%	1,086	10.3%	6,132	57.9%	980	9.3%	10,587	100.0%	2,447	22.5%	1,136	10.4%	6,328	58.1%	981	9.0%	10,892	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					4,220	9.6%	32	0.1%	141	0.3%	245	0.6%	4,638	10.6%
		20-23																					10,704	24.5%	776	1.8%	1,658	3.8%	1,451	3.3%	14,589	33.3%
		24-29																					0	0.0%	1,889	4.3%	2,112	4.8%	9,100	20.8%	13,101	29.9%
		30-34																					0	0.0%	1,220	2.8%	1,047	2.4%	2,027	4.6%	4,294	9.8%
		35-39																					0	0.0%	923	2.1%	649	1.5%	1,019	2.3%	2,591	5.9%
		40-49																					0	0.0%	1,053	2.4%	672	1.5%	1,489	3.4%	3,214	7.3%
		50-59																					0	0.0%	224	0.5%	128	0.3%	782	1.8%	1,134	2.6%
		60-84																					0	0.0%	27	0.1%	7	0.0%	174	0.4%	208	0.5%
		Total																					14,924	34.1%	6,144	14.0%	6,414	14.7%	16,287	37.2%	43,769	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,447	4.5%	1,136	2.1%	6,328	11.6%	981	1.8%	10,892	19.9%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						14,924	27.3%	6,144	11.2%	6,414	11.7%	16,287	29.8%	43,769	80.1%
	Total																						17,371	31.8%	7,280	13.3%	12,742	23.3%	17,268	31.6%	54,661	100.0%

TABLE 3 - AWARD YEAR 2004-05
COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, AGE, AND DEPENDENCY STATUS

CAL GRANT A AND B RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
December 31, 2004

			Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total	
					With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents			
					Married		Single								Married		Single								Married		Single					
		Age	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
March Competition	Recipients	19 and under	20	2.1%	0	0.0%	3	0.3%	0	0.0%	23	2.4%	150	1.4%	1	0.0%	17	0.2%	12	0.1%	180	1.7%	170	1.5%	1	0.0%	20	0.2%	12	0.1%	203	1.8%
		20-23	157	16.2%	6	0.6%	50	5.1%	6	0.6%	219	22.5%	1,978	18.9%	42	0.4%	758	7.2%	157	1.5%	2,935	28.1%	2,135	18.7%	48	0.4%	808	7.1%	163	1.4%	3,154	27.6%
		24-29	0	0.0%	33	3.4%	172	17.7%	37	3.8%	242	24.9%	0	0.0%	199	1.9%	1,906	18.2%	504	4.8%	2,609	24.9%	0	0.0%	232	2.0%	2,078	18.2%	541	4.7%	2,851	24.9%
		30-34	0	0.0%	17	1.7%	111	11.4%	13	1.3%	141	14.5%	0	0.0%	205	2.0%	1,117	10.7%	190	1.8%	1,512	14.5%	0	0.0%	222	1.9%	1,228	10.7%	203	1.8%	1,653	14.5%
		35-39	0	0.0%	30	3.1%	98	10.1%	6	0.6%	134	13.8%	0	0.0%	181	1.7%	813	7.8%	129	1.2%	1,123	10.7%	0	0.0%	211	1.8%	911	8.0%	135	1.2%	1,257	11.0%
		40-49	0	0.0%	26	2.7%	133	13.7%	8	0.8%	167	17.2%	0	0.0%	284	2.7%	1,109	10.6%	186	1.8%	1,579	15.1%	0	0.0%	310	2.7%	1,242	10.9%	194	1.7%	1,746	15.3%
		50-59	0	0.0%	6	0.6%	35	3.6%	2	0.2%	43	4.4%	0	0.0%	98	0.9%	236	2.3%	119	1.1%	453	4.3%	0	0.0%	104	0.9%	271	2.4%	121	1.1%	496	4.3%
		60-84	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	1	0.1%	3	0.3%	0	0.0%	12	0.1%	18	0.2%	37	0.4%	67	0.6%	0	0.0%	12	0.1%	20	0.2%	38	0.3%	70	0.6%
		Total	177	18.2%	118	12.1%	604	62.1%	73	7.5%	972	100.0%	2,128	20.3%	1,022	9.8%	5,974	57.1%	1,334	12.8%	10,458	100.0%	2,305	20.2%	1,140	10.0%	6,578	57.6%	1,407	12.3%	11,430	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					2,717	3.8%	15	0.0%	69	0.1%	111	0.2%	2,912	4.1%
		20-23																					16,046	22.5%	871	1.2%	1,611	2.3%	1,762	2.5%	20,290	28.5%
		24-29																					0	0.0%	2,600	3.6%	2,652	3.7%	24,657	34.6%	29,909	41.9%
		30-34																					0	0.0%	1,632	2.3%	1,155	1.6%	4,473	6.3%	7,260	10.2%
		35-39																					0	0.0%	1,118	1.6%	780	1.1%	1,976	2.8%	3,874	5.4%
		40-49																					0	0.0%	1,493	2.1%	877	1.2%	2,437	3.4%	4,807	6.7%
		50-59																					0	0.0%	382	0.5%	167	0.2%	1,260	1.8%	1,809	2.5%
		60-84																					0	0.0%	33	0.0%	5	0.0%	399	0.6%	437	0.6%
		Total																					18,763	26.3%	8,144	11.4%	7,316	10.3%	37,075	52.0%	71,298	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,305	2.8%	1,140	1.4%	6,578	8.0%	1,407	1.7%	11,430	13.8%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						18,763	22.7%	8,144	9.8%	7,316	8.8%	37,075	44.8%	71,298	86.2%
	Total																						21,068	25.5%	9,284	11.2%	13,894	16.8%	38,482	46.5%	82,728	100.0%
September Competition	Recipients	19 and under	23	5.9%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	24	6.1%	1,023	9.2%	1	0.0%	85	0.8%	72	0.6%	1,181	10.7%	1,046	9.1%	1	0.0%	86	0.7%	72	0.6%	1,205	10.5%
		20-23	50	12.8%	0	0.0%	2	0.5%	0	0.0%	52	13.3%	1,677	15.1%	32	0.3%	751	6.8%	117	1.1%	2,577	23.3%	1,727	15.1%	32	0.3%	753	6.6%	117	1.0%	2,629	22.9%
		24-29	0	0.0%	10	2.6%	53	13.6%	2	0.5%	65	16.6%	0	0.0%	229	2.1%	1,890	17.1%	303	2.7%	2,422	21.9%	0	0.0%	239	2.1%	1,943	16.9%	305	2.7%	2,487	21.7%
		30-34	0	0.0%	17	4.3%	55	14.1%	2	0.5%	74	18.9%	0	0.0%	233	2.1%	1,080	9.7%	141	1.3%	1,454	13.1%	0	0.0%	250	2.2%	1,135	9.9%	143	1.2%	1,528	13.3%
		35-39	0	0.0%	17	4.3%	50	12.8%	1	0.3%	68	17.4%	0	0.0%	242	2.2%	845	7.6%	93	0.8%	1,180	10.6%	0	0.0%	259	2.3%	895	7.8%	94	0.8%	1,248	10.9%
		40-49	0	0.0%	14	3.6%	71	18.2%	0	0.0%	85	21.7%	0	0.0%	345	3.1%	1,131	10.2%	156	1.4%	1,632	14.7%	0	0.0%	359	3.1%	1,202	10.5%	156	1.4%	1,717	15.0%
		50-59	0	0.0%	5	1.3%	18	4.6%	0	0.0%	23	5.9%	0	0.0%	100	0.9%	332	3.0%	115	1.0%	547	4.9%	0	0.0%	105	0.9%	350	3.1%	115	1.0%	570	5.0%
		60-84	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	16	0.1%	18	0.2%	54	0.5%	88	0.8%	0	0.0%	16	0.1%	18	0.2%	54	0.5%	88	0.8%
		Total	73	18.7%	63	16.1%	250	63.9%	5	1.3%	391	100.0%	2,700	24.4%	1,198	10.8%	6,132	55.3%	1,051	9.5%	11,081	100.0%	2,773	24.2%	1,261	11.0%	6,382	55.6%	1,056	9.2%	11,472	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					4,670	10.2%	31	0.1%	143	0.3%	278	0.6%	5,122	11.2%
		20-23																					10,625	23.1%	798	1.7%	1,668	3.6%	1,577	3.4%	14,668	31.9%
		24-29																					0	0.0%	1,997	4.3%	2,293	5.0%	10,072	21.9%	14,362	31.3%
		30-34																					0	0.0%	1,244	2.7%	1,016	2.2%	2,056	4.5%	4,316	9.4%
		35-39																					0	0.0%	1,000	2.2%	622	1.4%	1,011	2.2%	2,633	5.7%
		40-49																					0	0.0%	1,120	2.4%	659	1.4%	1,551	3.4%	3,330	7.3%
		50-59																					0	0.0%	237	0.5%	146	0.3%	836	1.8%	1,219	2.7%
		60-84																					0	0.0%	19	0.0%	11	0.0%	238	0.5%	268	0.6%
		Total																					15,295	33.3%	6,446	14.0%	6,558	14.3%	17,619	38.4%	45,918	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,773	4.8%	1,261	2.2%	6,382	11.1%	1,056	1.8%	11,472	20.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						15,295	26.7%	6,446	11.2%	6,558	11.4%	17,619	30.7%	45,918	80.0%
	Total																						18,068	31.5%	7,707	13.4%	12,940	22.5%	18,675	32.5%	57,390	100.0%

TABLE 3 - AWARD YEAR 2005-06
COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, AGE, AND DEPENDENCY STATUS

CAL GRANT A AND B RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
January 3, 2006

			Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total	
					With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents			
					Married		Single								Married		Single								Married		Single					
		Age	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
March Competition	Recipients	19 and under	20	1.9%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	23	2.2%	162	1.6%	2	0.0%	13	0.1%	11	0.1%	188	1.8%	182	1.6%	2	0.0%	14	0.1%	13	0.1%	211	1.8%
		20-23	164	15.4%	10	0.9%	60	5.6%	11	1.0%	245	23.0%	1,728	16.6%	67	0.6%	692	6.6%	152	1.5%	2,639	25.4%	1,892	16.5%	77	0.7%	752	6.6%	163	1.4%	2,884	25.1%
		24-29	0	0.0%	70	6.6%	167	15.7%	43	4.0%	280	26.2%	0	0.0%	456	4.4%	1,883	18.1%	623	6.0%	2,962	28.5%	0	0.0%	526	4.6%	2,050	17.9%	666	5.8%	3,242	28.3%
		30-34	0	0.0%	40	3.7%	103	9.7%	10	0.9%	153	14.3%	0	0.0%	381	3.7%	896	8.6%	219	2.1%	1,496	14.4%	0	0.0%	421	3.7%	999	8.7%	229	2.0%	1,649	14.4%
		35-39	0	0.0%	40	3.7%	87	8.2%	6	0.6%	133	12.5%	0	0.0%	342	3.3%	632	6.1%	141	1.4%	1,115	10.7%	0	0.0%	382	3.3%	719	6.3%	147	1.3%	1,248	10.9%
		40-49	0	0.0%	41	3.8%	123	11.5%	13	1.2%	177	16.6%	0	0.0%	434	4.2%	856	8.2%	196	1.9%	1,486	14.3%	0	0.0%	475	4.1%	979	8.5%	209	1.8%	1,663	14.5%
		50-59	0	0.0%	7	0.7%	43	4.0%	4	0.4%	54	5.1%	0	0.0%	120	1.2%	208	2.0%	130	1.2%	458	4.4%	0	0.0%	127	1.1%	251	2.2%	134	1.2%	512	4.5%
		60-84	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	13	0.1%	14	0.1%	37	0.4%	64	0.6%	0	0.0%	13	0.1%	16	0.1%	37	0.3%	66	0.6%
		Total	184	17.2%	208	19.5%	586	54.9%	89	8.3%	1,067	100.0%	1,890	18.2%	1,815	17.4%	5,194	49.9%	1,509	14.5%	10,408	100.0%	2,074	18.1%	2,023	17.6%	5,780	50.4%	1,598	13.9%	11,475	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					338	0.9%	4	0.0%	9	0.0%	17	0.0%	368	0.9%
		20-23																					7,428	19.0%	308	0.8%	470	1.2%	885	2.3%	9,091	23.2%
		24-29																						0.0%	1,475	3.8%	1,210	3.1%	17,922	45.8%	20,607	52.7%
		30-34																						0.0%	930	2.4%	493	1.3%	2,746	7.0%	4,169	10.7%
		35-39																						0.0%	584	1.5%	287	0.7%	1,086	2.8%	1,957	5.0%
		40-49																						0.0%	710	1.8%	348	0.9%	1,031	2.6%	2,089	5.3%
		50-59																						0.0%	173	0.4%	81	0.2%	506	1.3%	760	1.9%
		60-84																						0.0%	9	0.0%	5	0.0%	82	0.2%	96	0.2%
		Total																					7,766	19.8%	4,193	10.7%	2,903	7.4%	24,275	62.0%	39,137	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,074	4.1%	2,023	4.0%	5,780	11.4%	1,598	3.2%	11,475	22.7%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						7,766	15.3%	4,193	8.3%	2,903	5.7%	24,275	48.0%	39,137	77.3%
	Total																						9,840	19.4%	6,216	12.3%	8,683	17.2%	25,873	51.1%	50,612	100.0%

TABLE 3 - AWARD YEAR 2006-07
COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, AGE, AND DEPENDENCY STATUS

CAL GRANT A AND B RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
Febraury 13, 2007

		Age	Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total	
					With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents			
					Married		Single								Married		Single								Married		Single					
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
March Competition	Recipients	19 and under	24	2.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	25	2.1%	188	1.6%	1	0.0%	21	0.2%	10	0.1%	220	1.9%	212	1.7%	1	0.0%	22	0.2%	10	0.1%	245	1.9%
		20-23	208	17.4%	10	0.8%	54	4.5%	6	0.5%	278	23.3%	1,933	16.8%	38	0.3%	729	6.3%	178	1.6%	2,878	25.1%	2,141	16.9%	48	0.4%	783	6.2%	184	1.5%	3,156	24.9%
		24-29	0	0.0%	54	4.5%	188	15.8%	40	3.4%	282	23.6%	0	0.0%	247	2.2%	2,389	20.8%	697	6.1%	3,333	29.0%	0	0.0%	301	2.4%	2,577	20.3%	737	5.8%	3,615	28.5%
		30-34	0	0.0%	29	2.4%	140	11.7%	13	1.1%	182	15.3%	0	0.0%	195	1.7%	1,222	10.6%	213	1.9%	1,630	14.2%	0	0.0%	224	1.8%	1,362	10.7%	226	1.8%	1,812	14.3%
		35-39	0	0.0%	26	2.2%	120	10.1%	6	0.5%	152	12.7%	0	0.0%	185	1.6%	920	8.0%	143	1.2%	1,248	10.9%	0	0.0%	211	1.7%	1,040	8.2%	149	1.2%	1,400	11.0%
		40-49	0	0.0%	36	3.0%	176	14.8%	5	0.4%	217	18.2%	0	0.0%	265	2.3%	1,108	9.7%	195	1.7%	1,568	13.7%	0	0.0%	301	2.4%	1,284	10.1%	200	1.6%	1,785	14.1%
		50-59	0	0.0%	6	0.5%	49	4.1%	0	0.0%	55	4.6%	0	0.0%	101	0.9%	287	2.5%	140	1.2%	528	4.6%	0	0.0%	107	0.8%	336	2.7%	140	1.1%	583	4.6%
		60-84	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	12	0.1%	21	0.2%	43	0.4%	76	0.7%	0	0.0%	12	0.1%	22	0.2%	44	0.3%	78	0.6%
		Total	232	19.4%	161	13.5%	729	61.1%	71	6.0%	1,193	100.0%	2,121	18.5%	1,044	9.1%	6,697	58.3%	1,619	14.1%	11,481	100.0%	2,353	18.6%	1,205	9.5%	7,426	58.6%	1,690	13.3%	12,674	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					397	0.9%	1	0.0%	6	0.0%	22	0.1%	426	1.0%
		20-23																					8,292	19.6%	297	0.7%	469	1.1%	930	2.2%	9,988	23.6%
		24-29																					0	0.0%	1,505	3.6%	1,324	3.1%	19,106	45.2%	21,935	51.9%
		30-34																					0	0.0%	948	2.2%	591	1.4%	2,928	6.9%	4,467	10.6%
		35-39																					0	0.0%	629	1.5%	404	1.0%	1,209	2.9%	2,242	5.3%
		40-49																					0	0.0%	664	1.6%	460	1.1%	1,123	2.7%	2,247	5.3%
		50-59																					0	0.0%	200	0.5%	113	0.3%	526	1.2%	839	2.0%
		60-84																					0	0.0%	7	0.0%	4	0.0%	113	0.3%	124	0.3%
		Total																					8,689	20.6%	4,251	10.1%	3,371	8.0%	25,957	61.4%	42,268	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,353	4.3%	1,205	2.2%	7,426	13.5%	1,690	3.1%	12,674	23.1%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						8,689	15.8%	4,251	7.7%	3,371	6.1%	25,957	47.2%	42,268	76.9%
	Total																						11,042	20.1%	5,456	9.9%	10,797	19.7%	27,647	50.3%	54,942	100.0%

TABLE 3 - AWARD YEAR 2007-08
COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, AGE, AND DEPENDENCY STATUS

CAL GRANT A AND B RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
July 30, 2007

			Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total		Dependents		Independents						Total	
					With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents						With Dependents				No Dependents			
					Married		Single								Married		Single								Married		Single					
		Age	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
March Competition	Recipients	19 and under	25	1.8%	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	2	0.2%	30	2.2%	221	1.9%	1	0.0%	22	0.2%	12	0.1%	256	2.3%	246	1.9%	2	0.0%	24	0.2%	14	0.1%	286	2.2%
		20-23	164	11.7%	12	0.8%	84	6.0%	13	0.9%	272	19.5%	1,958	17.2%	69	0.6%	714	6.3%	152	1.3%	2,893	25.5%	2,122	16.6%	80	0.6%	798	6.3%	165	1.3%	3,165	24.8%
		24-29	0	0.0%	78	5.6%	247	17.6%	67	4.8%	391	28.0%	0	0.0%	492	4.3%	1,943	17.1%	808	7.1%	3,243	28.5%	0	0.0%	570	4.5%	2,190	17.2%	874	6.8%	3,634	28.5%
		30-34	0	0.0%	67	4.8%	164	11.7%	17	1.2%	248	17.7%	0	0.0%	474	4.2%	1,050	9.2%	310	2.7%	1,834	16.1%	0	0.0%	541	4.2%	1,214	9.5%	327	2.6%	2,082	16.3%
		35-39	0	0.0%	66	4.7%	114	8.2%	6	0.5%	186	13.3%	0	0.0%	397	3.5%	745	6.6%	163	1.4%	1,304	11.5%	0	0.0%	462	3.6%	859	6.7%	169	1.3%	1,491	11.7%
		40-49	0	0.0%	74	5.3%	181	12.9%	12	0.8%	267	19.1%	0	0.0%	525	4.6%	926	8.1%	253	2.2%	1,704	15.0%	0	0.0%	599	4.7%	1,107	8.7%	265	2.1%	1,971	15.4%
		50-59	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	5	0.0%	8	0.1%	11	0.1%	25	0.2%	0	0.0%	6	0.1%	9	0.1%	11	0.1%	27	0.2%
		60-84	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	23	0.2%	18	0.2%	66	0.6%	106	0.9%	0	0.0%	24	0.2%	19	0.1%	66	0.5%	109	0.9%
		Total	189	13.5%	299	21.4%	794	56.8%	117	8.4%	1,399	100.0%	2,179	19.2%	1,986	17.5%	5,426	47.7%	1,774	15.6%	11,365	100.0%	2,368	18.6%	2,285	17.9%	6,220	48.7%	1,891	14.8%	12,764	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					1,004	2.0%	4	0.0%	27	0.1%	41	0.1%	1,076	2.1%
		20-23																					12,435	24.3%	500	1.0%	736	1.4%	1,142	2.2%	14,813	29.0%
		24-29																					0	0.0%	2,129	4.2%	1,489	2.9%	17,801	34.8%	21,419	41.9%
		30-34																					0	0.0%	1,613	3.2%	809	1.6%	3,898	7.6%	6,321	12.4%
		35-39																					0	0.0%	1,131	2.2%	634	1.2%	1,599	3.1%	3,364	6.6%
		40-49																					0	0.0%	1,335	2.6%	689	1.3%	1,710	3.3%	3,735	7.3%
		50-59																					0	0.0%	15	0.0%	2	0.0%	54	0.1%	71	0.1%
		60-84																					0	0.0%	37	0.1%	8	0.0%	264	0.5%	309	0.6%
		Total																					13,439	26.3%	6,764	13.2%	4,395	8.6%	26,510	51.9%	51,108	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,368	3.7%	2,285	3.6%	6,220	9.7%	1,891	3.0%	12,764	20.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						13,439	21.0%	6,764	10.6%	4,395	6.9%	26,510	41.5%	51,108	80.0%
	Total																						15,807	24.7%	9,049	14.2%	10,615	16.6%	28,401	44.5%	63,872	100.0%

TABLE 4 - AWARD YEAR 2001-02
MARCH AND SEPTEMBER COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, AGE, AND STUDENT EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

CAL GRANT A AND B RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
December 31, 2001

			Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Student Educational Level										Student Educational Level										Student Educational Level									
		Age	1		2		3		4		Total		1		2		3		4		Total		1		2		3		4		Total	
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
March Competition	Recipients	19 and under	183	20.6%	66	7.4%	6	0.7%	3	0.3%	258	29.0%	1,107	10.7%	526	5.1%	51	0.5%	48	0.5%	1,732	16.7%	1,290	11.5%	592	5.3%	57	0.5%	51	0.5%	1,990	17.7%
		20-23	155	17.4%	64	7.2%	175	19.7%	51	5.7%	445	50.1%	491	4.7%	1,377	13.3%	2,290	22.1%	960	9.3%	5,118	49.5%	646	5.7%	1,441	12.8%	2,465	21.9%	1,011	9.0%	5,563	49.5%
		24-29	26	2.9%	7	0.8%	16	1.8%	3	0.3%	52	5.8%	122	1.2%	324	3.1%	468	4.5%	248	2.4%	1,162	11.2%	148	1.3%	331	2.9%	484	4.3%	251	2.2%	1,214	10.8%
		30-34	17	1.9%	5	0.6%	9	1.0%	5	0.6%	36	4.0%	87	0.8%	207	2.0%	245	2.4%	156	1.5%	695	6.7%	104	0.9%	212	1.9%	254	2.3%	161	1.4%	731	6.5%
		35-39	17	1.9%	11	1.2%	5	0.6%	3	0.3%	36	4.0%	77	0.7%	191	1.8%	162	1.6%	151	1.5%	581	5.6%	94	0.8%	202	1.8%	167	1.5%	154	1.4%	617	5.5%
		40-49	18	2.0%	9	1.0%	17	1.9%	3	0.3%	47	5.3%	105	1.0%	279	2.7%	274	2.6%	201	1.9%	859	8.3%	123	1.1%	288	2.6%	291	2.6%	204	1.8%	906	8.1%
		50-59	6	0.7%	3	0.3%	5	0.6%	1	0.1%	15	1.7%	14	0.1%	62	0.6%	55	0.5%	50	0.5%	181	1.7%	20	0.2%	65	0.6%	60	0.5%	51	0.5%	196	1.7%
		60-84	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.0%	6	0.1%	4	0.0%	7	0.1%	20	0.2%	3	0.0%	6	0.1%	4	0.0%	7	0.1%	20	0.2%
		Total	422	47.5%	165	18.6%	233	26.2%	69	7.8%	889	100.0%	2,006	19.4%	2,972	28.7%	3,549	34.3%	1,821	17.6%	10,348	100.0%	2,428	21.6%	3,137	27.9%	3,782	33.7%	1,890	16.8%	11,237	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					2,580	5.5%	1,613	3.4%	150	0.3%	178	0.4%	4,521	9.6%
		20-23																					1,595	3.4%	3,663	7.8%	5,687	12.1%	2,769	5.9%	13,714	29.1%
		24-29																					1,600	3.4%	3,855	8.2%	6,398	13.6%	4,972	10.5%	16,825	35.7%
		30-34																					694	1.5%	1,287	2.7%	1,518	3.2%	1,232	2.6%	4,731	10.0%
		35-39																					418	0.9%	833	1.8%	784	1.7%	640	1.4%	2,675	5.7%
		40-49																					568	1.2%	1,080	2.3%	867	1.8%	791	1.7%	3,306	7.0%
		50-59																					213	0.5%	322	0.7%	266	0.6%	247	0.5%	1,048	2.2%
		60-84																					59	0.1%	107	0.2%	53	0.1%	89	0.2%	308	0.7%
		Total																					7,727	16.4%	12,760	27.1%	15,723	33.4%	10,918	23.2%	47,128	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,428	4.2%	3,137	5.4%	3,782	6.5%	1,890	3.2%	11,237	19.3%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						7,727	13.2%	12,760	21.9%	15,723	26.9%	10,918	18.7%	47,128	80.7%
	Total																						10,155	17.4%	15,897	27.2%	19,505	33.4%	12,808	21.9%	58,365	100.0%
September Competition	Recipients	19 and under	16	6.8%	15	6.3%	0	0.0%	2	0.8%	33	13.9%	1,129	10.2%	470	4.3%	16	0.1%	42	0.4%	1,657	15.0%	1,145	10.2%	485	4.3%	16	0.1%	44	0.4%	1,690	15.0%
		20-23	8	3.4%	21	8.9%	21	8.9%	5	2.1%	55	23.2%	878	8.0%	1,855	16.8%	882	8.0%	313	2.8%	3,928	35.6%	886	7.9%	1,876	16.7%	903	8.0%	318	2.8%	3,983	35.4%
		24-29	9	3.8%	11	4.6%	6	2.5%	0	0.0%	26	11.0%	436	4.0%	758	6.9%	270	2.4%	154	1.4%	1,618	14.7%	445	4.0%	769	6.8%	276	2.5%	154	1.4%	1,644	14.6%
		30-34	5	2.1%	15	6.3%	6	2.5%	6	2.5%	32	13.5%	336	3.0%	530	4.8%	166	1.5%	116	1.1%	1,148	10.4%	341	3.0%	545	4.8%	172	1.5%	122	1.1%	1,180	10.5%
		35-39	10	4.2%	17	7.2%	4	1.7%	2	0.8%	33	13.9%	270	2.4%	431	3.9%	180	1.6%	117	1.1%	998	9.1%	280	2.5%	448	4.0%	184	1.6%	119	1.1%	1,031	9.2%
		40-49	12	5.1%	18	7.6%	12	5.1%	4	1.7%	46	19.4%	362	3.3%	573	5.2%	216	2.0%	189	1.7%	1,340	12.2%	374	3.3%	591	5.2%	228	2.0%	193	1.7%	1,386	12.3%
		50-59	3	1.3%	3	1.3%	4	1.7%	2	0.8%	12	5.1%	83	0.8%	131	1.2%	48	0.4%	45	0.4%	307	2.8%	86	0.8%	134	1.2%	52	0.5%	47	0.4%	319	2.8%
		60-84	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	0.0%	11	0.1%	3	0.0%	11	0.1%	30	0.3%	5	0.0%	11	0.1%	3	0.0%	11	0.1%	30	0.3%
		Total	63	26.6%	100	42.2%	53	22.4%	21	8.9%	237	100.0%	3,499	31.7%	4,759	43.2%	1,781	16.2%	987	9.0%	11,026	100.0%	3,562	31.6%	4,859	43.1%	1,834	16.3%	1,008	8.9%	11,263	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					2,489	8.6%	973	3.4%	51	0.2%	122	0.4%	3,635	12.6%
		20-23																					1,388	4.8%	3,684	12.7%	2,339	8.1%	930	3.2%	8,341	28.9%
		24-29																					1,534	5.3%	3,733	12.9%	2,109	7.3%	1,128	3.9%	8,504	29.4%
		30-34																					707	2.4%	1,267	4.4%	609	2.1%	426	1.5%	3,009	10.4%
		35-39																					544	1.9%	756	2.6%	378	1.3%	288	1.0%	1,966	6.8%
		40-49																					619	2.1%	988	3.4%	470	1.6%	397	1.4%	2,474	8.6%
		50-59																					198	0.7%	338	1.2%	144	0.5%	148	0.5%	828	2.9%
		60-84																					36	0.1%	52	0.2%	23	0.1%	36	0.1%	147	0.5%
		Total																					7,515	26.0%	11,791	40.8%	6,123	21.2%	3,475	12.0%	28,904	100.0%
	Recipients																						3,562	8.9%	4,859	12.1%	1,834	4.6%	1,008	2.5%	11,263	28.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						7,515	18.7%	11,791	29.4%	6,123	15.2%	3,475	8.7%	28,904	72.0%
	Total																						11,077	27.6%	16,650	41.5%	7,957	19.8%	4,483	11.2%	40,167	100.0%

TABLE 4 - AWARD YEAR 2002-03
MARCH AND SEPTEMBER COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, AGE, AND STUDENT EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

CAL GRANT A AND B RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
December 31, 2002

			Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Student Educational Level										Student Educational Level										Student Educational Level									
		Age	1		2		3		4		Total		1		2		3		4		Total		1		2		3		4		Total	
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
March Competition	Recipients	19 and under	15	1.9%	4	0.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	19	2.4%	58	0.5%	71	0.6%	28	0.2%	3	0.0%	160	1.4%	73	0.6%	75	0.6%	28	0.2%	3	0.0%	179	1.5%
		20-23	160	19.8%	31	3.8%	24	3.0%	18	2.2%	233	28.9%	582	5.1%	1,124	9.9%	886	7.8%	611	5.4%	3,203	28.1%	742	6.1%	1,155	9.5%	910	7.5%	629	5.2%	3,436	28.2%
		24-29	102	12.6%	39	4.8%	19	2.4%	3	0.4%	163	20.2%	508	4.5%	1,039	9.1%	654	5.7%	509	4.5%	2,710	23.8%	610	5.0%	1,078	8.8%	673	5.5%	512	4.2%	2,873	23.5%
		30-34	61	7.6%	32	4.0%	23	2.9%	7	0.9%	123	15.2%	309	2.7%	658	5.8%	384	3.4%	328	2.9%	1,679	14.7%	370	3.0%	690	5.7%	407	3.3%	335	2.7%	1,802	14.8%
		35-39	39	4.8%	24	3.0%	15	1.9%	10	1.2%	88	10.9%	246	2.2%	468	4.1%	294	2.6%	256	2.2%	1,264	11.1%	285	2.3%	492	4.0%	309	2.5%	266	2.2%	1,352	11.1%
		40-49	49	6.1%	47	5.8%	32	4.0%	19	2.4%	147	18.2%	358	3.1%	698	6.1%	364	3.2%	396	3.5%	1,816	15.9%	407	3.3%	745	6.1%	396	3.2%	415	3.4%	1,963	16.1%
		50-59	6	0.7%	7	0.9%	11	1.4%	8	1.0%	32	4.0%	73	0.6%	183	1.6%	99	0.9%	129	1.1%	484	4.2%	79	0.6%	190	1.6%	110	0.9%	137	1.1%	516	4.2%
		60-84	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	24	0.2%	28	0.2%	4	0.0%	26	0.2%	82	0.7%	25	0.2%	29	0.2%	4	0.0%	26	0.2%	84	0.7%
		Total	433	53.7%	185	22.9%	124	15.4%	65	8.1%	807	100.0%	2,158	18.9%	4,269	37.5%	2,713	23.8%	2,258	19.8%	11,398	100.0%	2,591	21.2%	4,454	36.5%	2,837	23.2%	2,323	19.0%	12,205	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					1,283	1.9%	1,090	1.6%	141	0.2%	130	0.2%	2,644	3.9%
		20-23																					1,975	2.9%	5,667	8.3%	9,797	14.4%	5,342	7.9%	22,781	33.5%
		24-29																					1,996	2.9%	5,073	7.5%	10,291	15.1%	8,598	12.7%	25,958	38.2%
		30-34																					711	1.0%	1,627	2.4%	2,427	3.6%	2,043	3.0%	6,808	10.0%
		35-39																					473	0.7%	923	1.4%	1,134	1.7%	985	1.5%	3,515	5.2%
		40-49																					602	0.9%	1,173	1.7%	1,446	2.1%	1,177	1.7%	4,398	6.5%
		50-59																					238	0.4%	419	0.6%	425	0.6%	395	0.6%	1,477	2.2%
		60-84																					44	0.1%	116	0.2%	74	0.1%	115	0.2%	349	0.5%
		Total																					7,322	10.8%	16,088	23.7%	25,735	37.9%	18,785	27.7%	67,930	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,591	3.2%	4,454	5.6%	2,837	3.5%	2,323	2.9%	12,205	15.2%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						7,322	9.1%	16,088	20.1%	25,735	32.1%	18,785	23.4%	67,930	84.8%
	Total																						9,913	12.4%	20,542	25.6%	28,572	35.7%	21,108	26.3%	80,135	100.0%
September Competition	Recipients	19 and under	11	3.5%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	12	3.9%	788	6.9%	228	2.0%	15	0.1%	16	0.1%	1,047	9.2%	799	6.8%	229	2.0%	15	0.1%	16	0.1%	1,059	9.1%
		20-23	14	4.5%	21	6.8%	8	2.6%	6	1.9%	49	15.8%	1,013	8.9%	1,278	11.2%	286	2.5%	202	1.8%	2,779	24.5%	1,027	8.8%	1,299	11.1%	294	2.5%	208	1.8%	2,828	24.2%
		24-29	13	4.2%	34	11.0%	6	1.9%	2	0.6%	55	17.7%	881	7.8%	1,075	9.5%	191	1.7%	195	1.7%	2,342	20.6%	894	7.7%	1,109	9.5%	197	1.7%	197	1.7%	2,397	20.5%
		30-34	32	10.3%	25	8.1%	2	0.6%	6	1.9%	65	21.0%	599	5.3%	750	6.6%	126	1.1%	141	1.2%	1,616	14.2%	631	5.4%	775	6.6%	128	1.1%	147	1.3%	1,681	14.4%
		35-39	18	5.8%	15	4.8%	1	0.3%	3	1.0%	37	11.9%	558	4.9%	528	4.6%	94	0.8%	115	1.0%	1,295	11.4%	576	4.9%	543	4.7%	95	0.8%	118	1.0%	1,332	11.4%
		40-49	32	10.3%	31	10.0%	6	1.9%	5	1.6%	74	23.9%	672	5.9%	753	6.6%	159	1.4%	181	1.6%	1,765	15.5%	704	6.0%	784	6.7%	165	1.4%	186	1.6%	1,839	15.8%
		50-59	6	1.9%	9	2.9%	0	0.0%	3	1.0%	18	5.8%	146	1.3%	184	1.6%	50	0.4%	63	0.6%	443	3.9%	152	1.3%	193	1.7%	50	0.4%	66	0.6%	461	3.9%
		60-84	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	24	0.2%	34	0.3%	6	0.1%	12	0.1%	76	0.7%	24	0.2%	34	0.3%	6	0.1%	12	0.1%	76	0.7%
		Total	126	40.6%	136	43.9%	23	7.4%	25	8.1%	310	100.0%	4,681	41.2%	4,830	42.5%	927	8.2%	925	8.1%	11,363	100.0%	4,807	41.2%	4,966	42.5%	950	8.1%	950	8.1%	11,673	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					2,523	6.4%	1,432	3.6%	83	0.2%	114	0.3%	4,152	10.5%
		20-23																					2,017	5.1%	5,857	14.8%	4,067	10.3%	1,382	3.5%	13,323	33.6%
		24-29																					2,074	5.2%	5,161	13.0%	3,152	7.9%	1,354	3.4%	11,741	29.6%
		30-34																					853	2.2%	1,656	4.2%	911	2.3%	471	1.2%	3,891	9.8%
		35-39																					572	1.4%	1,012	2.6%	515	1.3%	311	0.8%	2,410	6.1%
		40-49																					716	1.8%	1,175	3.0%	620	1.6%	407	1.0%	2,918	7.4%
		50-59																					222	0.6%	401	1.0%	201	0.5%	157	0.4%	981	2.5%
		60-84																					61	0.2%	86	0.2%	38	0.1%	55	0.1%	240	0.6%
		Total																					9,038	22.8%	16,780	42.3%	9,587	24.2%	4,251	10.7%	39,656	100.0%
	Recipients																						4,807	9.4%	4,966	9.7%	950	1.9%	950	1.9%	11,673	22.7%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						9,038	17.6%	16,780	32.7%	9,587	18.7%	4,251	8.3%	39,656	77.3%
	Total																						13,845	27.0%	21,746	42.4%	10,537	20.5%	5,201	10.1%	51,329	100.0%

TABLE 4 - AWARD YEAR 2003-04
MARCH AND SEPTEMBER COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, AGE, AND STUDENT EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

CAL GRANT A AND B RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
December 31, 2003

			Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Student Educational Level										Student Educational Level										Student Educational Level									
		Age	1		2		3		4		Total		1		2		3		4		Total		1		2		3		4		Total	
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
March Competition	Recipients	19 and under	10	1.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	11	1.2%	70	0.7%	73	0.7%	7	0.1%	8	0.1%	158	1.5%	80	0.7%	73	0.6%	8	0.1%	8	0.1%	169	1.5%
		20-23	152	16.3%	29	3.1%	15	1.6%	18	1.9%	214	23.0%	485	4.6%	1,353	12.8%	608	5.8%	450	4.3%	2,896	27.4%	637	5.5%	1,382	12.0%	623	5.4%	468	4.1%	3,110	27.0%
		24-29	132	14.2%	49	5.3%	14	1.5%	11	1.2%	206	22.2%	485	4.6%	1,271	12.0%	458	4.3%	342	3.2%	2,556	24.2%	617	5.4%	1,320	11.5%	472	4.1%	353	3.1%	2,762	24.0%
		30-34	83	8.9%	33	3.5%	13	1.4%	9	1.0%	138	14.8%	332	3.1%	804	7.6%	267	2.5%	187	1.8%	1,590	15.0%	415	3.6%	837	7.3%	280	2.4%	196	1.7%	1,728	15.0%
		35-39	65	7.0%	34	3.7%	20	2.2%	12	1.3%	131	14.1%	236	2.2%	586	5.5%	146	1.4%	131	1.2%	1,099	10.4%	301	2.6%	620	5.4%	166	1.4%	143	1.2%	1,230	10.7%
		40-49	92	9.9%	49	5.3%	30	3.2%	15	1.6%	186	20.0%	345	3.3%	953	9.0%	192	1.8%	200	1.9%	1,690	16.0%	437	3.8%	1,002	8.7%	222	1.9%	215	1.9%	1,876	16.3%
		50-59	15	1.6%	11	1.2%	10	1.1%	7	0.8%	43	4.6%	111	1.1%	282	2.7%	56	0.5%	48	0.5%	497	4.7%	126	1.1%	293	2.5%	66	0.6%	55	0.5%	540	4.7%
		60-84	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	18	0.2%	48	0.5%	9	0.1%	8	0.1%	83	0.8%	18	0.2%	48	0.4%	9	0.1%	9	0.1%	84	0.7%
		Total	549	59.0%	205	22.0%	103	11.1%	73	7.8%	930	100.0%	2,082	19.7%	5,370	50.8%	1,743	16.5%	1,374	13.0%	10,569	100.0%	2,631	22.9%	5,575	48.5%	1,846	16.1%	1,447	12.6%	11,499	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					1,220	1.7%	1,073	1.5%	88	0.1%	151	0.2%	2,532	3.6%
		20-23																					1,870	2.7%	5,124	7.3%	8,894	12.7%	6,217	8.9%	22,105	31.6%
		24-29																					2,062	2.9%	5,422	7.7%	10,902	15.6%	9,442	13.5%	27,828	39.7%
		30-34																					729	1.0%	1,621	2.3%	2,540	3.6%	2,138	3.1%	7,028	10.0%
		35-39																					531	0.8%	1,004	1.4%	1,271	1.8%	1,063	1.5%	3,869	5.5%
		40-49																					635	0.9%	1,250	1.8%	1,434	2.0%	1,333	1.9%	4,652	6.6%
		50-59																					252	0.4%	458	0.7%	483	0.7%	457	0.7%	1,650	2.4%
		60-84																					45	0.1%	129	0.2%	86	0.1%	119	0.2%	379	0.5%
		Total																					7,344	10.5%	16,081	23.0%	25,698	36.7%	20,920	29.9%	70,043	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,631	3.2%	5,575	6.8%	1,846	2.3%	1,447	1.8%	11,499	14.1%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						7,344	9.0%	16,081	19.7%	25,698	31.5%	20,920	25.7%	70,043	85.9%
	Total																						9,975	12.2%	21,656	26.6%	27,544	33.8%	22,367	27.4%	81,542	100.0%
September Competition	Recipients	19 and under	21	6.9%	7	2.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	28	9.2%	739	7.0%	229	2.2%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	969	9.2%	760	7.0%	236	2.2%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	997	9.2%
		20-23	11	3.6%	22	7.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	33	10.8%	877	8.3%	1,563	14.8%	11	0.1%	6	0.1%	2,457	23.2%	888	8.2%	1,585	14.6%	11	0.1%	6	0.1%	2,490	22.9%
		24-29	30	9.8%	23	7.5%	2	0.7%	0	0.0%	55	18.0%	912	8.6%	1,466	13.8%	7	0.1%	5	0.0%	2,390	22.6%	942	8.6%	1,489	13.7%	9	0.1%	5	0.0%	2,445	22.4%
		30-34	20	6.6%	21	6.9%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	42	13.8%	665	6.3%	855	8.1%	5	0.0%	3	0.0%	1,528	14.4%	685	6.3%	876	8.0%	5	0.0%	4	0.0%	1,570	14.4%
		35-39	18	5.9%	31	10.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	49	16.1%	496	4.7%	646	6.1%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	1,146	10.8%	514	4.7%	677	6.2%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	1,195	11.0%
		40-49	32	10.5%	44	14.4%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	77	25.2%	654	6.2%	968	9.1%	7	0.1%	5	0.0%	1,634	15.4%	686	6.3%	1,012	9.3%	8	0.1%	5	0.0%	1,711	15.7%
		50-59	11	3.6%	8	2.6%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	20	6.6%	162	1.5%	242	2.3%	3	0.0%	2	0.0%	409	3.9%	173	1.6%	250	2.3%	4	0.0%	2	0.0%	429	3.9%
		60-84	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	16	0.2%	38	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	54	0.5%	16	0.1%	39	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	55	0.5%
		Total	143	46.9%	157	51.5%	4	1.3%	1	0.3%	305	100.0%	4,521	42.7%	6,007	56.7%	38	0.4%	21	0.2%	10,587	100.0%	4,664	42.8%	6,164	56.6%	42	0.4%	22	0.2%	10,892	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					2,817	6.4%	1,595	3.6%	102	0.2%	124	0.3%	4,638	10.6%
		20-23																					2,118	4.8%	6,527	14.9%	4,444	10.2%	1,500	3.4%	14,589	33.3%
		24-29																					2,178	5.0%	5,835	13.3%	3,567	8.1%	1,521	3.5%	13,101	29.9%
		30-34																					899	2.1%	1,860	4.2%	1,008	2.3%	527	1.2%	4,294	9.8%
		35-39																					582	1.3%	1,097	2.5%	555	1.3%	357	0.8%	2,591	5.9%
		40-49																					802	1.8%	1,310	3.0%	637	1.5%	465	1.1%	3,214	7.3%
		50-59																					256	0.6%	466	1.1%	229	0.5%	183	0.4%	1,134	2.6%
		60-84																					47	0.1%	79	0.2%	38	0.1%	44	0.1%	208	0.5%
		Total																					9,699	22.2%	18,769	42.9%	10,580	24.2%	4,721	10.8%	43,769	100.0%
	Recipients																						4,664	8.5%	6,164	11.3%	42	0.1%	22	0.0%	10,892	19.9%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						9,699	17.7%	18,769	34.3%	10,580	19.4%	4,721	8.6%	43,769	80.1%
	Total																						14,363	26.3%	24,933	45.6%	10,622	19.4%	4,743	8.7%	54,661	100.0%

TABLE 4 - AWARD YEAR 2004-05
COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, AGE, AND STUDENT EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

CAL GRANT A AND B RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
December 31, 2004

			Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Student Educational Level										Student Educational Level										Student Educational Level									
		Age	1		2		3		4		Total		1		2		3		4		Total		1		2		3		4		Total	
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
March Competition	Recipients	19 and under	14	1.4%	7	0.7%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	23	2.4%	94	0.9%	79	0.8%	3	0.0%	4	0.0%	180	1.7%	108	0.9%	86	0.8%	5	0.0%	4	0.0%	203	1.8%
		20-23	137	14.1%	42	4.3%	21	2.2%	19	2.0%	219	22.5%	602	5.8%	1,394	13.3%	518	5.0%	421	4.0%	2,935	28.1%	739	6.5%	1,436	12.6%	539	4.7%	440	3.8%	3,154	27.6%
		24-29	164	16.9%	45	4.6%	28	2.9%	5	0.5%	242	24.9%	547	5.2%	1,320	12.6%	386	3.7%	356	3.4%	2,609	24.9%	711	6.2%	1,365	11.9%	414	3.6%	361	3.2%	2,851	24.9%
		30-34	59	6.1%	41	4.2%	29	3.0%	12	1.2%	141	14.5%	337	3.2%	784	7.5%	197	1.9%	194	1.9%	1,512	14.5%	396	3.5%	825	7.2%	226	2.0%	206	1.8%	1,653	14.5%
		35-39	47	4.8%	57	5.9%	21	2.2%	9	0.9%	134	13.8%	256	2.4%	618	5.9%	134	1.3%	115	1.1%	1,123	10.7%	303	2.7%	675	5.9%	155	1.4%	124	1.1%	1,257	11.0%
		40-49	53	5.5%	77	7.9%	26	2.7%	11	1.1%	167	17.2%	338	3.2%	892	8.5%	175	1.7%	174	1.7%	1,579	15.1%	391	3.4%	969	8.5%	201	1.8%	185	1.6%	1,746	15.3%
		50-59	12	1.2%	18	1.9%	8	0.8%	5	0.5%	43	4.4%	116	1.1%	259	2.5%	37	0.4%	41	0.4%	453	4.3%	128	1.1%	277	2.4%	45	0.4%	46	0.4%	496	4.3%
		60-84	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	3	0.3%	17	0.2%	43	0.4%	1	0.0%	6	0.1%	67	0.6%	19	0.2%	43	0.4%	1	0.0%	7	0.1%	70	0.6%
		Total	488	50.2%	287	29.5%	135	13.9%	62	6.4%	972	100.0%	2,307	22.1%	5,389	51.5%	1,451	13.9%	1,311	12.5%	10,458	100.0%	2,795	24.5%	5,676	49.7%	1,586	13.9%	1,373	12.0%	11,430	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					1,508	2.1%	1,354	1.9%	29	0.0%	21	0.0%	2,912	4.1%
		20-23																					2,140	3.0%	9,778	13.7%	4,227	5.9%	4,145	5.8%	20,290	28.5%
		24-29																					2,506	3.5%	11,990	16.8%	7,073	9.9%	8,340	11.7%	29,909	41.9%
		30-34																					831	1.2%	3,285	4.6%	1,451	2.0%	1,693	2.4%	7,260	10.2%
		35-39																					522	0.7%	1,996	2.8%	621	0.9%	735	1.0%	3,874	5.4%
		40-49																					733	1.0%	2,648	3.7%	665	0.9%	761	1.1%	4,807	6.7%
		50-59																					308	0.4%	1,054	1.5%	187	0.3%	260	0.4%	1,809	2.5%
		60-84																					72	0.1%	300	0.4%	25	0.0%	40	0.1%	437	0.6%
		Total																					8,620	12.1%	32,405	45.5%	14,278	20.0%	15,995	22.4%	71,298	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,795	3.4%	5,676	6.9%	1,586	1.9%	1,373	1.7%	11,430	13.8%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						8,620	10.4%	32,405	39.2%	14,278	17.3%	15,995	19.3%	71,298	86.2%
	Total																						11,415	13.8%	38,081	46.0%	15,864	19.2%	17,368	21.0%	82,728	100.0%
September Competition	Recipients	19 and under	18	4.6%	6	1.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	24	6.1%	917	8.3%	264	2.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1,181	10.7%	935	8.2%	270	2.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1,205	10.5%
		20-23	20	5.1%	32	8.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	52	13.3%	978	8.8%	1,598	14.4%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	2,577	23.3%	998	8.7%	1,630	14.2%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	2,629	22.9%
		24-29	22	5.6%	43	11.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	65	16.6%	970	8.8%	1,448	13.1%	2	0.0%	2	0.0%	2,422	21.9%	992	8.6%	1,491	13.0%	2	0.0%	2	0.0%	2,487	21.7%
		30-34	20	5.1%	53	13.6%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	74	18.9%	613	5.5%	839	7.6%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	1,454	13.1%	633	5.5%	892	7.8%	2	0.0%	1	0.0%	1,528	13.3%
		35-39	27	6.9%	40	10.2%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	68	17.4%	478	4.3%	699	6.3%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	1,180	10.6%	505	4.4%	739	6.4%	3	0.0%	1	0.0%	1,248	10.9%
		40-49	27	6.9%	57	14.6%	0	0.0%	1	0.3%	85	21.7%	688	6.2%	943	8.5%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%	1,632	14.7%	715	6.2%	1,000	8.7%	0	0.0%	2	0.0%	1,717	15.0%
		50-59	9	2.3%	13	3.3%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%	23	5.9%	202	1.8%	345	3.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	547	4.9%	211	1.8%	358	3.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	570	5.0%
		60-84	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	27	0.2%	61	0.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	88	0.8%	27	0.2%	61	0.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	88	0.8%
		Total	143	36.6%	244	62.4%	2	0.5%	2	0.5%	391	100.0%	4,873	44.0%	6,197	55.9%	6	0.1%	5	0.0%	11,081	100.0%	5,016	43.7%	6,441	56.1%	8	0.1%	7	0.1%	11,472	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					3,163	6.9%	1,959	4.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5,122	11.2%
		20-23																					2,283	5.0%	12,385	27.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14,668	31.9%
		24-29																					2,501	5.4%	11,861	25.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	14,362	31.3%
		30-34																					920	2.0%	3,396	7.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4,316	9.4%
		35-39																					561	1.2%	2,072	4.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2,633	5.7%
		40-49																					796	1.7%	2,534	5.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3,330	7.3%
		50-59																					318	0.7%	901	2.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1,219	2.7%
		60-84																					82	0.2%	186	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	268	0.6%
		Total																					10,624	23.1%	35,294	76.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	45,918	100.0%
	Recipients																						5,016	8.7%	6,441	11.2%	8	0.0%	7	0.0%	11,472	20.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						10,624	18.5%	35,294	61.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	45,918	80.0%
	Total																						15,640	27.3%	41,735	72.7%	8	0.0%	7	0.0%	57,390	100.0%

TABLE 4 - AWARD YEAR 2005-06
COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, AGE, AND STUDENT EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

CAL GRANT A AND B RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
January 3, 2006

			Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Student Educational Level										Student Educational Level										Student Educational Level									
		Age	1		2		3		4		Total		1		2		3		4		Total		1		2		3		4		Total	
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
March Competition	Recipients	19 and under	16	1.5%	5	0.5%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	23	2.2%	68	0.7%	107	1.0%	11	0.1%	2	0.0%	188	1.8%	84	0.7%	112	1.0%	13	0.1%	2	0.0%	211	1.8%
		20-23	151	14.2%	63	5.9%	22	2.1%	9	0.8%	245	23.0%	612	5.9%	1,321	12.7%	438	4.2%	268	2.6%	2,639	25.4%	763	6.6%	1,384	12.1%	460	4.0%	277	2.4%	2,884	25.1%
		24-29	173	16.2%	50	4.7%	38	3.6%	19	1.8%	280	26.2%	619	5.9%	1,495	14.4%	468	4.5%	380	3.7%	2,962	28.5%	792	6.9%	1,545	13.5%	506	4.4%	399	3.5%	3,242	28.3%
		30-34	63	5.9%	37	3.5%	36	3.4%	17	1.6%	153	14.3%	346	3.3%	747	7.2%	200	1.9%	203	2.0%	1,496	14.4%	409	3.6%	784	6.8%	236	2.1%	220	1.9%	1,649	14.4%
		35-39	54	5.1%	33	3.1%	27	2.5%	19	1.8%	133	12.5%	239	2.3%	589	5.7%	151	1.5%	136	1.3%	1,115	10.7%	293	2.6%	622	5.4%	178	1.6%	155	1.4%	1,248	10.9%
		40-49	61	5.7%	69	6.5%	22	2.1%	25	2.3%	177	16.6%	338	3.2%	761	7.3%	191	1.8%	196	1.9%	1,486	14.3%	399	3.5%	830	7.2%	213	1.9%	221	1.9%	1,663	14.5%
		50-59	16	1.5%	15	1.4%	15	1.4%	8	0.7%	54	5.1%	133	1.3%	232	2.2%	36	0.3%	57	0.5%	458	4.4%	149	1.3%	247	2.2%	51	0.4%	65	0.6%	512	4.5%
		60-84	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	23	0.2%	27	0.3%	6	0.1%	8	0.1%	64	0.6%	24	0.2%	27	0.2%	6	0.1%	9	0.1%	66	0.6%
		Total	535	50.1%	272	25.5%	162	15.2%	98	9.2%	1,067	100.0%	2,378	22.8%	5,279	50.7%	1,501	14.4%	1,250	12.0%	10,408	100.0%	2,913	25.4%	5,551	48.4%	1,663	14.5%	1,348	11.7%	11,475	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					109	0.3%	212	0.5%	40	0.1%	7	0.0%	368	0.9%
		20-23																					655	1.7%	2,017	5.2%	3,468	8.9%	2,951	7.5%	9,091	23.2%
		24-29																					1,070	2.7%	4,031	10.3%	7,582	19.4%	7,924	20.2%	20,607	52.7%
		30-34																					261	0.7%	1,010	2.6%	1,431	3.7%	1,467	3.7%	4,169	10.7%
		35-39																					156	0.4%	490	1.3%	656	1.7%	655	1.7%	1,957	5.0%
		40-49																					172	0.4%	553	1.4%	689	1.8%	675	1.7%	2,089	5.3%
		50-59																					91	0.2%	229	0.6%	204	0.5%	236	0.6%	760	1.9%
		60-84																					11	0.0%	32	0.1%	26	0.1%	27	0.1%	96	0.2%
		Total																					2,525	6.5%	8,574	21.9%	14,096	36.0%	13,942	35.6%	39,137	100.0%
	Recipients																						2,913	5.8%	5,551	11.0%	1,663	3.3%	1,348	2.7%	11,475	22.7%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						2,525	5.0%	8,574	16.9%	14,096	27.9%	13,942	27.5%	39,137	77.3%
	Total																						5,438	10.7%	14,125	27.9%	15,759	31.1%	15,290	30.2%	50,612	100.0%

TABLE 4 - AWARD YEAR 2006-07
COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, AGE, AND STUDENT EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

CAL GRANT A AND B RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
February 13, 2007

			Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Student Educational Level										Student Educational Level										Student Educational Level									
		Age	1		2		3		4		Total		1		2		3		4		Total		1		2		3		4		Total	
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
March Competition	Recipients	19 and under	17	1.4%	8	0.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	25	2.1%	79	0.7%	119	1.0%	17	0.1%	5	0.0%	220	1.9%	96	0.8%	127	1.0%	17	0.1%	5	0.0%	245	1.9%
		20-23	168	14.1%	59	4.9%	30	2.5%	21	1.8%	278	23.3%	612	5.3%	1,446	12.6%	490	4.3%	330	2.9%	2,878	25.1%	780	6.2%	1,505	11.9%	520	4.1%	351	2.8%	3,156	24.9%
		24-29	159	13.3%	59	4.9%	40	3.4%	24	2.0%	282	23.6%	672	5.9%	1,523	13.3%	626	5.5%	512	4.5%	3,333	29.0%	831	6.6%	1,582	12.5%	666	5.3%	536	4.2%	3,615	28.5%
		30-34	75	6.3%	44	3.7%	31	2.6%	32	2.7%	182	15.3%	371	3.2%	743	6.5%	269	2.3%	247	2.2%	1,630	14.2%	446	3.5%	787	6.2%	300	2.4%	279	2.2%	1,812	14.3%
		35-39	49	4.1%	48	4.0%	25	2.1%	30	2.5%	152	12.7%	312	2.7%	560	4.9%	178	1.6%	198	1.7%	1,248	10.9%	361	2.8%	608	4.8%	203	1.6%	228	1.8%	1,400	11.0%
		40-49	57	4.8%	66	5.5%	40	3.4%	54	4.5%	217	18.2%	396	3.4%	772	6.7%	176	1.5%	224	2.0%	1,568	13.7%	453	3.6%	838	6.6%	216	1.7%	278	2.2%	1,785	14.1%
		50-59	13	1.1%	18	1.5%	12	1.0%	12	1.0%	55	4.6%	134	1.2%	276	2.4%	51	0.4%	67	0.6%	528	4.6%	147	1.2%	294	2.3%	63	0.5%	79	0.6%	583	4.6%
		60-84	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	2	0.2%	20	0.2%	48	0.4%	3	0.0%	5	0.0%	76	0.7%	21	0.2%	48	0.4%	3	0.0%	6	0.0%	78	0.6%
		Total	539	45.2%	302	25.3%	178	14.9%	174	14.6%	1,193	100.0%	2,596	22.6%	5,487	47.8%	1,810	15.8%	1,588	13.8%	11,481	100.0%	3,135	24.7%	5,789	45.7%	1,988	15.7%	1,762	13.9%	12,674	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					121	0.3%	226	0.5%	68	0.2%	11	0.0%	426	1.0%
		20-23																					712	1.7%	2,019	4.8%	4,103	9.7%	3,154	7.5%	9,988	23.6%
		24-29																					1,082	2.6%	2,966	7.0%	8,817	20.9%	9,070	21.5%	21,935	51.9%
		30-34																					269	0.6%	734	1.7%	1,721	4.1%	1,743	4.1%	4,467	10.6%
		35-39																					182	0.4%	480	1.1%	799	1.9%	781	1.8%	2,242	5.3%
		40-49																					209	0.5%	508	1.2%	761	1.8%	769	1.8%	2,247	5.3%
		50-59																					80	0.2%	217	0.5%	259	0.6%	283	0.7%	839	2.0%
		60-84																					7	0.0%	44	0.1%	34	0.1%	39	0.1%	124	0.3%
		Total																					2,662	6.3%	7,194	17.0%	16,562	39.2%	15,850	37.5%	42,268	100.0%
	Recipients																						3,135	5.7%	5,789	10.5%	1,988	3.6%	1,762	3.2%	12,674	23.1%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						2,662	4.8%	7,194	13.1%	16,562	30.1%	15,850	28.8%	42,268	76.9%
	Total																						5,797	10.6%	12,983	23.6%	18,550	33.8%	17,612	32.1%	54,942	100.0%

TABLE 4 - AWARD YEAR 2007-08
COMPETITIVE RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
BY PROGRAM, AGE, AND STUDENT EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

CAL GRANT A AND B RECIPIENTS AND ELIGIBLE NON-RECIPIENTS
July 30, 2007

			Cal Grant A										Cal Grant B										All									
			Student Educational Level										Student Educational Level										Student Educational Level									
		Age	1		2		3		4		Total		1		2		3		4		Total		1		2		3		4		Total	
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
March Competition	Recipients	19 and under	27	1.9%	2	0.2%	2	0.2%	0	0.0%	31	2.2%	104	0.9%	153	1.3%	9	0.1%	0	0.0%	267	2.4%	131	1.0%	156	1.2%	12	0.1%	0	0.0%	299	2.3%
		20-23	233	16.6%	26	1.9%	13	0.9%	6	0.5%	278	19.9%	735	6.5%	1,546	13.6%	459	4.0%	244	2.1%	2,984	26.3%	967	7.6%	1,573	12.3%	472	3.7%	250	2.0%	3,263	25.6%
		24-29	296	21.2%	57	4.1%	22	1.6%	12	0.8%	387	27.6%	740	6.5%	1,577	13.9%	547	4.8%	344	3.0%	3,207	28.2%	1,036	8.1%	1,634	12.8%	568	4.5%	355	2.8%	3,594	28.2%
		30-34	142	10.1%	58	4.2%	35	2.5%	12	0.8%	247	17.6%	393	3.5%	846	7.4%	325	2.9%	246	2.2%	1,810	15.9%	535	4.2%	904	7.1%	360	2.8%	258	2.0%	2,056	16.1%
		35-39	90	6.4%	58	4.2%	31	2.2%	7	0.5%	186	13.3%	300	2.6%	608	5.4%	178	1.6%	201	1.8%	1,287	11.3%	390	3.1%	666	5.2%	209	1.6%	208	1.6%	1,473	11.5%
		40-49	129	9.2%	71	5.1%	39	2.8%	26	1.9%	266	19.0%	396	3.5%	830	7.3%	250	2.2%	205	1.8%	1,681	14.8%	526	4.1%	901	7.1%	289	2.3%	231	1.8%	1,947	15.3%
		50-59	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	11	0.1%	12	0.1%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	24	0.2%	12	0.1%	13	0.1%	1	0.0%	1	0.0%	26	0.2%
		60-84	1	0.1%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%	31	0.3%	56	0.5%	6	0.1%	11	0.1%	104	0.9%	32	0.2%	57	0.4%	6	0.0%	11	0.1%	106	0.8%
		Total	919	65.7%	275	19.7%	142	10.2%	63	4.5%	1,399	100.0%	2,710	23.8%	5,628	49.5%	1,775	15.6%	1,252	11.0%	11,365	100.0%	3,629	28.4%	5,903	46.2%	1,917	15.0%	1,315	10.3%	12,764	100.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients	19 and under																					397	0.8%	640	1.3%	62	0.1%	11	0.0%	1,111	2.2%
		20-23																					1,116	2.2%	6,778	13.3%	4,207	8.2%	3,038	5.9%	15,139	29.6%
		24-29																					1,632	3.2%	6,568	12.9%	6,494	12.7%	6,524	12.8%	21,219	41.5%
		30-34																					494	1.0%	1,953	3.8%	1,921	3.8%	1,878	3.7%	6,246	12.2%
		35-39																					349	0.7%	1,186	2.3%	929	1.8%	860	1.7%	3,324	6.5%
		40-49																					437	0.9%	1,486	2.9%	901	1.8%	867	1.7%	3,692	7.2%
		50-59																					5	0.0%	41	0.1%	8	0.0%	15	0.0%	70	0.1%
		60-84																					49	0.1%	160	0.3%	40	0.1%	58	0.1%	307	0.6%
		Total																					4,480	8.8%	18,814	36.8%	14,562	28.5%	13,252	25.9%	51,108	100.0%
	Recipients																						3,629	5.7%	5,903	9.2%	1,917	3.0%	1,315	2.1%	12,764	20.0%
	Eligible Non-recipients																						4,480	7.0%	18,814	29.5%	14,562	22.8%	13,252	20.7%	51,108	80.0%
	Total																						8,109	12.7%	24,717	38.7%	16,479	25.8%	14,567	22.8%	63,872	100.0%

COMPETITIVE CAL GRANT A AND B PROGRAM
SCORING SUMMARY FOR 2007-08

ELEMENTS	MAXIMUM POINTS
GRADE POINT AVERAGE (GPA)	70
PARENT EDUCATIONAL LEVEL (Mother and Father)	18
ACCESS EQUALIZER	18
STUDENT or PARENT HOUSEHOLD STATUS	18
FAMILY INCOME and HOUSEHOLD SIZE	76

GPA	SCORE
2.00 - 2.04	30
2.05 - 2.09	31
2.10 - 2.14	32
2.15 - 2.19	33
2.20 - 2.24	34
2.25 - 2.29	35
2.30 - 2.34	36
2.35 - 2.39	37
2.40 - 2.44	38
2.45 - 2.49	39
2.50 - 2.54	40
2.55 - 2.59	41
2.60 - 2.64	42
2.65 - 2.69	43
2.70 - 2.74	44
2.75 - 2.79	45
2.80 - 2.84	46
2.85 - 2.89	47
2.90 - 2.94	48
2.95 - 2.99	49
3.00 - 3.04	50
3.05 - 3.09	51
3.10 - 3.14	52
3.15 - 3.19	53
3.20 - 3.24	54
3.25 - 3.29	55
3.30 - 3.34	56
3.35 - 3.39	57
3.40 - 3.44	58
3.45 - 3.49	59
3.50 - 3.54	60
3.55 - 3.59	61
3.60 - 3.64	62
3.65 - 3.69	63
3.70 - 3.74	64
3.75 - 3.79	65
3.80 - 3.84	66
3.85 - 3.89	67
3.90 - 3.94	68
3.95 - 3.99	69
4.00	70

FAFSA VALUE	PARENTS' EDUCATION	SCORE per PARENT
1	Middle School/Jr High	9
2	High School	5
3	College or Beyond	0
4	Other / Unknown	9

PARENTS' EDUCATION SAMPLES		
FAFSA VALUE		
FATHER	MOTHER	SCORE
		0
	1	9
	2	5
	3	0
	4	9
1		9
1	1	18
1	2	14
1	3	9
1	4	18
2		5
2	1	14
2	2	10
2	3	5
2	4	14
3		0
3	1	9
3	2	5
3	3	0
3	4	9
4		9
4	1	18
4	2	14
4	3	9
4	4	18

DEPENDENT STUDENT: PARENT HOUSEHOLD	
Married	0
Unmarried	18
Separated / Divorced	18
Widowed	18

INDEPENDENT STUDENT: STUDENT HOUSEHOLD	
Married	0
Single, no dependents	0
Single, with dependents	18

OR

INDEPENDENT STUDENT: IF STUDENT IS AN ORPHAN	
Married	0
Single, no dependents	22
Single, with dependents	18

2007-08 COMPETITIVE CAL GRANT A AND B PROGRAM
SCORING FOR ACCESS EQUALIZER

Student will receive Access Equalizer points if a disadvantaged high school experience is indicated either by:

1. The high school code on the GPA verification form is one of the following:
   * A continuation high school; or
   * A high school in the upper quartile of free or reduced lunch program; or
   * A high school in the lowest quartile of university-going rate, excluding those high schools having no reported university-going rate and those having a free or reduced lunch rate of less than 25 percent.

or

2. The student submitted a GED test score.

GPA from	Disadvantaged High School Experience	
	No	Yes
High School	0	18
Non-High School	0	See below chart

Number of Years Out of High School	Educational Level				
	No College	1	2	3	4
2-3	9	6	3	0	0
4-5	12	9	6	0	0
6-7	15	12	9	3	0
8 or more	18	15	12	6	3

TABLE 1
2007-08 COMPETITIVE CAL GRANT A AND B PROGRAM
SCORING FOR FAMILY INCOME AND HOUSEHOLD SIZE
DEPENDENT STUDENTS

Family Income	Size of Household								
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2
$0 - $17,500	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
$17,501 - $18,800	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	75
$18,801 - $20,100	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	74
$20,101 - $21,400	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	73
$21,401 - $22,700	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	75	71
$22,701 - $24,000	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	74	70
$24,001 - $25,300	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	73	69
$25,301 - $26,600	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	72	68
$26,601 - $27,900	76	76	76	76	76	76	75	70	67
$27,901 - $29,200	76	76	76	76	76	76	74	69	66
$29,201 - $30,500	76	76	76	76	76	76	73	68	65
$30,501 - $31,800	76	76	76	76	76	76	72	67	64
$31,801 - $33,100	76	76	76	76	76	75	71	66	63
$33,101 - $34,400	76	76	76	76	76	74	69	65	62
$34,401 - $35,700	76	76	76	76	76	73	68	64	61
$35,701 - $37,000	76	76	76	76	76	71	67	63	60
$37,001 - $38,300	76	76	76	76	75	70	66	62	59
$38,301 - $39,600	76	76	76	76	74	69	65	61	58
$39,601 - $40,900	76	76	76	76	73	68	64	60	57
$40,901 - $42,200	76	76	76	75	72	67	63	59	56
$42,201 - $43,500	76	76	76	74	71	66	62	58	55
$43,501 - $44,800	76	76	76	73	70	65	61	57	54
$44,801 - $46,100	76	76	76	72	69	64	60	56	53
$46,101 - $47,400	76	76	75	71	68	63	59	55	51
$47,401 - $48,700	76	76	74	70	67	62	58	54	50
$48,701 - $50,000	76	76	72	69	66	61	57	52	49
$50,001 - $51,300	76	75	71	68	65	60	56	51	47
$51,301 - $52,600	76	74	70	67	64	59	55	50	46
$52,601 - $53,900	76	73	69	66	63	58	54	48	44
$53,901 - $55,200	75	72	68	65	62	57	53	47	42
$55,201 - $56,500	74	71	67	64	61	56	51	45	41
$56,501 - $57,800	73	70	66	63	60	55	50	44	39
$57,801 - $59,100	72	69	65	62	59	54	49	42	38
$59,101 - $60,400	71	68	64	61	58	52	47	40	36
$60,401 - $61,700	70	67	63	60	57	51	46	38	34
$61,701 - $63,000	69	66	62	59	55	50	44	37	33
$63,001 - $64,300	68	65	61	58	54	48	42	34	31
$64,301 - $65,600	67	64	60	57	53	47	41	32	29
$65,601 - $66,900	66	63	59	56	52	45	39	30	27
$66,901 - $68,200	65	62	58	55	50	44	37	28	
$68,201 - $69,500	64	61	57	54	49	42	35		
$69,501 - $70,800	63	60	56	52	48	40	33		
$70,801 - $72,100	62	59	55	51	46	39	31		
$72,101 - $73,400	61	58	54	50	45	37	29		
$73,401 - $74,700	60	57	53	48	43	35			
$74,701 - $76,000	59	55	51	47	41	33			
$76,001 - $77,300	58	54	50	45	39	31			
$77,301 - $78,600	57	53	49	44	38	28			
$78,601 - $79,900	56	52	47	42	36				
$79,901 - $81,200	55	50	46	40	34				
$81,201 - $82,500	53	49	44	38	31				
$82,501 - $83,800	52	48	42	36	29				
$83,801 - $85,100	51	46	41	34	27				

INELIGIBLE

NOTE: The maximum income ceilings for the Cal Grant program are within the family income ranges. The cells above and to the left of the bold line in the matrix show Cal Grant A and B eligibles. The cells below and to the right of the bold line in the matrix show Cal Grant A eligibles only.

TABLE 2
2007-08 COMPETITIVE CAL GRANT A AND B PROGRAM
SCORING FOR FAMILY INCOME AND HOUSEHOLD SIZE
INDEPENDENT STUDENTS WITH DEPENDENTS OTHER THAN SPOUSE

Family Income	Size of Household								
	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2
$0 - $17,900	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76
$17,901 - $19,400	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	75
$19,401 - $20,900	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	73
$20,901 - $22,400	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	72
$22,401 - $23,900	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	74	71
$23,901 - $25,400	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	73	70
$25,401 - $26,900	76	76	76	76	76	76	76	72	68
$26,901 - $28,400	76	76	76	76	76	76	75	70	67
$28,401 - $29,900	76	76	76	76	76	76	74	69	66
$29,901 - $31,400	76	76	76	76	76	76	73	68	65
$31,401 - $32,900	76	76	76	76	76	76	71	67	64
$32,901 - $34,400	76	76	76	76	76	74	70	66	63
$34,401 - $35,900	76	76	76	76	76	73	69	64	61
$35,901 - $37,400	76	76	76	76	76	72	68	63	60
$37,401 - $38,900	76	76	76	76	76	71	66	62	59
$38,901 - $40,400	76	76	76	76	74	69	65	61	58
$40,401 - $41,900	76	76	76	76	73	68	64	60	57
$41,901 - $43,400	76	76	76	75	72	67	63	59	55
$43,401 - $44,900	76	76	76	74	70	66	62	57	54
$44,901 - $46,400	76	76	76	73	69	65	61	56	53
$46,401 - $47,900	76	76	75	71	68	63	59	55	51
$47,901 - $49,400	76	76	74	70	67	62	58	53	50
$49,401 - $50,900	76	76	73	69	66	61	57	52	48
$50,901 - $52,400	76	75	71	68	65	60	56	50	46
$52,401 - $53,900	76	74	70	67	63	59	54	49	45
$53,901 - $55,400	76	73	69	66	62	58	53	47	43
$55,401 - $56,900	75	71	68	64	61	56	52	45	41
$56,901 - $58,400	74	70	67	63	60	55	50	44	39
$58,401 - $59,900	72	69	66	62	59	54	48	42	37
$59,901 - $61,400	71	68	64	61	58	52	47	40	35
$61,401 - $62,900	70	67	63	60	56	51	45	37	33
$62,901 - $64,400	69	66	62	59	55	49	43	35	31
$64,401 - $65,900	68	64	61	58	54	48	41	33	29
$65,901 - $67,400	67	63	60	56	52	46	39	30	
$67,401 - $68,900	66	62	59	55	51	44	37		
$68,901 - $70,400	64	61	58	54	49	42	35		
$70,401 - $71,900	63	60	56	52	47	40	32		
$71,901 - $73,400	62	59	55	51	46	38	30		
$73,401 - $74,900	61	57	54	49	44	36			
$74,901 - $76,400	60	56	52	47	42	33			
$76,401 - $77,900	59	55	51	46	40	31			
$77,901 - $79,400	57	54	49	44	38	28			
$79,401 - $80,900	56	52	47	42	36				
$80,901 - $82,400	55	51	46	40	33				
$82,401 - $83,900	53	49	45	38	31				
$83,901 - $85,400	52	47	44	36	29				

INELIGIBLE

NOTE: The maximum income ceilings for the Cal Grant program are within the family income ranges. The cells above and to the left of the bold line in the matrix show Cal Grant A and B eligibles. The cells below and to the right of the bold line in the matrix show Cal Grant A eligibles only.

TABLE 3
2007-08 COMPETITIVE CAL GRANT A AND B PROGRAM
SCORING FOR FAMILY INCOME AND HOUSEHOLD SIZE
SINGLE INDEPENDENT AND MARRIED STUDENTS

Family Income	Size of Household	
	Married	Single Independent
$0 - $6,850	72	72
$6,851 - $7,390	72	71
$7,391 - $7,930	72	70
$7,931 - $8,470	72	68
$8,471 - $9,010	72	67
$9,011 - $9,550	72	66
$9,551 - $10,090	72	65
$10,091 - $10,630	72	64
$10,631 - $11,170	72	63
$11,171 - $11,710	72	62
$11,711 - $12,250	72	61
$12,251 - $12,790	72	60
$12,791 - $13,330	72	59
$13,331 - $13,870	72	58
$13,871 - $14,410	71	57
$14,411 - $14,950	70	56
$14,951 - $15,490	69	55
$15,491 - $16,030	68	54
$16,031 - $16,570	67	53
$16,571 - $17,110	66	52
$17,111 - $17,650	65	51
$17,651 - $18,190	64	50
$18,191 - $18,730	63	49
$18,731 - $19,270	62	48
$19,271 - $19,810	61	47
$19,811 - $20,350	60	46
$20,351 - $20,890	59	45
$20,891 - $21,430	58	44
$21,431 - $21,970	57	43
$21,971 - $22,510	56	42
$22,511 - $23,050	55	41
$23,051 - $23,590	54	40
$23,591 - $24,130	53	39
$24,131 - $24,670	52	38
$24,671 - $25,210	51	37
$25,211 - $25,750	50	37
$25,751 - $26,290	49	36
$26,291 - $26,830	48	35
$26,831 - $27,370	47	**INELIGIBLE**
$27,371 - $27,910	46	
$27,911 - $28,450	45	
$28,451 - $28,990	44	
$28,991 - $29,530	43	
$29,531 - $30,070	42	
$30,071 - $30,610	41	
$30,611 - $31,150	40	

NOTE: The maximum income ceilings for the Cal Grant Program are within the family income ranges.

GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mary T. Lindsey, Chair
Sharon Bowles, Vice-Chair

AGENDA FOR TELECONFERENCE MEETING OF AUGUST 16, 2007, 2:-00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

California Student Aid Commission
EDFund Boardroom
3300 Zinfandel Drive
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

TAB	ITEM	
	Introductions/Call to Order	2:00 p.m.
1.	Approval of Minutes of October 14, 2005, February 21, 2006, April 14, 2006, and May 26, 2006	2:10.
2.	Consideration of Budget Change Proposals for 2008-09	2:30
	a. Increase Number of Competitive Awards	
	b. Increase Maximum Cal Grant B Access Grant	
	c. Provide Tuition/Fees to All Cal Grant B Recipients	
	d. Increase Maximum Award at Non-public Institutions	
	e. Increase Number and Amount of Cal Grant C Awards	
	Adjournment	4:00

Times are subject to change

1

Information/Action Item

GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Approval of Minutes (October 14, 2005, February 21, 2006, April 14, 2006 and May 25, 2006)

Enclosed, for the Committee's review and approval, are the following minutes:

1) October 14, 2005 GAC Committee Minutes
2) February 21, 2006 GAC Teleconference Minutes
3) April 14, 2006 GAC Teleconference Minutes
4) May 26, 2006 GAC Teleconference Minutes

The following meeting minutes need to be assigned for review by the proposed (see table) GAC review teams:

5) May 24, 2007 GAC Teleconference Minutes
6) February 14, 2007 GAC Teleconference Minutes
7) January 25, 2007 GAC Special Advisory Work Group Teleconference Minutes
8) January 5, 2007 GAC Special Advisory Subcommittee Teleconference Minutes
9) December 14, 2006 GAC Work Group Teleconference Minutes
10) August 4, 2006 GAC Work Group Minutes
11) June 16, 2006 GAC Teleconference Minutes

The following meeting minutes are pending completion:

12) July 19, 2007 GAC Minutes
13) April 5, 2007 GAC Minutes (1:14PM)
14) September 18, 2006 GAC Special Advisory Work Group Teleconference
15) September 5, 2006 GAC Special Advisory Subcommittee Teleconference

Recommended Action: Approve minutes for October 14, 2005, February 21, 2006, April 14, 2006, and May 25, 2006. After approval of these minutes, items 5-11, noted above, will be assigned to the review teams.

Responsible Staff: Jorge Cortez, Staff
School Support Services Branch

CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION

GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GAC) MEETING

3300 ZINFANDEL DRIVE
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
Friday, October 14, 2005

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mary Lindsey, Chair, PI

Michele Dyke, Commission Liaison
(for Louise McClain)
Tim Bonnel, CCCCO
Lora Jo Bossio, UC
Sharon Bowles, K-12,
Laura Cunha, PI
Kenneth Evans, Jr., CSU Student
Greg Gollihur, CPEC

Noelia Gonzalez, CASFAA
Maria Hernandez, CSU
Kate Jeffrey, UC
Catherine Kasakoff, AICCU
(for Catherine Thomas)
Aram Nadjarian, AICCU
Mary Robinson, CSU
Michelle Sliwa, K-12
Veronica Villalobos, AICCU
Craig Yamamoto, CCC

COMMISSION STAFF

Diana Fuentes-Michel, Director
California Student Aid Commission
Max Espinoza, Chief, Grant Services Division

Carlos Machado, Chief, Policy & Research Division
Anne Robertson, Manager, Cal Grant Operations Branch
John Bays, Chief, Information Technology Division
Steve Caldwell, Chief, Outreach & Legislation
Carole Durante, Information Officer II, Outreach & Legislation
Thea Pot- Van Atta, Manager, School Support Services
Branch
Bryan Dickason, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Liisa Rohmer, Staff, Policy & Research Division
Gloria Falcon, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Shelly Leide-Lynch, Information Technology Services
Division
Edna Ong, Research Analyst, Government and Public Affairs
Justin Ngo, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Jorge Cortez, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Despina Costopoulos, Coordinator, Cash for College
Michael Bolden, Staff, Federal Policy & Programs Division

ALSO PRESENT

Bob Quinn, Specialist, California Community Colleges
Trish McNamara, Consultant, California Community Colleges

Introduction/ Call to Order

Committee Chairperson Mary Lindsey welcomed all participants and brought the meeting to order. She informed the Grant Advisory Committee (GAC) that the agenda was full and every effort would be made to stay on schedule.

Tab 1: Approval of Minutes from the October 21-22, 2004 Meeting.

Chairperson Lindsey asked if there were any additions, corrections, or deletions to the minutes. Committee Member Craig Yamamoto moved to approve the minutes as submitted. Committee Member Aram Nadjarian seconded the motion. Motion passed with Member Bonnel abstaining.

Tab 2: Approval of Minutes from the May 19, 2005 Meeting.

Chairperson Lindsey asked if there were any additions, corrections, or deletions to the minutes. Committee Member Timothy Bonnel noted that his name only has one L. Committee Member Mary Robinson noted that on page 6 the last sentence is, "Leroy Rooker." On page 7, she added, the second line should read "The state law is the Information Practices Act." Committee Member Robinson moved to approve the minutes with the noted corrections. Committee Member Lora Jo Bossio seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Tab 3: Approval of Minutes from the August 11, 2005 Meeting.

Chairperson Lindsey asked if there were any additions, corrections, or deletions to the minutes. Committee Member Robinson noted that on page 2 the last sentence should read "approval of the minutes was tabled to October 13, 14." Committee Member Robinson moved to approve the minutes. Committee Member Maria Hernandez seconded the motion. Motion passed with Member Bonnel abstaining.

Chairperson Lindsey noted that approval of the September 29, 2005 GAC Teleconference minutes would need to be tabled until the next GAC meeting on March 10th.

Chairperson Lindsey took the opportunity to thank the members for the work completed during the GAC workshop. She especially thanked the staff for putting the dinner, and the activities for both days, in place and recognized the contributions of Brenda Metzger, previous Commission staff person.

Tab 4: Committee Chair's Report.

Chairperson Lindsey noted that Commissioner Louise McClain could not attend due to other commitments, but she (Commissioner McClain) expressed her appreciation for the hard work completed by the GAC members.

Election of Commission Officers occurred. The new Chair is Commissioner Jim Sandoval and the new Vice-Chair is Commissioner McClain. Diana Fuentes-Michel, Executive Director of the Commission, explained that Commissioner James Fousekis continues as Treasurer and Commissioner Josefina Baltodano is the new Secretary. The chair of Grants and Programs has not been selected. When asked about the length of appointment for the chair, Executive Director Fuentes-Michel explained that the appointing authority determines the duration of appointment. She further explained that if Chairperson Sandoval is not reappointed when due, he will be grandfathered in for 60 days during which time he can be reappointed at any time. Business with the Commission is to continue as usual unless directed otherwise.

Continuing with her report, Chairperson Lindsey expressed concern with discussing the high school equivalency and GPA issues as one. Previous discussion allowed for combining both issues since a GPA, or its equivalent, was needed to get a Cal Grant award. This, however, is no longer the case with the new exit exam requirement (California High School Exit Exam—CAHSEE). With the new requirement, she explained, a student can have a GPA without having a diploma. This concluded Chairperson Lindsey's report.

Tab 5: Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Fuentes-Michel began her discussion by passing out the Proposition 76 analysis completed by the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO). She explained that the Commission submitted budget change proposals for the July 1, 2006 fiscal year. Additionally, she explained that staff is looking at workload adjustments and working closely with EdFund management on finalizing the preparation for the next EdFund finance and board meetings.

Executive Director Fuentes-Michel explained that she and Commissioner Baltodano, Fiscal Chair of the Commission, have been working on legislative and budget principles in an effort to successfully work through this year's budget. Additional areas being discussed include:

1) **Proposition 76-** This initiative, to be listed in the November 2006 ballot, is intended to make key changes to the budget process. If successful, the initiative would impact the way the state conducts business, in addition to the Commission's overall budgeting. Funding of the Commission's entitlement program, as known today, would not be automatic and subject to the availability of funds. The new proposition sets a spending limit and affects the Proposition 98 guarantee. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel encouraged all GAC members to understand the impact of this proposition on higher education and K-12, and to also understand how the Commission could be impacted.

2) **Higher Education Fee Increase-** This fee increase could be a factor in the availability of Cal Grant funding. The Commission will continue to advocate for the full funding and implementation of the Grant Delivery System.

3) **Grant Delivery System Proposal-** A Feasibility Study Report (FSR) was submitted to the Department of Finance (DOF) requesting funding for a new processing system (EdFund Platform) for Cal Grant program data that would replace the Teale Data System which is the Commission's current processing system. The proposal, as noted by Executive Director Fuentes-Michel, was received well by DOF, but not approved until late spring and therefore could not be considered until May 2006 (timing issue). The expectation is that the Governor will include the funding request in his budget proposal.

4) **Staff Support-** The Commission seeks funding for additional staff in the School Support Services Branch. As noted by Executive Director Fuentes-Michel, staff capacities are limited going only about one person deep, so the effort is to focus the work on services to the schools and the students. The Commission's Information Technology Division is another area warranting attention. Stagnant salaries and lack of a qualified applicant pool for available positions make it challenging to address workforce needs.

5) **California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) -** Executive Director Fuentes-Michel explained that Sue Stickel, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, should be calling shortly to discuss the Superintendent's position as to the recommendation put forth by GAC on the CAHSEE issue. The Commission is also working on scheduling time with Secretary Bersin to see where the Governor stands in terms of administrative change versus going through the legislative process.

Chairperson Lindsey asked if the analysis, being completed by staff to look at the number of students impacted by CAHSEE, could be used in consultation with the legislature and the Governor. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel explained that the Superintendent has asked that the Commission look at the various Federal Ability to Benefit (ATB) exams and determine if they are above or below the academic requirement (standard) set by CAHSEE for all students. The other piece to this, explained Executive Director Fuentes-Michel, is the information to be shared with students and schools and the order in which the "message" will be issued.

The Superintendent's perception of CAHSEE is that students have six opportunities to pass the exam. Their concern with the Commission, noted Executive Director Fuentes-Michel, is what should be said to the student; when should an alternative be made available; and what type of support (industry partners, legislature) would the Commission have in offering the alternative to the student. Superintendent staff is highly interested in discussing the number of students affected and what that means.

Committee Member Bonnel asked about the message currently shared with schools and students by the Commission. Max Espinoza, Chief Grant Services Division, explained that the Commission has notified students and schools that the "expected graduation date on the FAFSA" is what is used for Cal Grant purposes and will continue to do so. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel explained that the Commission needs to hold additional conversations with GAC and other stakeholder groups, such as the California Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (CASFAA), to determine what kind of message should be sent to students and schools. Once the message is clear, she added, the Commission can move to get appropriate information out via existing communication tools. She expects to have more direction after the November 2005 Commission meeting.

Committee Member Greg Gollihur expressed concern about assessing all ATB exams in relation to CAHSEE since the exams are designed for different purposes. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel clarified that the question for the Superintendent to consider is whether students can take the ATB for Cal Grant consideration. The Superintendent's concern, she adds, is with ATB's level of proficiency and the standard being set. The Commission has communicated to the Superintendent's Office and others in the community, that the ATB has been a vehicle for students to enter postsecondary education and be considered for financial aid. Finally, Executive Director Fuentes-Michel explained that the issue with ATB tests as an alternative to the CAHSEE is determining whether the alternative meets the standard for competency, and also, making an argument that the ATB exam has historically been used as an alternative for students accessing all segments of higher education.

Committee Member Bonnel explained that the CAHSEE issue would negatively impact the goal of SB 1644 to create a "college going culture" among all students, particularly underrepresented students. He explained the importance of keeping a promise to California students regarding a Cal Grant award in addition to recapturing those potential students impacted by CAHSEE, but he was concerned about the law being "hijacked" for some other purpose. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel explained that the previous administration had not addressed the question of access in the event that the exam was not passed and that the current administration, particularly given the $6.7 billion deficit, may have to address the exit exam issue relative to providing access to Cal Grants.

Committee Member Robinson indicated concern that the high school graduation requirement would negatively impact the Cal Grant eligibility of students who are eligible for admission to a California State University (CSU) or other four-year institution by virtue of transfer from a community college. A secondary concern was California not recognizing the ATB and the message that would send to the financial aid community regarding federal dollars. Committee Member Veronica Villalobos recommended that the Commission be prepared to present alternatives to the ATB exam, adding a preference that admission to an associate or baccalaureate degree be considered the equivalent to high school graduation.

Chairperson Lindsey requested that a teleconference be scheduled between staff and GAC members to discuss CAHSEE further. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel indicated a willingness to discuss the issues with staff and GAC, after the meeting with Secretary Bersin and in advance of presentation to the Commission.

Committee Member Noelia Gonzalez asked if schools are ultimately responsible for verifying high school graduation dates before making a Cal Grant payment. Mr. Espinoza explained that, as noted in the Institutional Participation Agreement (IPA), the schools would need to verify high school graduation. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel added that this matter is currently being addressed by legal counsel and Commission staff for more clarification. She reiterated that the goal of the Commission, in sharing information with schools, is to continue to have current (pre-CAHSEE) eligible students continue to be eligible. Mr. Espinoza noted that the Commission needs to address the CAHSEE issue first with the expectation that doing so will bring more clarity to related issues.

Committee Member Bossio explained that the involvement of high schools in determining the high school graduation date and Cal Grant eligibility may be more beneficial for the student because the high schools can address the issue on a timelier r timely basis. Committee Member Bonnel requested that CSAC provide clarification on the IPA issue regarding verification of a student's high school graduation date. According to his

understanding, as discussed in the rules for federal participation and previous discussions with system office representatives, student self-certification of the graduation date is acceptable unless there is conflicting information. Mr. Espinoza indicated that he understood Committee Member Bonnel's concern and that staff would go back and look at the issue to ensure all stakeholders are on the same page. Mr. Espinoza emphasized the need to maintain the integrity of the Cal Grant program and be able to explain the Commission's actions to the public, the legislature, and the Governor.

Chairperson Lindsey recapped the issues: 1) If ATB or some other remedy is identified to address the CAHSEE issue; the process to make the change would be either regulatory or legislative. Additionally, there will need to be clear discussion about the method used. 2) Regardless of what decision is made about CAHSEE, all impacted areas will need to be assessed (staff, legal) and the discussion will go outside the financial aid community to include K-12 and higher education members. Committee Member Robinson added that the discussion has to include what is actually noted on the high school transcript, by the schools, when the student does not graduate.

Chairperson Lindsey closed the discussion by requesting that the Commission continue to be a student advocate in addressing the CAHSEE issue.

Continuing her report, Executive Director Fuentes-Michel indicated that from October through December the Commission will be actively involved in outreach efforts; communicating the availability of financial aid to schools, newspapers, and the community at large. Crocker-Flanagan has been selected as the Commission's new public relations firm and efforts are underway to put together the elements of the next campaign. Lastly, she noted that the State Bureau of Audits is at the Commission conducting an audit.

Tab 6: Cal Grant Update

A) Cal Grant Awards

1. September 2nd competition award numbers at 12,240.
2. Per CCC request, and in consultation with CCCSFAA, the Commission changed (pushed back) the date of processing for the September 2nd cycle. This will allow for more accurate and equitable representation of potential Cal Grant recipients.
3. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel noted that the delay in processing resulted in an increase of 3.8% in CCC Cal Grant awards from last year.
4. Decline in March 2nd competitive grant awards for private institutions has caught the attention of staff and is currently being reviewed.

B) Web Grants for Students Implementation

1. 20,000 students asked to test Web Grants for Students site.
2. 20,000 student sample reflective of all segments and different programs (Cal A, B C); new and renewal.
3. September 2nd Cal Grant recipients will receive an insert with award notification explaining site access; discuss benefits of doing so.
4. Email feedback positive. Volume not large, but consistent message.
5. 800 Web Grants for Students accounts established to date. Data will continue to be collected.
6. Student Support staff informing callers to check their records on-line.
7. Continued discussions with IT staff to determine additional data to be secured in Phase II.
8. Per Committee Member Laura Cunha's request, GAC members to receive visual representation of Web Grants for Students. Information Technology Chief, John Bays, added that the same training capability existing for Web Grants can be duplicated for Web Grants for Students.
9. Web Grants for Students training to be incorporated to existing training efforts.
10. A&E to provide direct input on programming; recommendations.
11. 24-hour access.

C) Interactive Voice Response (IVR) System Implementation

1. Allows access to basic student account information by student using Social Security Number (SSN) and Date of Birth (DOB). Rollout projected for November 2005.
2. Will get feedback from students and work with vendor to correct as needed.
3. Will be studying impact of IVR and Web Grants for Students on call volume.
4. Live body available during business hours. Student can opt out of IVR.
5. 24-hour access.

D) External Letter Review Progress Update

1. To date, External Letter Review Committee has reviewed all system-generated letters, letter attachments, and pamphlets for the new and renewal Cal Grant program process.
2. First two meetings held on August 16th and September 21st 2005. Third meeting scheduled for October 25th and a projected final one in November 2005.
3. Review process is simultaneous and collaborative with one scribe making corrections as group moves forward.
4. Corrections to be tested. Expect to have corrections in place and most letters in production by January 2006.
5. Goal is to increase service to students, as is the case with the other initiatives.
6. Committee Member Bossio reiterated the value of the letter review process. The process, she explained, has been collaborative, positive and great fun for all participants.
7. Ms. Robertson thanked the hard work of Judith Fredericks, Cal Grant Operations Branch.
8. Committee Member Yamamoto noted that, Melba Brown, from his staff, expressed the positive aspects of being on the committee and providing input.

E) Downloadable GPA Verification Form Project

1. Secured input for form change from Letter Review Committee, CASFAA, CCCSFAAA and other industry partners.
2. 90% of input has been incorporated to new, downloadable GPA Verification Form.
3. Downloadable form available for printing November 2005.
4. Both downloadable and hardcopy GPA Verification Forms to be mailed in, either by student or school official. Student cannot submit electronically since GPA needs to be verified. School can submit electronically.
5. Downloadable GPA will have bar code to identify student.
6. Phase II looking at all electronic processes. This will entail student giving authorization for Commission to secure data from school.
7. Every school will be mailed 100 preprinted GPA forms and schools will be able to order more from the EdFund website.
8. Committee Member Robinson asked if the GPA Verification Form could be linked to the school's site. Mr. Espinoza said yes.
9. Committee Member Kate Jeffrey noted that a previously established URL currently in place, but no data/information available. Ms. Robertson said she would check it.
10. Student with FAFSA, on Commission records, will be notified that no GPA filed and is needed.

F) New & Improved School Training Initiative and Calendar

1. School Support Services Branch (SSSB) created to better address school concerns.
2. SSSB in process of hiring new staff to address service needs.
3. Training Summary includes:

    - **California State Map-** Shows the state divided in 12 regions. Goal is to spend three days in each region starting with Tuesday and ending on Thursday. On the first two days, staff with three years or less will be invited to attend an in-depth training while the third day will be spent

with more experienced staff. Extended time, such as this, will allow schools an environment where multiple program-related questions can be asked.

- **Schools/Colleges by Region- Provides** a list of all eligible colleges in the designated region. Regions are defined by major service areas and number of schools served. Additionally, use of regions as opposed to segments ensures that information is shared between segments to ensure that a change in one area does not affect one segment positively while affecting another negatively.

- **Master Training Calendar-** Lists the various regions identified and notes the workday workload known to date for the months of June 2005 through July 2006.

- **External Training-** This source identifies existing and planned training modules/ subject matter. The specific training module identifies the audience, purpose and subject matter.

As noted by Mr. Espinoza, the training calendar has been shared with various stakeholder groups (CASFAA, A&E, and CCCSFAAA) and schools in an effort to secure input. The EdFund Client Relations Model (CRM) for training served as a guide for creating the Commission's program, but clearly the staff levels differed, thereby shaping the level of service provided. Mr. Espinoza noted that an additional two staff positions, aside from the three to be hired soon, have been requested through the Budget Change Proposal (BCP) process.

Additionally, Mr. Espinoza noted that suggestion for training included having members from the financial aid community be part of the training process and having advanced training sessions for more experienced personnel.

The Fall Workshops are included in the calendar and, as expressed by Bryan Dickason, School Support Services Branch, being able to plan for training eight months in advance is of great value to the schools. The development of curriculum and extending training services to schools unable to attend scheduled sessions, he continued, offers more options to schools.

The training relationship between the Commission and EdFund continues to grow with trainers from both entities working closely to ensure effective service to the student and schools. Schools from all regions, adds Mr. Espinoza, will know both their Commission and EdFund representative and will be able to address program issues immediately.

Committee Member Bossio noted the value of the forward-looking training calendar. Committee Member Catherine Kasakoff asked if the Commission had thought of developing an institutional self-assessment for evaluating the infrastructure of the school's organization; a self-audit program to help schools better assess how they are managing their program. Mr. Dickason explained that the development of such a tool would need to occur in consultation with the Commission's audit team and school staff.

Committee Member Bonnel concurred with Committee Member Bossio, adding that an advance training calendar allows school to plan for staff needs; staff did a great job putting together curriculum and setting up opportunities. He added, however, that an additional piece to consider for the training module is an IT piece discussing automation on campuses. He asked if the Commission could, for example, build an interface function using an access database for schools to be able to download rosters and update at once instead of updating records individually. Advising the schools of upcoming processes or program changes may be beneficial to the schools. Committee Member Bossio added that IT could create or do segmental pieces based on software such as SCT Banner.

Committee Member Cunha, hearing of the continued plans for training growth, thanked staff for all the help given to her institution. With respect to the self-evaluation tool, Committee Member Robinson recommended staff look at the National Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA) model for self-evaluation, citing that it was comprehensive in helping schools identify the various tasks completed by staff. Finally, Committee Member Robinson also thanked Commission training staff for the help they provide California State University (CSU) schools at their Annual Fall Conferences in September.

Mr. Espinoza summarized group input by stating 1) create a self-evaluation tool for schools that help them prepare for the Commission audits, and 2) add an IT-specific training module based on current programs/systems used by schools. This piece would inform schools of upcoming technological additions or modifications. He added that the second request could be considered by adding it to the menu and communicating with IT and, as noted by Mr. Bays, the EdFund Synergy Group.

When asked about additional ideas for the third day of regional sessions, Mr. Dickason added that he would like to see a session for more seasoned staff that allows staff to get program and policy information updates immediately. Committee Member Kasakoff added that she would like to see notes from GAC minutes added to the third day. Committee Member Cunha recommended the use of WebEx for training use by those schools that cannot attend training sessions. Finally, Committee Member Bossio added that staff may consider a training component specifically for admissions and outreach directors that teaches them about financial aid efforts and how they can assist in getting information to students.

Tab 7: Cal Grant Outreach Update.

Carlos Machado, Chief of the Governmental and Public Affairs Division, informed the committee that, given limited resources, every effort is being made to be more efficient in getting Cal Grant information out to students who have not been considered for Cal Grant awards previously. Additionally, he explained that the GPA verification process is emphasized by the Commission and a priority when planning outreach events.

Additional efforts, explained Mr. Machado, are being made to direct existing resources to those communities that have been historically under-served. A list of identified under-served schools will be shared at the Cal Grant Outreach Summits so that participants can provide input and identify other schools as needed. The two summits planned for the year will be held at San Joaquin Delta College on October 20, 2005 and University of California, Irvine on October 27, 2005.

Despina Costopoulos, Cash for College Coordinator, began her discussion of the program, by discussing the following:

1. An advisory committee has been established for Cash for College. Stakeholders include the various higher education segments; CCCSFAAA; Parent Institute for Quality Education; CASFAA; and other interested entities.
2. The advisory committee has met three times since September 2005 and is committed to meeting regularly to ensure the success of the program.
3. Funding has been secured through Education Financing Foundation of California to offer $1,000.00 scholarships to workshop participants. There are 275 scholarships available.
4. Healthy Families Call Center will be helping with the follow-up effort for students.
5. Cash for College will continue with its TV show. Leo Vargas, a UCLA financial aid advisor, will be participating in the show. He is the first to graduate high school, attend college and graduate with a four-year degree. He also acts.
6. The TV piece is being edited to be used year-round by college partners.
7. Cash for College staff will be asking for input from GAC, and other partners, on how to better serve students and schools.

Committee Member Villalobos informed Ms. Costopoulos that there were two impressive students on GAC that could be used as spokespersons. Ms. Costopoulos noted that she learned about the accomplishments of the students just recently and would like to discuss them further. Mr. Machado complimented Ms. Costopoulos in her outreach efforts, adding that the Commission has been impressed with what she has been able to accomplish in terms of extending the Commission's outreach efforts. Mr. Espinoza added that Ms. Costopoulos has leveraged a relatively small number of dollars ($500,000) and negotiated resources that allowed the presentation of 236 workshops for the year. Additionally, he added, Commission campaigns are being integrated so that programs such as Cash for College and I Can Afford College are working in similar, complimentary directions and, coming this year, participants will be able to register for the workshops online.

The Cal Grant Public Awareness Campaign was discussed by Carol Durante, Information Office II, Public Relations Branch. She explained the following:

1. The Commission has selected Crocker Flanagan, a public relations firm, to assist with this year's campaign. Will be working on messaging and timelines and focusing on the GPA.
2. Focus of campaign is to get Cal Grant information out to priority schools (under-served communities).
3. Complete radio campaigns for identified student communities.
4. Create the financial aid materials box.
5. Place kiosks in malls.
6. Work closely with corporate sponsors. Have secured work with the Penny Saver.
7. Will be looking for free TV.

Funding for the outreach campaign was cut one-third, explained Mr. Machado, so every effort is being made to identify areas where outreach can continue strong and cut back in less critical areas. Committee Member Bonnel noted that year-round use of the financial aid boxes may be effective by including information from other programs (I Can Afford College) and just replenish the information periodically. He also asked if there were any concerns on the Commission's part with regards to the delay in selecting a contractor; the effect such delay may have on the number of grants and the lack of media use.

Mr. Machado explained that every effort is being done to be timely and that Crocker Flanagan is confident they can get the outreach campaign up and running given in the prescribed time. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel also added that, unlike the campaign of the three previous years, the current campaign is different and the lessons of the past are being used to bring focus and direction to the current campaign. In particular, she noted that recent studies show that certain student groups are not as familiar with Cal Grant programming as are students from the general population and it is these students, and their corresponding schools, that will be identified. As for the lateness, Executive Director Fuentes-Michel noted that the current campaign started one week later than last year's campaign. She explained that conceptually, the campaign had been approved and the weekly meeting with Crocker Flanagan will ensure a timely campaign roll-out.

Committee Member Kasakoff asked if the campaigns would be multilingual. Mr. Machado said yes, the Commission would be communicating in multiple languages. Committee Member Bonnel asked if an advisory committee was assembled to help in planning the campaign. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel explained that, at this point, staff will be accessing the Cash for College Advisory Group and using existing program sources, and individuals, to help shape the campaign.

The notion of using an integration model, explained Executive Director Fuentes-Michel, allows the creative and fiscally effective use of existing resources, but also encourages staff to prepare for the possibility of reduced outreach campaign funds. The Commission, she added is moving toward a model that integrates various in-house resources such as Cash for College, EdFund grantees (if still available), in addition to the Cal SOAP Program and its directors. The infrastructure to continue support of the outreach campaign, if funds are reduced or eliminated altogether, is going to exist primarily through Cash for College and the Cal SOAP Directors and each of these programs have advisory bodies.

Executive Director Fuentes-Michel will be looking at developing good corporate sponsorships to support outreach efforts since funding sources are changing and levels may not allow for conducting business as usual. Statewide program efforts, and their funding, are smaller and staff have to find ways to continue with the work of the Commission that needs to be done and also be responsive to community feedback concerning the campaigns message. Mr. Machado cited the example of pulling ads last year (2004) when informed by externals that the messaging might be inconsistent with Commission intent.

Committee Member Bonnel acknowledged that the message got pulled, but added that it took a while to get the ad pulled and this was why he asked about the mechanism of input when developing the campaign for 2006. He wanted to communicate the importance of working with different groups to ensure the messaging is on target and different groups are not stepping over each other.

Mr. Espinoza, citing the pulling of last year's ad within 48 hours of being informed of the deadline issue, explained that development of the campaign will consider external input, as deemed necessary, but staff will also have to ensure that Cal Grant application information will have to be discernable among all other financial aid sources and deadlines. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel added that Crocker Flanagan is aware of the "lessons learned" from the previous campaign and have consulted with staff and will be attending the two Cal Grant Outreach Summits to better understand the program. The goal, she added, is to have the firm hear concerns expressed from the financial aid and outreach communities and be able to create an effective campaign using the information. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel is hopeful that by the following week staff will have an idea of what the campaign will look like.

Committee Member Bonnel added that he was pleased that GAC and educational segments will be included in the consultation process as it pertains to the current Cal Grant campaign. He emphasized the importance of his system (CCC) working closely with the Commission since for many of their students, the $60-70 million in Cal Grant funds makes it an incredible resource for CCC students. Mr. Machado thanked Committee Member Bonnel for his comment.

Tab 8: Recommend Approval of the Proposed 2006-07 Income and Asset Ceilings

Liisa Rohmer, Research Analyst II, explained that SB 1644 incorporated a formula set for adjusting the income and asset ceilings and allowed use of the California per capita income as a base. The September 2005 estimated per capita income and estimated Consumer Price Index (CPI) was used to calculate the particular income and asset ceilings. Staff recommended approval of the 2006-07 income and asset ceilings as presented in tab 8a.

Committee Member Bonnel moved that the income and asset ceilings be approved as presented in Tab 8a. Committee Member Hernandez seconded the motion. The motion passed to recommend the adoption of the 2006-07 income and asset ceilings to the Commission for approval.

Tab 9: Recommend Approval of the Cal Grant Selection Criteria for 2006-07

Carlos Machado, Chief, Governmental & Public Affairs Division, introduced the 2006-07 selection criteria. He asked the group to review the criteria that would be recommended for approval by the Commission. Edna Ong, Research Program Specialist I, explained that when SB 1644 established the competitive program, it also required that the Commission adopt selection criteria on an annual basis. The criteria, she added, was to be used when considering (scoring) competitive students and 2% of the Cal Grant B entitlement students (students who receive both the tuition/fees and access piece of a grant for the first year).

Ms. Ong explained that the only change made to the criteria was the income ceiling, thereby changing the matrixes for both the "level of income" and "household size" factors. Commission staff recommended GAC approval of the criteria so that they could be forwarded to the Commission for approval. Committee Member Cunha asked for clarification between categories (boxes) 1) Independent Student: Student Household and 2) Independent Student: If Student Is an Orphan. She wanted clarification on the "or" qualifier between the two categories, wondering if it should read "and/or" instead of just "or".

Committee Member Cunha wanted to know why a single person, with no dependents who is an orphan, gets more points (22) than a single student with dependents (18). Chairperson Lindsey's recollection on this matter was that the qualifier should be an "and" because the single person with dependents was supposed to get 18 points and then, if they were also an orphan, they would get an additional 18 points for a total of 36.

Anne Robertson, Manager, Cal Grant Operations Branch, explained that she believed the qualifier between the two categories should be an "or," but recommended that staff review the process. Ms. Robertson continued that the alternative scoring matrix that addressed the orphaned student was created because the orphan student was "ending up" with a lower maximum number of points than the independent student that is not an orphan.

At this point, it was recommended by Executive Director Fuentes-Michel that staff look at the assignment and calculation of points and report back to GAC after lunch.

After Lunch

Ms. Robertson clarified that when looking at 1) independent students with dependents and 2) independent orphaned students with dependents, 18 points are assigned to each. She then began the discussion of differentiation; explaining that the tables used, when assigning scores to the different categories of the competitive scoring, dictates the final, total score secured by the student.

Chairperson Lindsey asked what the number of points would be for an independent orphan student with no dependents. Ms. Robertson said 200 points. Chairperson Lindsey then asked about an independent orphan student with dependents. The number of points secured, again, is 200. The reason the number of points did not change is because each of the scenarios requires use of a different table when looking at family income and household size; whether a student has dependents or not or the student is dependent or independent; single or married; or orphaned or not. The key is to use the correct table (1 or 2) when scoring the student to ensure the correct number of points are assigned.

Recognizing that students in all categories were not being disadvantaged, Chairperson Lindsey asked for a motion to approve the 2006-07 selection criteria. Committee Member Sharon Bowles moved to approve the selection criteria and Committee Member Kate Jeffrey seconded. The motion to recommend the 2006-07 selection criteria to the Commission for approval was passed.

Tab 10: Recommend Approval of the Proposed 2006-07 Student Expense Budgets

Ms. Rohmer explained that Student Expense Budgets are adjusted to calculate need for Cal Grant applicants. The Commission uses the Student Expenses and Resources Survey (SEARS) as the base year and then the budget is adjusted by the various CPI categories that include books, supplies, and transportation. Ms. Rohmer asked GAC to approve the Nine-month Student Expense Budgets (table 3) as presented and also asked that a workgroup be convened to look at the methodology used to calculate the budget. As noted by Ms. Rohmer, the current methodology for calculating the expense budget has been used for approximately 15 years.

Chairperson Lindsey asked if the workgroup was to be under the SEARS Advisory Workgroup or under GAC, Ms. Rohmer said GAC. Mr. Espinoza explained that the recommended workgroup could be a new one or under the existing Enhancing Reporting & Analysis Workgroup. Chairperson Lindsey and Mr. Espinoza commented that a separate workgroup may be needed since addressing or analyzing “methodology” may be a big task. Chairperson Lindsey reiterated the issues before the group: 1) approval of the proposed student expense budget and 2) creating an additional workgroup for next year to look at SEARS issues.

To Committee Member Robinson’s recollection, the issue of looking at the student expense budget and the SEARS methodology surfaced last year. She believes that a subcommittee or workgroup of GAC would be more appropriate for the SEARS review since the current SEARS Advisory Committee may not reflect the members that regularly work with and apply the student budget parameters.

Chairperson Lindsey, having noted the issue of looking at the SEARS methodology, motioned that GAC recommend the approval of the proposed 2006-07 student expense budgets as presented. Committee Member Yamamoto moved that the motion be approved. Committee Member Bonnel seconded the motion. The motion to accept the proposed 2006-07 student expense budget was approved.

Tab 11: Workgroup Updates

A.) Enhancing Reporting & Analysis (ERA) Work Group

Committee Member Jeffrey noted that extensive dialogue occurred regarding 1) definition of graduation from high school and 2) the Cal Grant high school GPA and what can be used as its equivalent. Committee

Member Jeffrey explained that more work is needed on the two issues listed above. Staff, in consultation with GAC leadership, will continue research efforts on the noted issues and report back to GAC.

Committee Member Jeffrey explained that GAC recommended the reinstatement of Cal Grants for students who have been attending colleges and universities affected by hurricanes in the south. The group recommended that "CSAC staff exercise existing flexibility in the interpretation of CSAC's policies on reinstating Cal Grants and approving retroactive leaves of absence, so that students of colleges and universities affected by the Katrina and Rita hurricanes, who are being accommodated by eligible California colleges and universities, are able to receive Cal Grants if they had been awarded a Cal Grant in the past."

Along with the recommendation, Committee Member Jeffrey explained that the group needed further clarification on how far back the leave could go; two or four years since the initial Cal Grant award. Committee Member Bossio explained that if GAC is recommending use of existing leave policies, the Commission could only go back two years from initial award because students gone for three or four years are no longer eligible.

Committee Member Bonnel moved to pass the recommendation as noted by Committee Member Jeffrey. Committee Member Bowles seconded the motion. Committee Member Robinson asked that the motion be amended so that language in the recommendation that refers to "California colleges and universities" be replaced with "eligible California institutions." Chairperson Lindsey, noting the "technical amendment" to the motion called for a vote. The motion was approved.

Committee Member Bonnel requested that, for the record, there be a delineation of the deliverables that had been discussed by the workgroup on the previous day. Chairperson Lindsey provided the following list:

1) Staff to determine the number of September 2nd Cal Grant recipients eligible for March 2nd competition had the deadline been met. Staff to separate Cal Grant-eligible students right out of high school versus those "out one year." Also, determine how many of the March 2nd recipients were "one year out people."
2) Regarding the selection criteria issue, staff to generate a summary of trend data on students' characteristics like age and other key characteristics.
3) Definition of high school graduation and the Cal Grant GPA requirement. Staff to look at GPA equivalency.
4) Follow-up on the ATB issue and early admissions; special admissions.
5) Staff to bring back to the group proposed criteria for staff to use in determining retroactive leaves of absences (per Mr. Espinoza's notes).
6) The issue of "accreditation" as written into regulation. The workgroup to assess this issue and report to GAC.

Committee Member Jeffrey noted that issue number six was tied to the definition of high school graduation and defining alternatives to the Cal Grant GPA. Chairperson Lindsey closed the discussion and moved to the next workgroup.

B.) Technology & Enhancements (T&E) Work Group

Committee Member Bossio explained that the Technology & Enhancements Workgroup did not formally meet for the year as a group or in conference calls. Instead, she continued, the workgroup had members participate in the Advisory & Enhancement (A&E) Committee meetings in an effort to serve as a bridge between GAC, A&E and the technology group (T&E) and facilitate effective communication.

T&E members, added Committee Member Bossio, participated in the letter review (formal system-generated letter review) of Commission letters and provided input from a technology and policy perspective. Recognizing the value of inter-workgroup participation, Committee Member Bossio, on behalf of the T&E workgroup, recommended continued participation of T&E members, who represent GAC, with A&E and other related groups.

Committee Member Bossio recommended the following on behalf of GAC's T&E workgroup:

1) The Chairs of the T&E workgroup cooperate with CSAC staff in the development of A&E agendas.
2) The T&E workgroup look at the business rules related to real-time database development.
3) T&E review of the current delivery system with an eye toward streamlining and enhancements.
4) Review of EdFund/CSAC Synergy Projects and review of Web Grants for Students Phase II.

Mr. Espinoza asked for clarification on agenda staff consulting with the Chairs of T&E. Committee Member Bossio explained that the A&E agenda was to be reviewed before being finalized. This, in her view, was keeping in spirit with the effort to get participant input. The intent of the recommendations, added Chairperson Lindsey, is to "ensure that policy issues are identified so that operations or technology doesn't drive the policy issues."

Committee Member Hernandez moved to accept the recommendations noted by Committee Member Bossio. Committee Member Bowles seconded the motion. Committee Member Bossio reread the motion as follows: So moved that:

1) Members of the GAC Technology & Enhancements (T&E) Workgroup participate in the A&E Committee, representing GAC and reporting back.
2) Chairs of the T&E workgroup work with CSAC staff in development of A&E agendas.
3) The following topics be reviewed by T&E:
    a. business rules tied to real-time database
    b. review of current delivery system with an eye towards streamlining and enhancements
    c. review EdFund/CSAC synergy projects.
    d. Review Phase II of Web Grants for Students.

Committee Member Bonnel asked if subsequent T&E issues, identified now, could be added to the T&E list of topics. Chairperson Lindsey explained that identified topics are usually presented to the full Commission for approval and it is off that list that the work is completed. Mr. Espinoza added that, at least during the past year, topics have been added to the established list as they have arisen and in consultation with GAC and Commissioners.

Committee Member Bonnel expressed concern with having, in effect, given the T&E workgroup a charge with passing the recommendation (topic list) at this point in the meeting. He wanted the option to add topics or issues to the list when discussing selection of topics for GAC workgroups on Tab 16. Mr. Espinoza explained that additional topics could be added at that time.

The motion was approved.

Tab 12: Federal Legislative Update

Michael Bolden, Associate Governmental Program Analyst, Federal Policy & Programs Division, explained that on June 24, 2005, the house passed a $602 billion Labor-Health and Human Services (HHS) Education appropriations bill (HR 3010) for federal fiscal year 2006. This bill adds $50 to the maximum Pell Grant award which is half of what President Bush had sought in his budget proposal.

Mr. Bolden explained that, in response to hurricane Katrina, the delegation from Louisiana has asked for $250 billion to restart and rebuild the fabric of the region. Other states, also impacted, will be putting forth their requests. The Congressional Republican Study Committee (RSC), adds Mr. Bolden, has put forth a plan called the Operation Offset Plan. This committee is looking at programs that could be eliminated or have funding reduced in order to offset some of the cost of the disaster recovery efforts related to higher education. An example of this effort is the recommendation to eliminate the Leveraging Educational Assistance Program (LEAP) citing that most states operate programs far larger than the contribution made by the federal government. The RSC expects to save $722 million over ten years.

Committee Member Bonnel indicated concerns with the federal government's proposal to limit Pell Grants to 18 semesters. He cited the need for clarification on the 18 semester limitation, asking if the constraint referred to 18 semesters of full-time or part-time attendance. Committee Member Bonnel's concern was with students

attending on a part-time basis and having them exhaust their Pell eligibility before transferring to another institution.

Tab 13: State Legislative Update

Mr. Machado noted that the Governor has taken action on all bills sent to him from the 2005 legislative year. Of specific interest to the Commission, are bills addressing the GPA submission issue and high school exit exam.

Steve Caldwell, Manager, Outreach and Legislation Branch, informed the group that, along with the previously discussed issues, such as Proposition 76 and the Living Within Our Means Act, AB 1531 (California High School Exit Exam-CAHSEE), will be a topic of discussion at the start-up of the legislature in January 2006. Mr. Caldwell discussed the following legislative activity:

1) **AB 1531 (CA High School Exit Exam)-** Governor vetoed bill, citing that under current law, students have six opportunities to pass the exit exam. Allowing school districts to offer alternative assessments, he continued, sends the wrong message to students, parents, teachers and administrators that students are not expected to achieve at the highest levels.
2) **SB 796 (State Government Operations: Accountability)-** Signed into law. The bill outlines the requirements for several designated agencies in reporting to the legislature various updates regarding fiscal management and long range financial planning and cost savings.
3) **AB 350 (Formula for Maximum Award for Private Schools)-** Bill did not go through. Had some changes to the bill where the formula would only apply to four-year programs. The Commission had concerns with equity. The bill is a two-year bill so it will come back up in January. The Commission intends to protect the awards.
4) **AB 593 (California Hope Endowment Fund)-** Vetoed. Crafters of the bill wanted to use excess state property to raise funds for education. The Governor discussed Proposition 60A that states revenue generated by the sale of surplus property is to be used to pay off the debt accrued from the economic recovery bonds.
5) **AB 1241 (GPA Submission for Cal Grant Programs)-** Vetoed. This bill required the Commission to collect information regarding 1) number of GPAs received each year for the March and September 2nd competitions, 2) number of pupils in grade 12 for each high school, and 3) number of student aid applications received by September 2nd each year from students who are likely to be leaving high school and entering college for the first time.
6) **AB 1646 (Public Postsecondary Education: Community Colleges)-** Signed into law. The bill revises and recasts numerous statutes relating to the operation of the California Community College system and its component district and campuses. Requires a district to exempt a student from paying nonresident tuition and fees if the student was enrolled or admitted with intention to enroll, in the fall term to an institution in Alabama, Louisiana or Mississippi and could not continue their attendance due to Katrina.

Committee Member Bonnel asked when the Commission would be establishing legislative priorities for the next session or the continuation of the two-year session. Mr. Caldwell explained that the Commission has a priority list for the two-year session, but will be consulting with the Commission for the January 2006 session.

Chairperson Lindsey asked for clarification on the Governor's veto of AB 1241. Mr. Caldwell explained that the Governor's justification for a veto was due to his understanding that it was not necessary to convene a specific workgroup since the Commission already has a group studying the barriers to the GPA submission process. Mr. Caldwell added that the Governor's response did not address the technical assistance to high schools or the piece that has high schools responsible for submitting the GPA, but the bill made it to his desk and this will allow the Commission to continue conversations about GPA requirements.

Chairperson Lindsey noted that discussion of AB 1241 did not clarify if GAC was the workgroup referenced by the Governor in his veto response and, in a earlier discussion, Executive Director Fuentes-Michel had

indicated that the group may include involvement of staff from the Secretary's Office and other stakeholders. Mr. Espinoza noted that GAC has driven the issue and will most likely be part of any workgroup being utilized.

In a separate note, tied to Tab 6, Ms. Robertson handed out the new GPA Verification Form (hardcopy that has a envelope in it) and explained that all pertinent groups (CCCSFAAA, parents, CASFAA, A&E, etc.) have reviewed the form and approved it. Ms. Robertson explained that the form will be going to print shortly and asked if there was any final input.

Tab 14: Election of Committee Chair and Vice-Chair

Chairperson Lindsey informed the group that chairs cannot serve more than two consecutive years and if voted in, must be prepared to attend all meetings for the full year. She asked for chair nominations. Committee Member Bowles nominated Chairperson Lindsey for a second term. Committee Member Sliwa seconded. No additional nominations were advanced for the position of chair.

Chairperson Lindsey asked for nominations for Vice-Chairperson. Committee Member Robinson nominated Committee Member Hernandez who indicated that she would be willing to serve.. Committee Member Bowles seconded the nomination. Committee Member Nadjarian nominated Committee Member Gonzalez, but she declined due to work duties and load. No additional nominations were advanced for the position of vice chair.

Committee Member Bonnel noted that the GAC list shows him as having a term and he should not. As a system office representative, he should be listed, in the term column as "N/A." Mr. Espinoza offered to check if system representatives "term out," but if not, the list will be corrected. Committee Member Bonnel noted that other system staff had N/A designations.

Committee Member Cunha asked for clarification on her term date since she was not sure of the actual appointment date. Mr. Espinoza explained that she was an alternate and had simply taken over the seat when the member vacated the seat. He explained that her status on the list would be checked.

Committee Member Robinson moved that, given there was a single nomination for the each positions - chair and vice chair - the committee elect the nominees by acclamation.. Committee Member Bonnel seconded the nomination and the motion was approved.

Tab 15: Selection of Workgroups and Workgroup Topics for Upcoming Year

A.) Enhancing Reporting & Analysis (ERA)

Chairperson Lindsey reiterated the areas previously discussed regarding the GAC workgroups and their respective topics (Tab 11 of this agenda). She noted that GAC was to 1) include any new topics to either the Enhancing Reporting & Analysis (ERA) or Technology & Enhancements (T&E) workgroups, and 2) discuss the creation of a new SEARS workgroup to address methodology in conducting research/data collection.

Committee Member Jeffrey read the list of topics, according to her notes, for the ERA workgroup as:

1) Determine what constitutes "high school graduation" as relevant to the Cal Grant Programs.
2) Identify GPA alternatives to the high school GPA requirement.
3) Staff to complete research on the number of September 2nd recipients originally eligible for March 2nd competition (entitlement) had the deadline been met.
4) Review the selection criteria for the competitive program.
5) Clarify "retroactive leave of absence policy" for Commission
    a. Discuss how policy applied when natural disasters occur (Katrina).
    b. Define Cal Grant GPA and process for collecting it.
    c. Discuss shifting high school GPA completion responsibility from student to high school.
6) Discuss creating a new workgroup to review the student expense budget.
7) Review new policies developed since passing 1644.
8) Review current regulations and the Cal Grant manual.

9) Review the subsistence piece of the Cal Grant.
10) Review possible changes to the overall Cal Grant Program.
11) Review existing Cal Grant legislation and modify as needed.

Mr. Espinoza recommended keeping two workgroups, as opposed to adding new ones, so they remain manageable. The SEARS issue, for example, can be addressed through the ERA, in consultation with staff. In the case of Cal Grant program review, Mr. Espinoza reiterated the importance of looking at legislation as it is tied to 1644, existing regulations that govern our Cal Grant programs, and other program/policy areas that are affected by the law (legislation) being studied; take a comprehensive look at the law and how it impacts various aspects of Cal Grant programming.

Committee Member Bonnel asked if the letter review model could be employed in addressing specific topics. Specifically, Committee Member Bonnel expressed that the group look "hard at the access grant" issue. Mr. Espinoza explained that the day before the "in-person" meeting (three meetings schedule for 2006) could be used to work through the larger legislative/program issues. The day before the meeting, he added, could be divided in half to accommodate both workgroups. Committee Member Bonnel reiterated his concern about addressing program issues now; noting that previous efforts to address program issues have not been successful and students have been hurt. In response to discussion about the likelihood of making significant "program change" and using the group's time effectively, Committee Member Robinson noted that it is time to start the discussions so that when the appropriate time surfaces, the group could put forth recommendations.

Chairperson Lindsey asked for a motion that did not specifically reference the access grant, and then an amendment to the motion to specifically reference it, because then, she noted, the group can vote on the amendment, get that settled, and come back to the overall motion. Her goal was to move forward with the topics issue for this tab. Discussion continued with Committee Member Jeffrey noting that she saw the review of legislation being twofold 1) looking at changes to the program that would be long term, and 2) review of the legislation to modify as needed to minimize program/administrative complexities. She added that the goal would be to simplify the program for both the Commission to administer and for students and schools to understand.

B.) Technology & Enhancements (T&E)

Chairperson Lindsey asked the members if there was any other discussion on this workgroup since it had been discussed in Tab 11, under Workgroup Updates. Committee Member Nadjarian asked if Web Grants for Students was listed as a topic on T&E. Chairperson Lindsey said yes.

Chairperson Lindsey asked if current information on the GAC member list is updated on the website. Mr. Espinoza said the information would be updated and posted on the Commission site.

Committee Member Sliwa moved that the workgroup's charge be accepted as proposed, including modifications to the list. Committee Member Robinson seconded the motion. Chairperson Lindsey clarified that concerns for specific aspects of Cal Grant programming are to be included in the overall review of program legislation. Motion to accept the workgroups and topics, as discussed, was approved.

Tab 16: Calendar Dates for 2006 GAC Workgroup and GAC Meetings

Thea Pot-Van Atta, Manager of School Support Services Branch, began her discussion explaining that efforts are currently underway to be more expeditious and proactive in addressing customer concerns.

Ms. Pot-Van Atta explained that she and Chairperson Lindsey had discussed the creation of a GAC calendar so that staff and committee members can track assigned tasks and adherence to specific timelines. Chairperson Lindsey talked about delayed GAC minutes and the need to get them out, in rough draft, for input by GAC members. She would like to see the first draft, in Word format, out to members by no later than six weeks after the meeting. In doing this, Chairperson Lindsey adds, the group would have ample time to review the minutes, provide input, and do so while information is still fresh in the reviewer's mind.

Committee Member Robinson asked that a brief, bulleted summary of actions taken by GAC members be included with the GAC minutes for member review. Chairperson Lindsey asked Committee Member Robinson if the summary was to be posted on the Commission's website as well. Mr. Espinoza commented that posting the summary of GAC actions may be possible, thereby allowing others who could not attend, read what the GAC membership has decided. In the interest of time, Mr. Espinoza asked that the group give the Chairperson authority to "sign-off" on the GAC summary action list so it could be posted on the Commission's website and not have to go out to the entire membership. Chairperson Lindsey, in consultation with the members, concurred with Mr. Espinoza's recommendation.

Ms. Pot-Van Atta moved to review of the 2006 GAC Calendar. Before discussing the meeting dates, Mr. Espinoza asked GAC members to look at the budget letter, issued by DOF, directing all state advisory bodies to exercise fiscal prudence when holding meetings and keep to those meetings deemed absolutely necessary. In looking at the calendar, Chairperson Lindsey asked if staff was recommending GAC meet three times a year. Mr. Espinoza said yes, GAC to meet three times in person. Chairperson Lindsey clarified stating 1) two one-day meetings and 2) one two-day meeting. Mr. Espinoza said yes, adding that this would not violate the spirit of the letter issued by DOF.

Committee Member Bonnel commented that the August meeting may be difficult for GAC high school and student representatives to attend. Second, he recommended that staff ask for four meetings, instead of the desired three, just in case the Commissioners decide to authorize a lesser amount of meetings that are originally requested. Finally, if a fourth meeting is requested, Committee Member Bonnel recommended staff look at a meeting in May 2006 which would place it between two Commission meetings; allowing enough time to look back at the successes and challenges of the March 2nd competition cycle.

Chairperson Lindsey understood the logic behind Committee Member Bonnel's recommendation, given that previously GAC requested three meetings and the Commissioners rolled it back to two, but opted to have staff address the meeting issue directly with the Commissioners. Mr. Espinoza commented that ultimately, the Commissioner can override staff recommendations, but the number of meetings was reasonable and manageable. As for a meeting in May 2006, Mr. Espinoza added that May is a difficult time for Commission staff since there is increased activity responding to concerns from the legislature, the Governor's Office and DOF. Teleconferencing, added Mr. Espinoza, is always an option to meeting and the previous year's success in negotiating meeting time shows it can be successfully accomplished.

Chairperson Lindsey asked about GAC involvement, as in the past, with the May revise and BCP processes. Mr. Espinoza noted that the March meeting would be a good time to list these processes and/or issues on the agenda since the legislative hearings usually take place in April.

With respect to budget principles, the rules or guidelines that help maintain the integrity of the Cal Grant Programs, Mr. Espinoza explained that GAC input needs to take place during the October meeting for consideration at the subsequent Commission meeting.

Mr. Caldwell was asked by Chairperson Lindsey if the establishment of budget principles is an ongoing process or activity. Mr. Caldwell explained that maintenance of the principles was ongoing, noting that they are employed when there are modifications to Cal Grant programming or in response to the LAO's answer to the Governor's budget. It is here, in response to the LAO's analysis, that the Commission submits its budget principles to the legislature. Chairperson Lindsey asked that a standing information/action be listed on the GAC agenda for every in-person meeting. The March meeting, explained Mr. Caldwell, would be a good time to discuss the LAO analysis of the budget, but GAC may want to discuss budget principles in October since the Commission discusses them in their November meeting.

On the matter of the proposed meeting dates for GAC, Committee Member Yamamoto indicated that the March 2nd Cal Grant deadline presents challenges for establishing early spring meeting dates. Committee Member Bonnel noted that A&E is scheduled to meet six times, meeting three times between GAC meetings, and issues surfacing from the A&E meetings may not be conveyed to GAC in a timely manner. Secondly, he was concerned with the frequency of A&E meetings and the increasing reliance that staff if placing on that body as opposed to GAC, the designated advisory body to the Commission.

Chairperson Lindsey addressed Committee Member Bonnel's concerns by stating that 1) the three recommended meetings are in person, 2) T&E Chairs, Committee Member Yamamoto and Committee Member Bossio, will be attending the A&E meetings, thereby ensuring matters surfacing at A&E will be brought forth to the GAC membership, and 3) if an issue arose at an A&E meeting that warranted attention from GAC, the issue could be addressed at the next scheduled meeting or through teleconferencing. Mr. Espinoza added that the increased A&E and GAC meeting dates are a direct result of financial aid community members requesting more meetings. Also, on the subject of the role of GAC, in terms of advising the Commission or directing staff, Mr. Espinoza explained to Committee Member Bonnel that such perceived roles may be a function of minimal meeting time; not allowing for greater meeting time for live meetings between members.

Committee Member Jeffrey spoke in support of the proposed meeting dates adding that the "flexibility" piece, which allows for teleconferencing, will ensure GAC matters are addressed. Committee Member Robinson also proposed that the GAC in-person meetings be held on Fridays to help promote workgroup meetings the day before (like the October meetings).

The GAC "in-person" meetings were scheduled for March 10th, August 4th, and October 19th and 20th, 2006. Moving the March meeting to the 10th allows ten days to notice a GAC meeting if, by chance, directed by the Commission during their February 2006 meeting, to address a specific GAC issue. The in-person meetings will be held on Fridays, with the understanding that a workgroup meeting may be scheduled the day before (Thursday) as done with the traditional October meeting. Finally, the flexibility to call a teleconference will be reserved by staff and the leadership of GAC.

Committee Member Villalobos moved to accept the 2006 GAC Calendar with corrections. Committee Member Gonzalez seconded. The motion was approved.

Chairperson Lindsey recognized the contributions and efforts of previous members no longer serving with GAC. Nicole DiMartini, Sherri Hancock, and Ryan Sanders, were not present to receive their certificates of appreciation, but their service to students of California as members of the Committee was recognized and honored by Chairperson Lindsey and the other GAC members. Staff will be forwarding certificates of appreciation to those former members of the Committee.

Chairperson Lindsey adjourned the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

_____

Mary Lindsey, Chair

CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION

GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE TELECONFERENCE

10811 INTERNATIONAL DRIVE
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95670
Tuesday, February 21, 2006

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mary Lindsey, Chair, CAPPS
Louise McClain, Commission Liaison
Laura Cunha, CAPPS
Noelia Gonzalez, CASFAA
Maria Hernandez, CSU
Kate Jeffrey, UC
Richard Quintana, CCCCO
Mary Robinson, CSU
Catherine Thomas, AICCU
Veronica Villalobos, AICCU

Craig Yamamoto, CCC

COMMISSION STAFF

Max Espinoza, Chief, Grant Services Division
John Bays, Chief, Information Technology Division
Steve Caldwell, Chief, Outreach & Legislation
Anne Robertson, Manager, Cal Grant Operations Branch
Bryan Dickason, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Dianna Ximenez, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Gloria Falcon, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Jorge Cortez, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Justin Ngo, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Catalina Mistler, Manager, Specialized Programs Operations Branch
Judith Beck, Staff, Specialized Programs Operations Branch
Renee Alexander, Staff, Specialized Programs Operations Branch
Linda Brown, Staff, Specialized Programs Operations Branch
Clarita Cortez, Staff, Specialized Programs Operations Branch
Veronica Rodriguez, Assistant to the Chief, Program Administration & Services Division
Cora Manuel, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Keith Yamanaka, Chief Legal Counsel
Drew Schrepel, Staff, School Support Services Branch

Introductions/Roll Call

No introductions made by Committee Chairperson Mary Lindsey. Roll call was taken and it was determined that a quorum was in place.

Tab 1: State Nursing Assumption Program of Loans for Education

Chairperson Lindsey began the meeting by explaining that the group was called together for GAC input to the State Nursing Assumption Program of Loans for Education (SNAPLE) regulations. She added that on this day the Commission would be delivering a notice to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) regarding the proposed regulations with an anticipated publish date of March 3, 2006, thereby starting the 45-day public comment period. GAC, she added, can provide additional input after the current day meeting (in the public comment period).

When asked what he'd like GAC to do, Max Espinoza, Chief, Program Administration & Services Division, began with a historical perspective of the program. He explained that the program had been established through the Budget Act of 2005 with the Commission charged with its administration. Unsure of the duration of the program, Mr. Espinoza explained that the Commission was still responsible for establishing program regulations and clarifying any matters concerned with statute.

Mr. Espinoza explained that staff has been working with primarily with the nursing community and the financial aid community to gather input on program administration. Stakeholder meetings have been held, such as the one held on February 03, 2006, so participants could engage in discussion about the program. Additionally, individual phone calls have been made and emails sent to stakeholders to get input. Information gathered from all contacts, whether formal or personalized, have been collected and modification to the regulations have been made accordingly.

What Mr. Espinoza sought from the teleconference GAC group participants was specific feedback on concerns, regarding the SNAPLE program and SNAPLE regulations that needed to be considered before submittal of the regulations. He reiterated that this opportunity will not be the last the group will have to provide input.

Mr. Espinoza added that during the 45-day public comment period, if anyone submits comments, Commission staff would be required to respond to the comments before any action can be taken by the Commission. Keith Yamanaka, Chief Counsel, added that the Commission would have to respond either with the recommended change or an explanation as to why the regulation is the way that it is, therefore not allowing for the recommendation to be implemented.

Catalina Mistler, Manager of Specialized Programs & Student Support Branches, explained that Commission staff had met with representatives from the Board of Registered Nurses and staff from the Legislative Advocate for the California Nurses Association and at that time they had reviewed the regulations, line by line, to ensure accurate stakeholder representation. After the changes to the regulations were made, she added, directors of nursing as well as nursing staff were contacted to clarify questions or staff concerns.

Mary Robinson, California State University representative, asked Ms. Mistler how the stakeholder group was identified for invitation to the February 3, 2006 meeting. Ms. Mistler explained that Commission staff had worked with the Executive Director of the Nursing Program of the Office of Health Planning and Development (OHSPD), and in particular Diane Tamoto, who had worked with OHSPD's advisory committee and through those contacts a stakeholder group, was assembled. Mr. Espinoza commented that a Special Alert, dated January 23, 2006, went out to the financial aid community informing them of the upcoming meeting. Additionally, work with the Governor's Office occurred to encourage participation.

Chairperson Lindsey noted that input from the group was sought during the teleconference, yet the regulations were being forwarded to the OAL on the same day. Mr. Espinoza explained that what the Commission sought

from the GAC meeting was input on "striking" content seen in the regulations; he sought input on matters that brought concern for GAC members, especially on the bigger policy issues connected to the regulations.

Chairperson Lindsey wanted to clarify that the input from GAC, as it pertained to the teleconference, was input on staff work that is going forward to the OAL and not a recommendation the GAC is putting forward to the Commission, which is what GAC usually does. Mr. Espinoza explained that the current meeting was about giving GAC another opportunity to give input before submitting the regulations.

Catherine Thomas, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities representative, asked if the February 10, 2006 email with the latest version of the regulations contained the latest input for the regulations. Ms. Mistler explained that a subsequent email had been issued and that contained the latest input from both GAC members and stakeholders.

GAC members expressed concern about the version of regulations received and reviewed by some attending the teleconference. Kate Jeffrey, University of California representative, asked if staff could review the changes made from the earlier version of regulations and discuss the bigger policy issues. Ms. Mistler explained that there have been no major changes to the regulations since the last updated version of March 3, 2006. Some members had a version of the regulations dated February 10, 2006. Ms. Thomas explained that some basic clean-up work, such as definitions and acronyms, was needed on the regulations. Commissioner Louise McClain added that the regulations needed to identify trimesters, when discussing terms, and differentiation between campuses located or headquartered in California.

Ms. Mistler stated that all recommendations to date were reflected in the March 3rd version. Mary Robinson, California State University representative, stated that the definition listed in the regulations for "academic year" was inconsistent with that used by all federal programs. Judith Beck, Associate, Specialized Programs Operations Branch, explained that the academic year, in this case, refers to when the candidate has finished their degree and are employed. In this way, she added, the employer has greater leeway in determining their academic year and this definition can almost include every term format such as semesters, trimesters, and quarters. The first definition provided by staff, explained Ms. Mistler, was too restrictive for Mary Gill so the definition was modified to its current form.

Ms. Robinson suggested that staff be cognizant of the community's definition of "academic year," especially if the same expression is being used to mean something different from what most view as the definition. Ms. Beck explained that many of the schools have different definitions for academic year. Ms. Thomas reiterated GAC's suggestion that staff use the federal definition of academic year. Veronica Villalobos, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU) representative, recalled the discussion on the issue explaining that a University of Phoenix (UOP) representative asked for the greatest flexibility as possible.

Ms. Robinson responded by stating that being too flexible in redefining academic year may not be equitable in terms of the period that's used for the awards of the recipients. Chairperson Lindsey added that she believed Ms. Robinson was referencing the federal government's definition of academic year tied to a minimum amount of time that had to be included. Ms. Beck informed the group that concern with the actual length of the academic year, as defined by the federal government, will be addressed by requiring students to teach at accredited schools which will require a "reasonable" and common definition of academic year.

Ms. Thomas commented that if the Commission doesn't define the length of the academic year, "people are going to be all over the map" with how they define their year. She added that the Commission "could be awarding one student the maximum for teaching for 30 days and everybody else who adheres to a normal academic year definition would have to teach nine months." Ms. Robinson commented that the Commission cannot advantage one institution over another and, added Chairperson Lindsey, the federal government has a minimum number of days that have to fit into the academic year. Ms. Thomas explained that the total was 30 weeks.

Mr. Espinoza reiterated the sentiment of the group stating that there should be a minimum standard of 30 weeks per academic year and that the Commission should attempt to exercise flexibility within that definition.

Chairperson Lindsey added that the standard definition should not be a problem for institutions, like UOP, because they administer federal financial aid which uses the same academic year definition.

Ms. Thomas, in continuing review of the SNAPLE regulations recommended that the Commission be consistent with the use of abbreviations or not use them at all. With the matter of definitions for employment and enrollment, Ms. Thomas noted that staff defined full-time and part-time employment, but did not do the same for enrollment, yet both terms are referenced in the document. Ms. Beck explained that in terms of enrollment, the law says a student "will be enrolled on at least a half-time basis each academic term as defined by an eligible institution" and therefore the Commission should not define enrollment here.

Ms. Thomas expressed concern about there being no definition for enrollment. Mr. Espinoza asked Ms. Thomas if the Commission should restate what the statute says on the matter. Ms. Thomas said yes to the question, noting that people are going to be looking for definitions and in her view; staff is defining some terms and not others. She'd like to see a definition for enrollment.

On the matter of email address requests of students, per SNAPLE regulations, Ms. Thomas asked if it was mandatory or optional. Ms. Mistler explained that the Commission asks for the information if available. Commissioner McClain asked about the meaning of "natural causes" as noted in Section 30610(h) noting that she thought a recommendation had been made to include "natural disaster" in that definition too. Ms. Beck explained, while it had been discussed, counsel explained that the law discussed physical illness as natural causes to the person.

Ms. Villalobos asked about the reasoning behind giving Registered Nurses (RNs), with an active RN license, an additional 20 points for the competition. Her concern was with a student being able to secure, or even needing, the active RN license to teach. Further, Ms. Thomas added that if a student has just been admitted to graduate school, how would they be able to get the full points. Richard Quintana, representing the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCC), explained that in order for a student to be admitted to a graduate program in nursing, they have to have clinical experience; in essence experience as a nurse before being considered for graduate school. This, Ms. Beck explained, is how the RN would have the active license.

Ms. Thomas asked about verification of Section 30911(b)(4) and (5), as noted on the SNAPLE regulations, where the student a) is not to owe federal or state funds, or b) delinquent or defaulted in student loans.
After thorough discussion about the issue, it was concluded by staff, Mr. Espinoza, Ms. Thomas, and Ms. Robinson that the student's current financial state, as it pertains to outstanding debt to the government or defaulted loans, would be certified by the student and verified by the Commission. If any other direction is taken by the Commission, Ms. Thomas and Ms. Robinson ask that the Commission be very clear, in the regulations, about what is expected of the student and the nominating institutions.

Ms. Jeffrey asked about the current draft of regulations discussing Section 30912(b)(3) where the participating institution is to determine that the student has an outstanding ability to become a nursing faculty based on a the student's GPA and a faculty evaluation. Ms. Mistler explained that the nomination is completed by the institution and both the GPA and the faculty evaluation would have to be provided for consideration to the program.

Ms. Jeffrey expressed concern about the nominating entity completing a faculty evaluation for a student who may or may not end up teaching at the same or similar institution. Ms. Thomas asked if that distinction mattered since the evaluation asked that the student be evaluated on their ability to function as nursing faculty. Ms. Jeffrey explained that the requirements for teaching faculty at a University of California (UC) school, which requires a doctorate, would be different for a faculty member at a California Community College (CC). Ms. Beck responded by saying that institutions are being asked to evaluate the student's ability to become a faculty member and not whether they (the nominating institution) would hire the student. Ms. Jeffrey asked if maybe the student evaluation should be based on factors used by institutions that hire nursing faculty and not limit the evaluation to the assessment of the participating institution doing the evaluation. She would take out the word "participating" institution, when having the evaluation completed, and just say "based on the factors used by institutions of higher nursing faculty."

With five minutes left before time ran out for the meeting, Chairperson Lindsey asked if the GAC wanted to meet again, for a longer period of time, to discuss the SNAPLE regulations. Ms. Thomas asked if committee members were satisfied with the scoring for SNAPLE. Commissioner McClain, understanding the history of previous discussion on the regulations, recommended more discussion on the issue since some program definitions, such as what constitutes full-time enrollment if you have students attending two different schools on a half-time basis. Laura Cunha, representative for the California Association of Private Postsecondary Schools, asked about the definition of "immediate" as being used in the regulations. Specific concerns such as these led Chairperson Lindsey to conclude that another meeting, to discuss the proposed regulations, was needed for the group.

Mr. Espinoza commented that the Commission heard the concerns of the group, but noted that the comments made at the meeting will most likely not be incorporated to the draft regulations being forwarded to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) due to the existing timeline. Mr. Espinoza recommended that the proposed meeting to continue discussion of the SNAPLE regulations be incorporated to the GAC agenda for the upcoming March 9 and 10, 2006 GAC meeting so that the group could review the regulations and take action as needed. Additionally, Mr. Espinoza explained that individual written concerns about the regulations would be taken for consideration during the public comment period.

Chairperson Lindsey asked if GAC could submit their written concerns, regarding the regulations, as a formal recommendation to the Commission even though the 45-day public comment process has started. Mr. Espinoza explained that the group can submit its recommendations to the Commission, but that the meeting to identify the recommendations be done during the next GAC meeting in March 2006.

Chairperson Lindsey concluded that an additional meeting to discuss the regulations would be needed and that the group would be notified. She also added that there is no formal GAC recommendation to the Commission regarding the SNAPLE regulations. Mr. Espinoza reiterated the importance of having GAC input, whether it be formally, full committee or as individual GAC members.

Chairperson Lindsey thanked and acknowledged the contributions of staff, Mr. Espinoza, Ms. Mistler, and GAC members for their work on the regulations.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

_____

Mary Lindsey, Chair

CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION
GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GAC) AD-HOC WORK GROUP

10811 INTERNATIONAL DRIVE
RANCHO CORDOVA, CALIFORNIA
Friday, APRIL 14, 2006

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mary Lindsey, Chair, PI

Maria Hernandez, Vice-Chair, CSU
Tim Bonnel, CCCCO
Lora Jo Bossio, UC
Louise McClain, Commission Representative

Laura Cunha, PI
Noelia Gonzalez, CASFAA

Kate Jeffrey, UC
Veronica Villalobos, AICCU
Craig Yamamoto, CCC

COMMISSION STAFF

Max Espinoza, Chief, Program Administration & Services Division
Anne Robertson, Manager, Cal Grant Operations Branch
Tina Kilgore-Goodwin, AVP Audit Services, EdFund
Damian Scribner, Staff, Cal Grant Operations Branch
Catalina Mistler, Manager, Specialized Programs Operations Branch
Bryan Dickason, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Drew Schrepel, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Gloria Falcon, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Allen Scott, Staff, Cal Grant Operations Branch Division
Corazon Manuel, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Justin Ngo, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Jessica Fontaine, Staff, Cal Grant Operations Branch
Jorge Cortez, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Randy Russell, Senior Information Systems Auditor, Audit Services, EdFund

ALSO PRESENT

Ted Waite, Golden State Advocacy

Introduction/ Call to Order

Committee Chairperson Mary Lindsey called the meeting to order and began by introducing Ms. Tina Kilgore-Goodwin, Assistant Vice-President of Audits Services and Mr. Randy Russell, Senior Information Systems Auditor with Audit Services. Both were in attendance to provide GAC members greater understanding of the California Student Aid Commission's (CSAC) internal audit and the recommendations being put forth.

Tab 1: Cal Grant Disbursements/ Advance Payments/ Reconciliation Processes and Proposed Changes

Mr. Russell began the discussion explaining that the first two findings of the audit, 1) disbursement of funds and 2) the timeframe in which disbursements are reported, were interrelated. He noted that the reporting process, from a control standpoint, does not allow for much accountability since funds may not be reported for 16 to 18 months after being disbursed.

Chairperson Lindsey asked if new reporting standards had been developed, prompting the review of the process. Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin explained that a review of the payment process had not been completed in some time, but, in speaking with Max Espinoza, Chief, Program Administration & Services Division, there had been some analysis of the current reporting practices and what she and her colleagues sought to do was look at that process and determine level of efficiency. The main focus of their review efforts, adds Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin, is determining the cash flow for a given academic year and looking at efficiency.

Mr. Espinoza asked about the number of schools assessed (looked at). Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin explained that audit staff looked at the reporting practices for all participating institutions for the 2003/04 and 2004/05 academic years. The review produced the following findings:

1. 230 institutions, out of 370, received advances that exceeded what they reported for a given term. This was interpreted to mean that either the schools didn't disburse the funds or there is a significant lag in reporting payment information to CSAC.

2. Approximately 70% (260 institutions) are reporting information to CSAC well after the October 15th deadline.

Chairperson Lindsey asked if the data resulting from the analysis included a review of both years; was it duplicated data, and was the break down by academic year and school. Mr. Russell explained that the data was compiled looking at all those factors. Chairperson Lindsey noted that the data had not been seen by the committee. Mr. Espinoza explained that he would check to see if the data could be shared.

Chairperson Lindsey, in response to concern about unreported funds, asked Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin to explain reasonable reporting audit standards. Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin explained that all recommendations must be viewed in relation to each other and that the processing time or scope of one activity can directly impact the other. Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin provided the example that encouraging the tightening, and enforcement, of reporting deadlines may make some of the other recommendations, such as reducing an institution's advance, a secondary issue that is directly impacted by tightening the deadlines. Additionally, when discussing the recommendations for addressing payment advances and meeting set deadlines, Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin noted that simultaneous implementation of multiple, related recommendations may be the most effective approach to addressing the issue(s).

Mr. Russell added that the State's position, as well as the Department of Finance (DOF), is that funds being disbursed from them should be disbursed at the last possible moment and funds being received should come in as soon as possible. This, he added, is clearly the methodology the State wants other agencies in the industry to use. His review of the audit data and that 2003-04 and 2004-05 academic year shows that there is still a lot of reporting into October, November and December for the term of the previous academic year.

Chairperson Lindsey explained that everybody understands that there have been reporting requirements that haven't been enforced or adhered to and that has contributed to the issue, but what she was also hearing is that even if the deadlines were adhered to, that would not be enough to address the reporting concerns. That

having been said, Chairperson Lindsey asked the Workgroup to look at what GAC might recommend regarding additional deadlines to address reporting concerns.

Chairperson Lindsey asked the group what they thought about adding additional reporting deadlines. She referenced Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin's recommendation of reporting 30 to 60 days after the end of the term and ideally, 30-60 days into the term if possible. Mr. Timothy Bonnel, California Community College Chancellor's Office (CCCCO), noted that his understanding was that the group had agreed to reporting within 60 days of the end of the term with recognition that there may be adjustments beyond that period as a result of other requirements. His recollection of the issue was that GAC approved a motion to reconcile within 60 days at the end of each term and no later than October 15th.

Commissioner Louise McClain and Chairperson Lindsey concurred that Mr. Bonnel's recollection was correct. Chairperson Lindsey asked Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin if the proposed recommendation by GAC would be acceptable to the auditors for the 2006-07 academic year. Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin agreed that reporting within 60 days of the end of the term, with potential adjustments after that period, would be a step in the right direction. This recommendation, however, would not allow CSAC to be able to determine whether the spring advance requires offsetting. Mr. Russell concurred, adding that reporting payment before the calculation of the next advance would be ideal, but working toward 30-60 days after the term is better than current reporting practices.

Mr. Bonnel expressed concern with schools not receiving their supplemental advances due to the advance process and students ultimately impacted aversely. He also noted that he did not see data showing the number of schools returning money to CSAC and the amount of funds returned by these schools. Mr. Bonnel's recollection is that most schools return less than $10,000 and that most are getting small advances to reconcile out.

Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin explained that there were 230 schools out of the 370 returning funds. The issue, she noted, addresses more than the amount of funds returned by the schools that owe CSAC money, but instead, the timeliness of reporting, or returning, funds and the inability to account for funds, in some cases, for over a year. Some schools, she added, are either posting payments or remitting funds toward the end of the year.

In response to Chairperson Lindsey's discussion of the advance process to schools, Mr. Russell explained the offset process and how schools showing a balance after the first advance have their spring advance reduced (offset) by the amount remaining in school accounts. Mr. Russell noted that, from an audit perspective, if funds are advanced in August or September, why are the funds not accounted for until October, November or December. Mr. Bonnel explained that in previous discussions, GAC recommended that schools be allowed to identify when they want the money as opposed to when they get it automatically.

Mr. Russell reiterated that the problem with delay in reporting payments and making payment adjustments prevents the accurate accountability of advanced funds. In his review of the two-year Cal Grant funding period, he noted that there were approximately 70-80 thousand payments previously reported, that had to be adjusted. Chairperson Lindsey asked what percentage amount this represented from all payments for the same period.

Ms. Anne Robertson, Cal Grant Operations Manager, explained that the issue, in her view, has to do with the order in which payments are made. She explained that CSAC issues the advance to the school, some schools report in excess of what is advanced and they subsequently receive "supplemental" advances above the allocated fall advance. When the spring advance is issued, there is no offset and so the school, again, receives full advance payment for the spring. But at the end of the year, some schools adjust payments to zero indicating that they've had the advance funds from the fall and spring. Reconciling 30 to 60 days after the term, added Ms. Robertson, would ensure CSAC gets the money back.

Mr. Craig Yamamoto, California Community Colleges, that the payment method exists because that is what was developed and schools have learned, with CSAC's training, "on how to report payments in order to satisfy the number of students they have at that time." Unlike the federal programs that have standards and software that takes care of reporting, CSAC's system is not integrated into People's software system and schools have

to manually report payments those (adjusted) payments; the matter is a workload issue to Mr. Yamamoto. He also added that the 95% advance doesn't address the need of Community College (CC) students and the September 2nd cycle also delays payment to students.

Ms. Robertson explained that the delay in reporting payment can be minimized if schools report 30-60 days after the term. Chairperson Lindsey expressed that part of the delay is how it is set up, adding that everyone at the meeting is willing to work with the reporting recommendation, but the approach has to be reasonable. Ms. Lora Jo Bossio, University of California, added that an additional issue is the short notice to schools. She explained that the reporting shift has to be looked at in terms of "long-term" change. Training schools and allowing schools to make the programming changes, if needed, needs to be considered. Ms. Bossio is concerned that the change in reporting practice for schools may not occur in the 2006-07 academic year.

Mr. Espinoza, in response to discussion about the 30-60 day reconciliation after the term recommendation, asked why the reconciliation could not occur sooner. Committee members Ms. Bossio, Mr. Yamamoto and Chairperson Lindsey explained that matters of 1) existing practice, 2) a short turn-around time expectation (implement reporting time frames in 2006-07), and 3) limited resources and program capabilities on campus may all contribute to not being able to meet the 30-60 day reporting time frame. Chairperson Lindsey expressed concern about the "bottle neck" effect on campuses because of the lateness of the program change and limitation of staff availability.

In response to Mr. Espinoza's comment about the need for better understanding, by CSAC staff in an effort to craft a response to the audit findings, Ms. Kate Jeffrey, University of California, explained that the issue is not that the 30-60 day, after term, recommendation is not feasible, it is that it may not work for the 2006-07 academic year, but instead the following year. Mr. Espinoza thanked Kate for the clarification.

Chairperson Lindsey explained that GAC recommended going forward to the Commission with a short and long-term plan for the advance/repayment process. The short term would allow reconciliation of payment 30-60 day after the term and then look a "just-in-time" processing for the long-term. Ms. Robertson explained that the problem with the short-term recommendation is that it does not address the issue of having to hold off the next advance due to payments that have not been posted or reported.

Mr. Bonnel expressed concern about schools returning funds in the middle of the year (reconciliation), noting that he did not want cash going back and forth between the school and CSAC. Mr. Bonnel explained that under the three-step plan; 1) 30-60 reconciliation after the term, 2) 30-60 after funds disbursed (within term) to the school and finally, 3) reporting payment in real-time, his biggest concern was with the second step of the plan. He explained that "within term" reconciliations pose a huge problem because of the 11,250 awards issued under the September 2nd competition which are usually paid in October and November.

Mr. Russell and Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin explained that "back and forth" of money between institutions could be eliminated if payments were reported within-term or 30-60 days after the advance was disbursed. In this case, explains Ms. Russell, there would be "no returning of funds needed" because reporting payments before the end of the term would be soon enough that the offset could be made on the next term. Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin added that "it's really doing what the institution normally does, just doing it sooner." Chairperson Lindsey explained that GAC members agree except at this late date, the infrastructure is not in place to implement in 2006-07.

Ms. Bossio recommended that GAC move forward with saying the group agrees with the findings of the audit and efforts are underway to get the right people together to develop a system for the 2007-08 academic year that could be implemented and too, provide for staff training at the school site. Ms. Robertson commented that if we chose to move with the 30-60 after-term payment, as discussed, she would then propose that CSAC continue to offset the next term advance with whatever was outstanding from the previous advance. This, she added, would be continuing the reporting process, as it currently stands, but adding the reconciliation piece 30-60 days after the term ends.

Ms. Bossio expressed concern about any particular term being closed off for future reporting when following the 30-60 day after term recommendation, noting that doing so may create more work for CSAC. Ms. Kilgore-

Goodwin explained that the goal would be to minimize subsequent reporting, but understood that circumstances would occur when additional adjustments would need to be made to a term after being closed. Mr. Espinoza also noted that terms warranting adjustments would be handled through an appeals process that would have been thoroughly reviewed by CSAC.

Ms. Bossio strongly argued that if closing out is to occur, that it be done to the academic year and not the term since schools work off the year and students view themselves as being a student for the year regardless of what occurs in terms. Ms. Bossio would support reconciling terms, but would want the process of having to make adjustments to be open the full academic year. Ms. Robertson explained that "adjustments" could occur after reconciliation, but they would have to be down, thereby "making payment" to CSAC. Any adjustments to the term for additional payments would require review on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Bossio expressed that it did not make sense to her to make adjustments down, but not up.

Mr. Espinoza understood Ms. Bossio's concern, but noted that a thoughtful appeals plan may address exceptional cases. Ms. Bossio expressed that the closing out the term and having to use an appeals process may convolute the system. Mr. Yamamoto expressed concern with a system that currently has processing challenges (e.g., backing out payments in one school and the student not being able to get paid at another, thereby warranting use of manual payment) and now implementing a "term-base" system that closes out the term.

Ms. Jeffrey asked if adjustments could be allowed up or down for the 2006-07 academic year and then tighten up the process in subsequent years. In this way, she added, CSAC could see the impact of adjustments on school and CSAC staff and too, the impact of appeals; this would help recognize that CSAC cannot "do everything in the first year, but you can at least take some steps in the right direction."

Chairperson Lindsey asked how the adjustment of a term downward, but not upward, helped the "cash flow" issue. Ms. Robertson answered that it did not and that is why staff may want to look at schools reporting a lot of adjustments downward, after the required time, and consider doing something such as putting their Cal Grant funds in interest-bearing accounts. Ms. Jeffrey agreed, adding that instead of cutting off adjustments, parameters should be set and anyone outside those parameters should be sanctioned.

Chairperson Lindsey asked the auditors, present at the meeting, if a "workgroup" could be established to address the advance/reconciliation issue between now and September and develop a plan that would be implemented in 2007-08. The group, added Chairperson Lindsey, would consist of auditors, business people, financial aid staff and CSAC staff. Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin explained that she cannot stipulate a time frame for changing the process, but the approach being taken to consider all impacted by the change is in line with the audit team's recommendations.

Ms. Jeffrey explained a similar experience had by the federal government. In her scenario, the federal government chose to transition a specific number of schools from their current process to a "just-in-time" one. They did it this way, she added, to see how it would work with a small sample of schools and then, if applicable, win the confidence of the remaining schools. She encouraged CSAC to consider using a similar model; where a pilot is implemented for a period of time.

Mr. Espinoza explained that CSAC is moving in good faith and that is why the "phase-in" approach would be considered as long as it shows effort in trying to get to the ideal. He explained that, as in previous efforts to address limited CSAC technology issues, he'd like to see the group recommend concrete proposals to the Commissioners concerning this reporting process. He added that there are some Commissioners that want to move very quickly.

Chairperson Lindsey commented that there appears to be a discrepancy between the internal auditors and CSAC in terms of what constitutes good faith effort. She explained that, given the late date to make changes to the process, they may not be doable and CSAC may not get the desired results. Without wanting to put the auditors on the spot, Mr. Espinoza explained that it is not up to the auditors determine what is acceptable, but instead, the Commissioners. Mr. Russell, a member of the audit team, agreed.

Ms. Bossio explained that if Commissioners were presented with a fully supported plan to establish a workgroup to look at implementation in 2007-08, that would be viewed as reasonable and in good faith. Mr. Espinoza recommended proposing actual steps to work toward a timelier reporting. These steps, he added, can be noted in addition to the workgroup recommendation, but it would reflect actions that would be implemented this coming year. Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin added that from an audit standpoint, if short-term steps would not be put in place, such as additional reporting deadlines, what would the plan be for reevaluating the advance methodology. She did not want to leave the impression that the audit team would be fine with nothing being done in the short term.

Chairperson Lindsey asked about the urgency even though the current processing/reporting status has been in place for 12 or 15 years. Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin explained that any time audit identifies control weakness or opportunities for improvement there is urgency. If there is anything that can be done, she added, we (audit) would like management to give it consideration. Mr. Espinoza added that Ms. Kilgore-Goodwin's explanation of their expectation is management's position.

Additional discussion between CSAC and GAC members transpired, but no actions were taken beyond this point. CSAC staff noted the previous recommendations from GAC, as well as additional comments about implementation concerns, but expects to proceed with the CSAC work plan. Staff, noted Mr. Espinoza, expects to provide the Commissioners with a detailed response in terms of what staff proposes to do to begin making changes that respond to audit findings and recommendations.

Chairperson Lindsey adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

_____

Mary Lindsey, Chair

CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION
GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GAC) TELECONFERENCE

10811 INTERNATIONAL DRIVE
RANCHO CORDOVA, CALIFORNIA
Friday, MAY 26, 2006

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mary Lindsey, Chair, PI

Maria Hernandez, Vice-Chair, CSU

Louise McClain, Commission Representative
Tim Bonnel, CCCCO

Lora Jo Bossio, UC
Sharon Bowles, High School Counselor Rep.
Laura Cunha, PI

Greg Gollihur, CPEC
Noelia Gonzalez, CASFAA
Kate Jeffery, UC
David Kopperud, K-12
Catherine Thomas, AICCU
Craig Yamamoto, CCC

COMMISSION STAFF

Diana Fuentes-Michel, Executive Director, California Student Aid Commission
Max Espinoza, Chief, Program Administration & Services Division
John Bays, Chief, Information Technology Division
Steve Caldwell, Chief, Governmental Affairs and Research Division
Anne Robertson, Manager, Cal Grant Operations Branch
Bryan Dickason, Acting Manager, School Support Services Branch

Tina Kilgore-Goodwin, AVP Audit Services, EdFund
Randy Russell, Senior Information Systems Auditor, Audit Services, EdFund
Damian Scribner, Staff, Cal Grant Operations Branch
Drew Schrepel, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Gloria Falcon, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Allen Scott, Staff, Cal Grant Operations Branch Division
Corazon Manuel, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Justin Ngo, Staff, School Support Services Branch
Jorge Cortez, Staff, School Support Services Branch

ALSO PRESENT

Ted Waite, Golden State Advocacy

Call to Order

Chairperson Mary Lindsey called the meeting of the Grant Advisory Committee to order at 12:05 p.m.

Tab 1: Cal Grant High School Graduation Verification Analysis & Recommendations

Mary Lindsey, Chair, began the discussion by providing some history. She noted that the original issue marked for discussion for this teleconference was the reconciliation and cash flow problem, but that the high school diploma issue had also been added. Chair Lindsey explained that a previous recommendation had been made to the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC) on how to ensure that students didn't inadvertently tell schools they had graduated from college when they may not have passed CAHSEE. From that, she added, the issued expanded beyond CAHSEE to high school verification (meaning securing a diploma) due to concerns from staff that verification had not been completed.

Max Espinoza, Chief, Program Administration & Services Division (PASD), pointed out that one of the reasons the high school graduation verification issue, along with addressing CAHSEE, is being done simultaneously is because CAHSEE is a part of the larger issue of verifying high school graduation. Mr. Espinoza added that the documents being reviewed are a work in progress and could be modified prior to the Commission seeing them. Chair Lindsey asked that, for the record, in any major changes were to occur, that staff work with her to identify those areas vetted by the Grant Advisory Committee (GAC) and those that were not.

Chair Lindsey asked Charles Wood, Staff Management Auditor, Management Services Division, to clarify the current process used by compliance staff to check for high school graduation. Mr. Wood explained that staff does not check for high school graduation at this time. Chair Lindsey concluded that the extent of the problem, or even if there is a problem, is not known. Mr. Wood agreed, adding that high school graduation verification would be done if something in the review process catches the attention of staff.

Mr. Wood informed GAC, in his discussion with Chair Lindsey, that CSAC worked with the understanding that when the school verifies eligibility, high school graduation verification is part of that review. Chair Lindsey agreed, but added that compliance is to follow up to ensure schools are doing what CSAC wants them to do. The assumption, added Chair Lindsey, is that schools have been verifying high school graduation all along, but on the other hand, compliance reviews have not been looking to see that the verification is being completed.

Kate Jeffery, University of California (UC) representative, explained that she viewed staff recommendations on high school graduation verification as reaffirming, through the Institutional Participation Agreement (IPA), that institutions have the responsibility for reviewing and validating all of the eligibility criteria for Cal Grant recipients before funds are disbursed. Chair Lindsey agreed with Member Jeffery that the IPA can be confusing and that such confusion lead to the issuance of an operations memo (GOM 2003-05) clarifying the language used in the memo about verification and/or confirmation of eligibility and directing schools on how to proceed.

In response to Member Jeffery's understanding of what CSAC expects of the institutions; that schools verify and confirm program eligibility before disbursement of funds, Mr. Espinoza explained that CSAC would rescind the direction given in the operations memo and defer to the direction provided in the IPA. Member Jeffery asked for clarification on the difference between verification of eligibility and confirmation of eligibility.

Mr. Espinoza asked if Mr. Wood wanted to respond. Mr. Wood explained that confirmation means that the school is responsible for verifying student eligibility and documenting that verification. Some schools, he added, have students complete questionnaires about high school graduation and residency and that information becomes documentation supporting their claim. At least for the 30% verification requirement, added Mr. Wood, some form of verification has to occur and that usually comes in form of an Institutional Student Information Record (ISIR).

Lora Jo Bossio, University of California representative, commented that verification for her means documentation and that she cannot do verification without the documentation. Mr. Espinoza asked if verification and documentation were one and the same. Mr. Wood explained that in some of his audits, he has

seen schools who work off a checklist, marking off what they view as a complete student file, but there is nothing to support (an actual document) to support the item checked off. Confirmation, he added, is "that documentation of the original, let's say, information they're receiving from the student,"

Chair Lindsey asked if the federal verification worksheet, which the feds accept as documentation and asks questions such as household members and untaxed income received, would not be accepted by CSAC. Mr. Wood said no, but added that the information checked off has to at least be verified back to the ISIR or any other federal information. Chair Lindsey added that doing the verification would be resolving conflict information.

Member Bossio asked Mr. Woods if verification of eligibility is a copy of the ISIR. Mr. Espinoza cautioned the group about discussion on what is currently acceptable as verification because further clarification on the issue is needed and what is currently acceptable may be changed. Chair Lindsey noted that the IPA has been in place for several years and presumably, compliance reviews have been based on the existing IPA so she wanted to know what the current level of compliance is being derived from the IPA.

Tim Bonnel, California Community College Chancellor's Office representative, expressed concern about having the verification discussion since staff, while it expects to have the IPA enforced as written, is unable to explain what enforcement means. Chair Lindsey asked Mr. Espinoza if the recommendation is for change in how schools are applying the IPA. Mr. Espinoza explained that the change he is specifically talking about how compliance checks are completed. Staff, he added, is recommending that the operations memo previously issued be rescinded with regards to components A and B of the IPA verification and certification.

In reading the IPA recommendation for verification, which states that Commission staff recommend participating institutions be responsible for verification and conformation of eligibility, Member Bossio explained that they do not know what those two things mean. Chair Lindsey asked if the requirement, as read by Member Bossio, would apply to the new IPA in 2006-07 or be retroactive.

Mr. Bonnel commented that this was his concern; the possibility of creating liabilities post facto not being sure about the validity of existing operations memos. Mr. Espinoza explained that the clarification memos addressed a policy issue that should have at least been vetted with the Executive Director, but was not. Chair Lindsey asked if the recommended verification would be applied retroactively. Mr. Espinoza explained that CSAC could expect institutions to verify Cal Grant eligibility, as stated in law, before disbursement of funds. Chair Lindsey countered with CSAC is responsible for establishing regulations that clarify the law, but no details have been provided.

In response to Chair Lindsey's reiteration of question regarding retroactive application of verification, Mr. Espinoza noted that staff is recommending that all eligibility requirements, as stated in law, be checked prior to disbursement of funds. Mr. Espinoza added that the law is pretty straightforward. Chair Lindsey commented that when institutions have questions, that is a sign that clarification is needed.

Member Jeffery commented that CSAC is working at reinterpreting the IPA, but that the application of the new interpretation, given the impact of the change, should be done proactively. She added that in her view, statute does not intend institutions to be fully responsible for the verification process, but instead, that the responsibility should be shared between CSAC and the institutions.

Chair Lindsey directed the group to focus on what institutions are doing now with the ending of the current academic year and the start of a new one, especially since no data has been provided discussing the number of students offered entitlement awards without a high school diploma. Member Bonnel cautioned that any proposal requiring a higher level of verification, based on no known quantifiable effect, will delay aid to students and that is not a good thing right now; students must be held harmless in this process.

Chair Lindsey asked if the hypothesis, in this discussion, is that there is a problem and therefore we should jump from the hypothesis to the solution without proving or disproving it. Greg Gollihur, California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) representative, asked if the hypothesis is 1) that a problem

exists or 2) that a misreading of the statute has occurred and had the operations memo been taken to the proper authorities it would not have been issued.

Member Jeffery asked for clarification of the issues noting that one issue is 1) the reinterpretation of the IPA and the second issue is 2) validating and/or documenting high school graduation and the CAHSEE exam. On the first, she added, that GAC may recommend that it is premature at this point to eliminate or undo the direction offered in the operations memo. On the second issue, perhaps GAC can address the issue separately from the bigger issue and determine how the specific issue (#2) can be handled for the upcoming year (2006-07).

Mr. Espinoza agreed with Member Jeffery's assessment. Chair Lindsey added that Member Jeffery's recommendation was more in keeping with what the meeting notice also noticed and she like the idea. Mr. Espinoza explained that at the heart of the matter is that CSAC does not have any guarantee that high school graduation is being verified, therefore it is hard to discuss CAHSEE without dealing with this issue and this he added, is within the scope of the notice of the meeting.

Chair Lindsey asked Mr. Espinoza if statute requires one hundred percent verification. Mr. Espinoza said he was not in a position to answer that question. Mr. Gollihur added that this is what is at the heart of the question; what does the statute say and whose responsibility is it. Mr. Espinoza reiterated that it is difficult to talk about CAHSEE without talking about how high school graduation is verified; putting aside anyone's view or position on the issue.

Member Bossio explained that she would like to see the recommendation from GAC state that CSAC awards will become preliminary awards being contingent upon verification of the student's high school graduation, residency, etc. That being the case, Member Bossio explained that the process of verification for the University of California (UC) system will probably not start until May and at the earliest, end on Labor Day.

Craig Yamamoto, California Community College (CC) representative, noted that the proposed verification process will be a tremendous work load for the campuses and it will harm the neediest students in the CC system, given that the CCs are open access and there is no requirement to admit students based on high school graduation.

Mr. Espinoza asked for tangibles in defining harm to students, as expressed in the conversation, adding that some CCs are at least collecting a self-certification from students stating that they have graduated from high school. What we do not know, added Mr. Espinoza, is whether or not the schools are collecting documentation. Mr. Bonnel noted that schools do not collect documentation because it is not required for any other purposes. He added that the federal government allows students to self-certify unless there is conflicting information.

In response to Mr. Espinoza's second request for an explanation of the view that the Commission's request for high school graduation verification, Member Yamamoto explained that the process of notifying the students and training staff on what to collect would create delays. And this, added Member Bonnel, might result in delayed payment to the student until later in the payment process. When asked about the requirement to have self-certification on file by Mr. Espinoza, Member Bonnel said he had no issue at all.

Member Bossio explained that the issue of reinterpreting, or redefining, verification vs. confirmation is the piece that affects everybody and changes what they are doing. Member Jeffery explained that what is being asked is the separation of the 1) high school graduation verification issue from the broader issue of 2) the reinterpretation of the IPA and to put the broader interpretation of the IPA into the future, with more consultation to follow. Begin work, she added, with the details of what is needed for the coming year for the verification issue.

Chair Lindsey expressed concern about schools having to do 100% high school graduation verification when historically a percentage (30) of verification was required understanding that students provided the best information on their Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) for that time. She noted concern with

going from zero verification to 100% without any supporting data saying that the high school graduation verification is a problem.

Member Bossio asked Louise McClain, Commissioner with the California Student Aid Commission, what would cause a student not to graduate outside of failing the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE). Commissioner McClain explained that it could be a failed class needed for graduation or any other requirement not being met. Both Commissioner McClain and Sharon Bowles, High School Counselor Representative, concluded that the number of CAHSEE-related non-graduates would be very small and that those students not passing the CAHSEE would most likely not be graduating because of other graduation requirements not met.

Chair Lindsey expressed the need for more data to determine if a problem exists with high school graduation verification. Member Jeffery asked staff why the federal definitions or standards would not suffice for the Cal Grant program as it pertains to self-certification. Mr. Espinoza explained that the problem with the graduation date is that it is planned and not an actual date and statute requires that Cal Grant recipients be high school graduates.

Both Members Jeffery and Yamamoto explained that the same requirement exists for the federal government, but they choose to interpret the law in a specific way, and too, noted Member Yamamoto, Community Colleges (CCs) can use the Ability to Benefit (ATB) test as a substitute for high school graduation. Mr. Espinoza explained that the relying on expected FAFSA information, like a projected graduation date, may not satisfy statutory requirements.

In comparing federal requirements with those of the state, Mr. Espinoza explained that with the federal programs, at least 30% verification is occurring whereas with Cal Grant there is no for the high school graduation factor. Member Jeffery explained that the high school requirement is 100% for the federal government. Member Bossio added that when a student is selected for federal verification, the school is looking at income, the family household, but they are not going back and checking high school graduation.

Mr. Espinoza asked if answering the expected high school graduation date question in the FAFSA sufficient to meet the needs of the federal government. Member Bossio explained that it did suffice unless there was reason to question the date of high school graduation. This, added Member Bonnel, is what drove the need for clarification. Mr. Espinoza asked if the federal government, during an audit, ever required a check on the date. Member Bonnel replied that only if there is conflicting information that was not resolved.

Executive Director Diana Fuentes-Michel explained that, as noted by Commissioner McClain, there can be a myriad of reasons for why a student ultimately does not graduate, whether due to CAHSEE or some other failed requirement, the state is telling CSAC they want to be assured that the student has graduated. Since there are no statewide databases that address the high school graduation and CAHSEE issues, added Director Fuentes-Michel, the goal is to identify reporting process that will allow GAC and CSAC to work through those issues. And she added, if there is no systematic way in which to get the information being requested, then the Commissioners would need to be told; CSAC staff is not advocating a position, but instead looking for advice about how to be responsive to a request made of CSAC. If the community feels that self-certification should be continued, she added, then that will be the motion put forward.

Chair Lindsey proposed that CSAC ask schools, toward the end of the school year, to list the students who did not receive their diplomas, regardless of the reason. Commissioner McClain encouraged CSAC to stay away from using transcripts as documentation since there is variety in format, version and type of transcript and too, because getting them may be difficult due to staff being gone after graduation. She also exclaimed that self-certification appears to be the only approach, given the discussion that makes sense. Executive Director Fuentes-Michel, in response to the discussion, commented that if self-certification is the way the Commission wants to go, then it needs to be affirmed and understood.

Member Bonnel noted that CCs have similar concerns with processing or handling the high school graduation verification process. A self-certification model that worked for students, schools and CCs, he added, could be implemented. By using self-certification, he continued, you would be address the issue of the student who attends one school and then changes mid-year and goes to another school. Member Bonnel recommended

that the change be done via Web Grants, thereby leaving the change at CSAC's level so the student doesn't have to provide different schools with certification information (single-source).

When discussing use of "federal standards" and self-certification to address the high school graduation verification issue, Chair Lindsey offered that if the state's administration understands and supports the federal government's position, that GAC and CSAC do the same. Mr. Espinoza cautioned framing a recommendation citing the administration when it has not come directly from them. Steve Caldwell, Chief, Governmental Affairs and Research Division, in paraphrasing Executive Director Fuentes-Michel when discussing the federal standards, explained that the administration understands the federal requirements and are asking CSAC if there are students getting Cal Grants who have not graduated from high school yet.

When asked by Chair Lindsey what the answer is to the direct question asked of CSAC by the administration regarding students receiving Cal Grants who have not graduated, Mr. Caldwell said the response would be that we do not know, but there is a possibility there are some students who are not graduates. Chair Lindsey pointed out that the assumption is that there are students who are not graduates and are receiving Cal Grants; that's it has already been proven.

Mr. Espinoza explained that CSAC is framing the issue as high school graduation is not checked (verified) and CSAC is putting forth a recommendation to make sure it gets checked. Member Bonnel commented that high school graduation is being checked; Mr. Espinoza explained that high school graduation is not being checked 100%. Chair Lindsey asked for the basis of Mr. Espinoza's position.

Commissioner McClain asked if it was the general GAC membership's position to support self-certification with an audit piece. Mr. Bonnel commented "absolutely." Commissioner McClain recommended that the motion framed in this manner and offered to support the thinking behind it since she heard the conversation. Member Bossio asked why GAC could not say that it supported keeping in alignment with the federal regulations on the issue of high school graduation verification.

Motion 1: After discussion on how to frame the motion, Member Bonnel moved that GAC recommend that self-certification be allowed for high school graduation and that the self-certification process and that it parallel the self-certification process with the federal financial aid delivery model and requirements and that GAC encourages the Commission to set up an audit plan to verify, on a sampling of students, for any site visits or desk audits they do, that there be a self-certification on file that meets the requirements as approved by the Commission. Member Yamamoto seconded.

Motion passed.

Motion 2: Member Jeffery moved that CSAC develop a study to determine the effectiveness of the self-certification, in combination with other acceptable documentation of process of high school graduation and that there be no implications for the individual students looked at (checking the effectiveness of motion 1). David Kopperud, K-12 representative, seconded.

Motion passed.

Motion 3: Member Jeffery moved that CSAC not rescind the Grant Operations Memo (GOM) 2003-05 or make changes, such as interpreting the IPA, until broader review and discussion of requirements for verification and confirmation, pertaining to Cal Grant eligibility, are held. Member Bonnel seconded.

Motion passed.

Tab 2: Cal Grant Disbursements/ Advance Payments/ Reconciliation Processes and Proposed Changes

Anne Robertson, Cal Grant Operations Branch, explained that the item being discussed is staff's response to the CSAC Internal Auditor's findings and recommended actions resulting from the Cal Grant disbursement reconciliation audit. The recommendation, she added was to reassess the current methodology of issuing

advances and supplemental disbursements to institutions in an effort to improve cash flow. The options given were:

1) calculate term advances based on final reconciled amounts disbursed to Cal Grant recipients
2) reduce the current 95% advance to institutions to a lower rate
3) advance only those funds to institutions needed to non-tuition disbursements that are paid directly to the Cal Grant recipients
4) eliminate advances to institutions altogether and, instead, only make payments based on actual costs incurred as reported by the institutions.

CSAC management's response, in short term Ms. Robertson added, is to modify the current methodology for calculating and issuing those term advances, with the objective of bringing the Commission into compliance with the Education Code.

Ms. Robertson continued, stating that to attain the short-term objective, staff recommend that the Commission use the date from the most reconciled year to calculate each individual institution's take rate and use this ratio in the process of calculating the amount of the institution's term advance payment. Mr. Espinoza added that staff wanted to hone in on the question of the CCs since they addressed the concern that the advance would not be adequate given the September competitive awards.

The issue of student's offered preliminary awards, as it pertains to calculation and whether or not they can be included in the calculation of advance awards was noted by Ms. Robertson. Chair Lindsey asked for a brief explanation of the concept of preliminary awards. Ms. Robertson provided the example of E2 students who have not returned their certification forms as preliminary students. But she also added that once that "hold" status was cleared, then they would be considered eligible or awarded students. Preliminarily-awarded students, she explained, would not be included in the calculation for term advances.

Ms. Robertson continued with staff recommendations noting that the long-term recommendation would be to eliminate the advances altogether, once Phase II of the Grant Delivery System (GDS) real-time database and Web Grants system enhancements are implemented. Management, she continued, also considered a recommendation to give special consideration to CCs to ensure that the fall term advance will be adequate for September 2nd competitive awards. The issue here again however, Ms. Robertson noted, would be whether or not those students coming off this cycle are eligible at the time of the advance; this would be a policy issue warranting address.

Mr. Espinoza asked for comments from the CCs regarding different calculation for them. Member Bonnel noted that if the full take rate formula includes September payments from the year that was reconciled, there would be no reason to adjust. Member Yamamoto agreed to Mr. Espinoza's comment that doing the calculation differently would help with the current situation.

Chair Lindsey asked about the advance payment simulations asked for back in March and April. Ms. Robertson explained that the effort on the simulations had started with the hire of Paula Rockwell, Research Manager II, Research & Policy Analysis Branch. Chair Lindsey expressed that she was real uncomfortable not having simulations and looking at what the impact might be and making a very under pressure decision that could backfire on everybody and really hurt the students. Mr. Espinoza explained that CSAC has to move on this issue to comply with state law, noting that at present CSAC is out of compliance.

Member Jeffery commented that the real issue is whether the institution is going to be getting enough to cover awards in the fall. Ms. Robertson noted that the use of the take rate as part of the formula for advancing dollars should mirror more closely what the school should be getting. The take rate, she added, will be based on current dollars which should include any fee or award amount increases in it.

Member Jeffery asked about the variance among the take rates on a yearly basis. Member Gollihur recommended that the take rate data be made available so that consensus can be gained since it is very difficult to know how the process is going to impact the individual schools. She also asked if the there could be reverse interest on the funds that have been advanced through the school to the student (state to pay interest

to the schools for advanced funds out of their budget). Mr. Espinoza explained that the Department of Finance or the Governor's Office would not see this type of payment as they have to or should do.

Member Bonnel asked Ms. Robertson if there was any formula for what the supplemental reconciliations are going to do or are is payment going to be made on outstanding reported payments. Ms. Robertson explained that the supplemental advance pays tot eh school any money above the original advance that have reported and this leads to reconciliation to zero, as noted by Member Bonnel. Mr. Bonnel explained that in the absence of data, he has no idea how the CCs would react to change in the advance formula.

Member Jeffery explained that GAC needed two kinds of data to address this issue: 1) data that notes if an institution would get more or less than they've been advanced in the past, and 2) whether the institution's take rates fluctuate, and if so, how much. Member Bonnel asked about the point at where you draw a line on take rates and where do you assign the take rate. He asked if you assigned the take rate where the student is awarded or where the award is activated. Ms. Robertson explained that the take rate would be counted where the student was awarded.

Ms. Robertson, in the interest of time, continued with the discussion about reporting Cal Grant disbursements and reconciliation and the time frames in which the institutions report disbursements and adjustments to CSAC often exceed the date defined in the IPA. The recommendations, she noted, is that the institutions be required to report disbursements and make adjustments prior to the published deadline. The following time frames were recommended:

1) limit institutions from reporting payments more than 30 days prior to the beginning of a term
2) require institutions to perform the final reconciliation of disbursements to Cal Grant recipients within 30-60 days of the end of each term and modify GDS to limit an institution's ability to report payments or make adjustments beyond the 30-60 days subsequent to the end of the term.

The recommendations, added Ms. Robertson, are part of a three-phase approach which include 1) changing the current methodology for issuing supplemental advance or supplemental payments, 2) limit reporting 30 days prior to the start of the term, and 3) automate the reconciliation process. Chair Lindsey asked about the discussion concerning a 30-60 reconciliation period and a final closed reconciliation. Her concern here was that final reconciliation may not be achievable in some case. Ms. Robertson said CSAC would recommend that reported payments be reconciled and that arrangements be made to resolve those payments that came in after the set time frame.

Member Bonnel expressed concern with setting up a supplemental appeal process for those cases after the 30-60 day time frame. He added that his recollection of the discussion is that schools would reconcile the term, but not close out the term. He continued that there were far too transactions that take place in the spring that affect the whole academic year and the same for transaction in fall that affect the spring. Member Bossio added that by requiring this new approach, CSAC would not be matching what the federal government does which is close out the year, but not the term.

Motion 4: Member Bossio moved that GAC supports the development of 60-day end-of-term preliminary reconciliation process that is not final or close out (staff recommendation #2). Member Bonnel seconded.

Motion passed.

Chair Lindsey asked that the group revisit recommendation #1, discussing the methodology for issuing advances. Member Jeffery asked that CSAC research look at variance as it pertains to take rates. Member Bonnel wants to see fluctuations in take rates, she added, but she want to see the take rate calculated base previous year's data over a period of five years. Member Jeffery wants to ensure the take rates do not fluctuate too much.

The group, through the direction of Chair Lindsey, decided to hold a teleconference on June 16, 2006 from 10-12p.m. to discuss, in greater detail, data that will be collected by Ms. Rockwell on the issue of advances. Mr. Espinoza asked that flexibility be allowed in gathering and distributing the materials for the meeting since the

data has to be collected and an internal review has to be completed. Mr. Espinoza reiterated that there is no recommendation on #1, a recommendation on #2, and a standing recommendation on #3 by GAC.

Chairperson Lindsey adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

_____

Mary Lindsey, Chair

Grant Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes Status

Date of Trans.	Minutes? (Y/N)	GAC Reviewer	Ratified (Y/N)	Comments
07/19/07	No	**Review Team:**	Pending	
05/26/07	Yes	**Review Team:**	Pending	
04/05/07	No	**Review Team:**	Pending	
02/14/07	Yes	**Review Team:**	Pending	
01/25/07	Yes	**Review Team:**	Pending	
01/05/07	Yes	**Review Team:**	Pending	

Grant Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes Status

12/14/06	Yes	**Review Team:**	Pending	
09/18/06	No	**Review Team:**	Pending	
09/05/06	No	**Review Team:**	Pending	
08/04/06	Yes	**Review Team:**	Pending	
06/16/06	Yes	**Review Team:**	Pending	
05/26/06	Yes	**Review Team:** Catherine Graham Laura Cunha	Pending	• No corrections needed per review team.

Grant Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes Status

04/14/06	Yes	**Review Team:** Noelia Gonzalez Tim Bonnel	Pending	• Grammar correction in GAC minutes, Tab 1, 3rd paragraph. • Corrected CCCCO on p.3, 2nd paragraph of work group minutes. • Grammar correction in work group minutes of p.5, 2nd to last paragraph.
02/21/06	Yes	**Review Team:** Marco de la Garza Sharon Bowles	Pending	• Listed participant names previously omitted. • Worked at expanding the discussion on SNAPLE, but couldn't come up with more dialogue to make the point better.
10/14/05	Yes	**Review Team:** Mary Robinson Mary Lindsey	Pending	• Listed participant names previously omitted. • Looked @ use of the phrase "industry partner" to see if could use another expression, but unable to do so. • Made necessary corrections to minutes per review team. • Looking to incorporate a more "executive summary" format in writing the minutes, but need to keep the names of people sharing the idea(s) in the conversation.

2

Information/Action Item

Grant Advisory Committee

Consideration of Preliminary Budget Change Proposals for 2008-2009

During the June 21-22, 2007 Commission Meeting, staff presented preliminary operational Budget Change Proposals (BCP) for 2008-09. During this presentation, the Commission indicated they wanted to consider Cal Grant policy BCPs.

Based on the Commission's approved Legislative Principals and Cal Grant Guiding Principles for the 2007-08 Budget Discussions, staff has identified the following potential Cal Grant BCPs. Additional information about each potential policy proposal is enclosed.

2.a Increase the number of Cal Grant Competitive awards
2.b Increase the amount of the Cal Grant B access grant
2.c Provide tuition and fees for all first-year Cal Grant B students
2.d Increase the maximum award for Cal Grant recipients at non-public institutions
2.e Increase the number and amount of Cal Grant C awards

The Commission has not submitted any Cal Grant policy BCPs since fiscal year 2002-03. This has been due to the Administration's General Fund spending policies that either called for reductions in General Fund appropriations or, given the need to maintain a prudent General Fund reserve, prior agreement by the Department of Finance (DOF) to submit General Fund budget augmentation requests. The Cal Grant Programs were spared budget reductions in fiscal years 2004-05 and 2005-06 because the State was able to appropriate funds from the Student Loan Operating Fund for the Cal Grant Programs.

Given the status of the General Fund, it is likely that the Administration's policy will again indicate that all General Fund proposals intended to expand services to a greater share of the population, increase the level of service to existing populations or that would initiate new services must be accompanied by an offsetting service reduction proposal or some other means to finance the proposal, unless DOF has previously agreed to review such proposals.

Notwithstanding this anticipated General Fund spending policy, the Commission may determine that these Cal Grant BCPs raise important policy issues that the Administration should be aware of and direct staff to submit them to DOF.

Staff notes that the Grant Advisory Committee (GAC) has historically provided advice on Cal Grant BCPs. Staff is seeking input from GAC on the further development of the BCPs and prioritization of the BCPs should GAC be so inclined.

Staff will present the final BCPs to the Commission at its September 6-7, 2007 Commission meeting. BCPs must be submitted to DOF no later than September 13, 2007.

Recommendation: Review and provide input on the development of the Cal Grant Budget Change Proposals for 2008-09.

Responsible Staff: Steve Caldwell, Chief
Governmental and Public Affairs Division

Catalina Mistler, Chief
Program Administration and Services Division

CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION
2008-09 CAL GRANT POLICY CONCEPT
INCREASE NUMBER OF COMPETITIVE AWARDS

Proposal:

To increase the number of Competitive Cal Grant A and Cal Grant B awards from the current limit of 22,500.

Background/History:

SB 1644 (Chapter 403, Statutes of 2000) established the Cal Grant Entitlement and Competitive Programs. The Cal Grant Programs provide awards to eligible students to receive a postsecondary education. These awards pay tuition, fees, and living expenses based on a variety of eligibility factors. The Cal Grant programs are known as Cal Grant A and B Entitlement Awards, the California Community College Transfer Entitlement Awards, Competitive Cal Grant A and B awards, and Cal Grant C awards.

The Cal Grant Entitlement program provides grants to graduating California high school seniors and California Community College students transferring to an eligible four-year college or university. Students (non-traditional, returning, and older adult) who do not meet the eligibility criteria for an Entitlement award may compete for Cal Grant Competitive awards, which are limited to 22,500 per year.

The California Student Aid Commission's report "The Competitive Cal Grant Program – A Report on the First Three Years 2001-04" found that those in the program are by far the most financially needy applicants. Along with financial need, students competing for these limited awards possess high Grade Point Averages (GPA) and show excellent potential for success to attain future educational and career goals. In the 2003-04 award period, 79.4 percent of recipients had a GPA of 3.00 or higher while only 4.7 percent of recipients possessed a GPA of 2.50 or lower.

At the Commission's April 20, 2006 meeting, the Commission adopted a support position on AB 2813 (De La Torre, Ch. 822, Stat. 2006). This bill contained a provision to increase the number of Cal Grant Competitive Awards from 22,500 to 45,000, but this provision was amended out of the bill on May 26, 2006. As ultimately enacted, AB 2813 increased the maximum age for the California Community College Transfer Entitlement Program from 24 to 27 years of age.

Also, in the 2005-06 legislative session, SB 1751 (Speier) and SB 1264 (Alquist) were introduced. SB 1751 would have increased the number of Cal Grant Competitive Awards from 22,500 to 34,000. SB 1264 would have increased the awards from 22,500 to 23,000. SB 1751 was held by the Senate Education Committee and SB 1264 was held by the Assembly Appropriations Committee. The Commission did not take a position on either bill.

It is unknown whether legislation to increase the number of competitive awards will be introduced during the 2007-2008 Legislative session.

This proposal would also support the Commission's 2007-08 approved legislative principles, specifically the principle of *Foster Educational Access and Affordability - Funding Objectives for*

the Cal Grant Program: The Commission will advocate the expansion of the Cal Grant program and for increases in the value of all Cal Grant awards to help defray the cost of obtaining a postsecondary education.

Implications of proposal:

Today, the state of California has an efficient Cal Grant Entitlement program that continues to fund more than 60,000 eligible new students each academic year compared to 30,000 in the pre-entitlement program era. However, the Competitive Cal Grant program is constrained because the number of awards has remained at 22,500 since 2001. In the 2005-06 year, 112,238 fully qualified students were unable to receive awards due to the limited number of competitive awards. These students demonstrated financial need and met the initial GPA and income criteria. A typical eligible non-recipient was 27 years of age, earned approximately $17,000, for a family of 3, and had a GPA of 2.9, but the Commission was required to apply scoring criteria to limit the awards to the authorized number.

A priority of the Commission and the State is continued advocacy for increased higher education opportunities for California students. Any funds invested in the Cal Grant Competitive program should be considered an investment in the future of the State's economy. With California's changing labor market and fluctuating economy, an increasing number of non-traditional, returning, and older adult students are seeking education and training. To meet the demands of this group, the Competitive Cal Grant program needs to respond effectively with more awards. Students who achieve a postsecondary education in California will increase their income potential and will contribute to the future tax base as their income increases.

Technology implications:

Commission staff would need to alter the Grant Delivery System to administer the changes. An increase in the number of Competitive Cal Grants could be accomplished in the upcoming fiscal year (2008-09) if approved in the 2008-09 State Budget Act.

Fiscal Impact:

For AB 2813 (De La Torre, Ch. 822, Stat. 2006), the Legislative Analyst's Office, based on Commission staff input, estimated that the annual cost to double the number of Competitive Awards would be $49 million.

Staff has not definitively determined the Commission's costs (personnel years, operating equipment and expenses) that would be associated with an increase in the number of Competitive Cal Grants. An increased number of Cal Grant Competitive awards would result in an increased number of Cal Grant GPA verification forms being processed as well as an additional number of student notifications and customer service. Commission staff will identify the need for additional positions as well as operating expenses and equipment as the nature and magnitude of the proposed increase is further explored.

CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION
2008-09 CAL GRANT POLICY CONCEPT
INCREASE MAXIMUM CAL GRANT B ACCESS GRANT

Proposal:

To increase the Cal Grant B maximum access grant from its current amount of $1,551.

Background/History:

SB 1644 (Chapter 403, Statutes of 2000) established the Cal Grant Entitlement and Competitive Programs. The Cal Grant Programs provide awards to eligible students to receive a postsecondary education. These awards pay tuition, fees, and living expenses based on a variety of eligibility factors. The Cal Grant programs are known as Cal Grant A and B Entitlement Awards, the California Community College Transfer Entitlement Awards, Competitive Cal Grant A and B awards, and Cal Grant C awards.

The Cal Grant Entitlement program provides grants to graduating California high school seniors and California Community College students transferring to an eligible four-year college or university. Students (non-traditional, returning, and older adult) who do not meet the eligibility criteria for an Entitlement award may compete for Cal Grant Competitive awards, which are limited to 22,500 per year.

The Cal Grant A program provides tuition and fees for up to four years of college. The Cal Grant B program provides only the access grant of $1,551 to 98 percent of Cal Grant B recipients who are in their first year of college, then tuition and fees and the access grant for the following three years. Under Cal Grant B, 2 percent of recipients who demonstrate significant financial need receive the access grant, tuition and fee assistance in the first year of attendance at four-year colleges and universities.

In May 1999, the Commission's Grant Advisory Committee developed and presented the definition of "access costs" (previously known as the "subsistence grant" and now called the access grant) to the Commission as those costs, in addition to living expenses, incurred when attending college - transportation, books and supplies, and meals away from home. Applying this definition to the Commission's 2003-04 Student Expenses and Resources Survey (SEARS) and subsequently adjusting the data for inflation, the access grant for the Cal Grant B program should be $3,402 in 2006-07.

The amount of the access grant portion of Cal Grant B has been stagnant at $1,551 for many years. In 2001-02, the Commission advocated for an increase from $1,410 to $2,322 as indicated in a previous SEARS. The increase was discussed and proposed in the spring budget process; however a compromise was reached by the Joint Legislative Budget Conference Committee to provide a 10 percent increase to the access grant from $1,410 to $1,551.

At the Commission's April 19, 2007, meeting, the Commission adopted a support position on AB 175 (Price). This bill requires that the access cost stipend be increased annually between 5 percent and 10 percent beginning with the 2009-10 award year until the award has reached or exceeded the 20 percent goal recommended by the latest SEARS. This bill was held by the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

AB 175 is identical to AB 1315 (Liu, 2005-06), a bill introduced last year. AB 1315 was held by the Senate Education Committee, and died.

This proposal would also support the Commission's 2007-08 approved legislative principles, specifically the principle of *Foster Educational Access and Affordability - Funding Objectives for the Cal Grant Program: The Commission will advocate the expansion of the Cal Grant program and for increases in the value of all Cal Grant awards to help defray the cost of obtaining a postsecondary education*.

Implications of proposal:

The continued commitment from the State to improve the availability and amount of financial aid is crucial to ensure educational access for all California students. This commitment strengthens the state's economic well-being by educating California's future workforce. Increasing the access grant would support this commitment by providing greater flexibility for students to apply towards transportation costs, books and supplies, and meals away from home. Given the dramatic increase in books, supplies and other costs related to attaining an education beyond high school, an increase to the access stipend paid to California's most financially needy students would be a necessary step for students and families with demonstrated financial need.

Technology implications:

Commission staff would need to alter the Grant Delivery System to administer the changes. An increase in the value of the Cal Grant B access stipend could be accomplished in the upcoming fiscal year (2008-09) if approved in the 2008-09 State Budget Act.

Fiscal Impact:

The impact to the General Fund would be as follows, as calculated under AB 175 (Price):

	2008-09	**2009-10**	**2010-11**	**2011-12**
Current Access Grant	$1,551			
AB 175 Proposed Access Grant		**$1,706**	**$1,877**	**$2,064**
Increase over $1,551		$155	$326	$513
Percent Change		10.0%	21.0%	33.1%
Projected Paid Recipients	144,400	144,400	144,400	144,400
Estimated Increased Cost over $1,551		**$20.0 m**	**$42.1 m**	**$66.3 m**

The total estimated increased cost over the three-year period would be $128.4 million.

Assumptions:

1. No growth in the number of projected paid recipients.
2. The 2008-09 Access Grant of $1,551 is increased by ten percent for 2009-10, and by another ten percent in each of the following two years.

An increase in the award amount could be absorbed into the administrative costs of operating the current size (number of awards) of the Cal Grant program.

CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION
2008-09 CAL GRANT POLICY CONCEPT
PROVIDE TUITION/FEES TO ALL CAL GRANT B RECIPIENTS

Proposal:

To eliminate the restriction in the Cal Grant B program that, in the first year of enrollment, denies tuition and fee benefits and instead provides only a stipend for access costs to 98 percent of Cal Grant B recipients and to implement first-year tuition and fee grants that will be phased in stages to mitigate costs.

Background/History:

SB 1644 (Chapter 403, Statutes of 2000) established the Cal Grant Entitlement and Competitive Programs. The Cal Grant Programs provide awards to eligible students to receive a postsecondary education. These awards pay tuition, fees, and living expenses based on a variety of eligibility factors. The Cal Grant programs are known as Cal Grant A and B Entitlement Awards, the California Community College Transfer Entitlement Awards, Competitive Cal Grant A and B awards, and Cal Grant C awards.

The Cal Grant Entitlement program provides grants to graduating California high school seniors and California Community College students transferring to an eligible four-year college or university. Students (non-traditional, returning, and older adult) who do not meet the eligibility criteria for an Entitlement award may compete for Cal Grant Competitive awards, which are limited to 22,500 annually.

Cal Grant B provides an annual award for access costs up to $1,551 for books and living expenses for first-year recipients. Cal Grant B does not, however, pay for tuition and fees at qualifying postsecondary institutions until the beginning of the second year and thereafter for 98 percent of participants. Current law states that only the top 2 percent of Cal Grant B recipients receive tuition and fees for the first-year.

Related Legislation:

- Assembly Bill 175 (Price), held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee, provides for an increase in the maximum Cal Grant B access grant beginning in 2009-10.

  Commission Position: Support

- Assembly Bill 302 (De La Torre), held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee, would eliminate the restriction that denies first year college students with a Cal Grant B tuition benefits and instead provides only a small stipend for access costs to 98 percent of Cal Grant B recipients.

  Commission Position: Support

Implications of proposal:

In both the entitlement and competitive Cal Grant programs, a very low-income student qualifies for a Cal Grant B, while middle-income students qualify for a Cal Grant A. In recognition that Cal Grant B serves the lowest income students, the annual award pays for tuition and fees and a small stipend (currently $1,551) toward books, supplies, food and rent. (Cal Grant A pays for tuition and fees only.)

However, because it was assumed when the Cal Grant B program was authorized (in the early 1960s as the "College Opportunity Grant Program"), that the lowest income students would not go to a four-year college or university, but rather would choose to first go to a community college, the Cal Grant B program does not pay for tuition and fees in the first year. Rather, most Cal Grant B recipients receive only the $1,551 stipend in the first year. Tuition and fee payments, in the first year are paid

only to the top 2 percent of Cal Grant B recipients based on GPA. This assumption is no longer valid. Statistics from the March 2, 2007 entitlement application pool reflect that 53 percent of all Cal Grant B participants choose to go to a four-year college or university their first-year. Cal Grant B policies for the first year of attendance are no longer consistent with the state's commitment to provide equal educational access to and selection of an institution of higher education for students with financial need.

A significant number of lower income (Cal Grant B) students receive a smaller lifetime award than higher income (Cal Grant A) students. A Cal Grant B award recipient enrolling at a private college may receive $3,504 less over the lifetime of the grant than the Cal Grant A recipient at the same school. This is because the first-year tuition benefit (currently a maximum of $9,708) is more than four years of the access grant (currently $1,551 per year) received under Cal Grant B. In 2007-08, under the student fee increase recently approved by the UC Regents, a Cal Grant A recipient would receive $432 more over four years than a Cal Grant B recipient.

In addition, in the decade from 1994-95 to 2003-04, non-fee related costs increased from $7,355 to $9,689 (32%) at UC and from $6,533 to $7,881 (21%) at CSU. Last fiscal year, 90 percent of students lived away from home with an average on-campus budget of $22,500. Grant aid has not kept pace with increases in total college costs, resulting in higher levels of borrowing, even among students with the greatest financial need. These factors combine to make it more difficult for students and/or institutions to fund the first year of college without the support of a Cal Grant for statewide tuition and fees.

An option the Commission may wish to consider is to phase out the restriction of tuition and fee awards to first-year Cal Grant B participants in stages. Examples of the phased-in approach are 1) award for tuition and fees to the top 2 percent to the top 5 percent of the Cal Grant B Entitlement Program based on GPA, and 2) award tuition and fees to 5 percent of Cal Grant B participants based on the current scoring practices.

Technology implications:

Commission staff would need to alter the Grant Delivery System to administer the changes. Adding first year tuition and fee support for Cal Grant B students, with an increase in the value of the Cal Grant B access stipend (Tab.5.b), could be accomplished in the upcoming fiscal year (2008-09) if approved in the 2008-09 State Budget Act.

Fiscal Impact:

The Commission would incur increased local assistance costs and costs for the establishment and operation of processing, reporting, outreach and system modifications. The significant cost of $49 million to implement this change may be a challenge given the state's ongoing structural deficit.

If the Commission proposal incorporated a phased-in approach as discussed above and assuming the 5 percent phased-in approach, Commission staff estimates for the first year that approximately 960 additional High School Entitlement Cal Grant B recipients would receive a Tuition and Fee award at an estimated cost of $4.0 million. In addition, about 90 March Competitive Cal Grant B recipients would receive a Tuition and Fee award at an estimated cost of $0.4 million. Staff recommends that the proposal would be fully implemented in the first year, but a phased-in approach until the first-year Cal Grant B students are fully funded may gain more traction.

Because the infrastructure for Cal Grant B already exists, additional long-term staffing needs will be studied, but are not anticipated at this time.

CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION
2008-09 CAL GRANT POLICY CONCEPT
INCREASE MAXIMUM AWARD AT NON-PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

Proposal:

To increase the current maximum award amount for nonpublic postsecondary institutions and support the development of a statutory formula that adjusts the maximum award amount for nonpublic postsecondary institutions that would not be subject to the annual budget process.

Background/History:

SB 1644 (Chapter 403, Statutes of 2000) established the Cal Grant Entitlement and Competitive Programs. The Cal Grant Programs provide awards to eligible students to receive a postsecondary education. These awards pay tuition, fees, and living expenses based on a variety of eligibility factors. The Cal Grant programs are known as Cal Grant A and B Entitlement Awards, the California Community College Transfer Entitlement Awards, Competitive Cal Grant A and B awards, and Cal Grant C awards.

The Cal Grant Entitlement program provides grants to graduating California high school seniors and California Community College students transferring to an eligible four-year college or university. Students (non-traditional, returning, and older adult) who do not meet the eligibility criteria for an Entitlement award may compete for Cal Grant Competitive awards, which are limited to 22,500 per year.

Cal Grant award maximum amounts for students attending public colleges and universities are tied to the statewide tuition and fees charged by the institutions. However, maximum award amounts for students attending nonpublic institutions are established in the Annual Budget Act. The last time the State increased the maximum nonpublic Cal Grant award amount was in 2000-2001 when the award was raised from $9,420 to $9,708. The Governor's current budget proposal does not increase maximum award amounts for any Cal Grant awards. The maximum Cal Grant award for Cal Grant recipients attending private and independent institutions would remain at $9708.

Prior to the adoption of SB 1644, the maximum Cal Grant award for students attending nonpublic colleges and universities was specified in state law developed in consultation with representatives from all of California's postsecondary education institutions as well as the Legislative Analyst's Office and the Department of Finance. At that time, California Education Code Section 66021.2 stipulated that:

> The maximum award for students attending nonpublic institutions shall be set and maintained at the estimated average General Fund cost of educating a student at the public four-year institutions of higher education. In accordance with this policy, the formula for determining the estimated average General Fund cost shall include both of the following: (1) seventy-five percent of the average General Fund cost per student at the California State University, and (2) the average of the University of California and the California State University system wide and campus-based student fees.

In the Governor's 2004-2005 state budget proposal, the Governor proposed to reduce the maximum Cal Grant for students attending nonpublic colleges and universities by 44 percent

from $9,708 to $5,482. This recommendation was not adopted, but the maximum award was reduced to $8,322 for two years to save the General Fund money.

For the 2005-06 fiscal year, the Governor again proposed to reduce the maximum Cal Grant award for new recipients attending nonpublic colleges and universities by 10.5 percent, bringing the maximum Cal Grant award for new recipients down to $7,449. This recommendation was not adopted.

Last year the Legislature passed AB 358 (Liu) that would have set the nonpublic Cal Grant maximum at 90 percent of the weighted public cost of educating a needy student at UC or CSU. This bill was vetoed by the Governor. For 2007-2008, the Governor proposes to leave the maximum private Cal Grant award unchanged at $9,708, which is estimated to be about $1,300 lower than the parity target sought by AB 358.

In recent years, the Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) has recommended the Legislature establish in statute a policy that would link the value of the Cal Grant for financially needy students at nonpublic institutions to the General Fund subsidy the State provides for needy students at public institutions. LAO believes that, without a specific policy, Cal Grant decisions can appear arbitrary, unpredictable, and inconsistent.

Implications of proposal:

In November 2004, the California Student Aid Commission (Commission) convened an ad hoc Committee on the Future of the Cal Grant to develop a recommended formula for future adjustments in the maximum Cal Grant award for students attending nonpublic California colleges and universities. After two meetings, the ad hoc Committee recommended to the Commission that it sponsor legislation to establish a policy. At its January 13, 2005 meeting, the Commission directed CSAC staff to sponsor legislation to amend the state's Education Code to read:

> 69432(b): Maximum award amounts for students at independent institutions ~~and for Cal Grant C and T awards~~ shall be ~~identified in the annual Budget Act~~ based on the estimated average General Fund costs of educating a student at the public four-year institutions. The estimated general fund cost is defined as the weighted average of the General Fund component of the marginal cost at the University of California and the California State University (as determined jointly by the Department of Finance, the Legislative Analyst Office, and the segments) plus the weighted average Cal Grant award at the University of California and California State University. Maximum award amounts for Cal Grant A and B awards for students attending public institutions shall be referenced in the annual Budget Act.

Commission staff worked with Assembly Member, and Chair of the Assembly Higher Education Committee, Carol Liu to include the proposed language into AB 358, which eventually died.

The nonpublic Cal Grant maximum award amount has not kept pace with increases in total college costs, resulting in higher levels of borrowing, even among students with the greatest financial need. During difficult fiscal times, some policymakers argue that the nonpublic Cal Grant should be reduced as one way to ensure that nonpublic institutions share the budget shortfalls. The purpose of the Cal Grant program, however, is to increase access and choice for financially needy students at their choice of California colleges and universities. Although some private institutions are well endowed and might be able to offset any reduction made to their financially needy students' Cal Grant awards, the rising cost of higher education makes it difficult for many students and families to afford a postsecondary education.

Affordability has always been a priority for higher education in California. Higher education researchers and advocates are concerned that budget constraints and the resulting increases in tuition and fees over time have created an "affordability gap", and that this gap prevents low- and middle-income families from accessing higher education. Adequate funding for financial aid programs and enrollment growth are necessary to ease the burden of college costs for California families and reduce the affordability gap.

Technology implications:

Commission staff would need to alter the Grant Delivery System to administer the changes. An increase in the number of Competitive Cal Grants could be accomplished in the upcoming fiscal year (2008-09) if approved in the 2008-09 State Budget Act.

Fiscal Impact:

The Senate Appropriations Committee estimated that the cost to increase the maximum Cal Grant award based on the AB 358 formula would be $12.3 million in year one and $86.2 million when fully implemented after four years. The cost was determined with input from Commission Staff.

Staff has not definitively determined the Commission's costs (personnel years, operating equipment and expenses) that would be associated with an increase in Cal Grant maximum award. Commission staff will identify the need for additional positions as well as operating expenses and equipment as the nature and magnitude of the proposed increase is further explored.

CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION
2007/08 POLICY CONCEPT
INCREASE NUMBER AND AMOUNT OF CAL GRANT C AWARDS

Proposal:

To increase the number of awards and grant amounts in the Cal Grant C program.

Background/History:

The Cal Grant C program is the Commission's state-funded financial aid program for postsecondary students pursuing short-term career technical and occupational training. Cal Grant C provides assistance with tuition and fees and books and supplies to low- and middle-income students. Cal Grant C is financed through the State's General Fund. It is a competitive program and eligibility is based on financial need, among other criteria.

The number of awards and grant amounts are determined through the annual State Budget Process. In the 2000-01 academic year, Cal Grant C award amounts increased for the first time in 16 years: the book and supplies allowance increased from $530 to $576 and tuition and fee awards increased from $2,360 to $2,592. Since 2000-2001, the award amounts and number of new awards (7,761), have remained unchanged, while the cost of college has increased and the number of eligible students competing for an award continues to exceed the number of awards allocated in the annual Budget Act.

For the 2007-2008 fiscal year, the authorized number of new awards is 7,761; the authorized maximum tuition and fee award remains at $2,592 and the authorized award for training-related costs remains at $576. In the academic year 2006-2007, the California Student Aid Commission (Commission) granted 16,074 continuing and new Cal Grant C awards. The California Community Colleges represent the largest number of Cal Grant C recipients with over 11,207 students. Eligible Community Colleges students receive a Board of Governors Fee Waiver to cover the tuition portion of the program costs. The private career colleges represent only 23 percent of recipients for the academic year with 3,822 students.

Implications of proposal:

According to the U.S. Department of Education, one-third of college students are involved in career and technical programs, and as many as 40 million adults engage in short-term postsecondary occupational training in the United States. In California, for the academic year 2003-2004, over 1.6 million postsecondary students enrolled in career technical education.

Employment opportunities for people with vocational degrees and certification continue to grow. The demand for building construction, electrical and technical workers, skilled craftspeople, welders, machinists and auto technicians remains strong. Health care and information technology are two of the fastest-growing career technical and occupational fields. Registered nurses are in particularly high demand in California.

Affordability has always been a concern for higher education advocates in California. Higher education researchers and advocates are concerned that budget constraints and the resulting increases in tuition and fees over time have created an "affordability gap", and that this gap prevents low- and middle-income families from accessing higher education.

However, the availability of grant aid has been constrained both at the state and federals levels and, coupled with persistently escalating costs, has led to substantial increases in borrowing for both low and middle income families. The Commission supports legislative policies that encourage all efforts to increase the level of need-based state funding for student financial assistance. An increase in the number of Cal Grant C awards and in the amounts of the awards would be consistent with the Commission's Legislative Principles, specifically, to *Foster Educational Access and Affordability-Funding Objectives for the Cal Grant Program*:

- Provide continuous educational opportunities by adopting budget principles, which intend to, at a minimum, preserve the Cal Grant Entitlement and Competitive Program's eligibility requirements, preserve the value of the award, and maintain the current number of awards.
- Pursue a state budget that is supportive of access and institutional choice through the Cal Grant Program.
- Advocate for funds that increase the number of competitive Cal Grant awards for qualified non-recipient students.
- Support full fee funding for Cal Grant students at the public universities and a maximum Cal Grant award that supports the ability of students to choose to attend a private university.
- Continue to help students fund their unmet financial need through low-cost loans under the federal student loan program.

Technology implications:

Commission staff would need to alter the Grant Delivery System to administer the changes. An increase in the number of Cal Grant C awards could be accomplished in the upcoming fiscal year (2008-09) if approved in the 2008-09 State Budget Act.

Fiscal Impact:

Staff has not definitively determined the Commission's costs (personnel years, operating equipment and expenses) that would be associated with an increase in the number of Cal Grant C awards. An increased number of Cal Grant C awards would result in an increased number of Cal Grant C Supplements (applications) being processed as well as an additional number of student notifications and customer service. Commission staff will identify the need for additional positions as well as operating expenses and equipment as the precise nature and magnitude of the proposed increase is further explored.