

Information/Action Item

GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Approval of May 19, 2005 Minutes

Enclosed, for the Committee's review and approval, are the minutes from the May 19, 2005 Grant Advisory Committee Meeting.

CALIFORNIA STUDENT AID COMMISSION

GRANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

3300 ZINFANDEL DRIVE
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
Thursday, May 19, 2005

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mary Lindsey, Chairperson
Tim Bonnell alternate for Sherri Hancock,
Vice-Chairperson
Louise McClain, Commission Liaison
Lora Jo Bossio, UC
Sharon Bowles, High School
Laura Cunha, PI
Nicole DeMartini, CSU student
Greg Gollihur, CPEC
Noelia Gonzalez, CASFAA
Kate Jeffery, UC
David Kopperud, CDE
Corina McDaniel,
alternate for Maria Hernandez - CSU
Aram Nadjarian, AICCU
Mary Robinson, CSU
Ryan Sanders, UC
Michelle Sliwa, K-12
Catherine Thomas, AICCU
Veronica Villalobos, AICCU
Craig Yamamoto, CCC

STAFF

Michael Bolden, Federal Police Liaison
Bryan Dickason, Trainer
Max Espinoza, Chief, Program Administration and
Services Division
Sam Kipp, Manager, Policy and Research Branch
Brenda Metzger, Liaison
Catalina Mistler, Manager, Specialized Programs
Operations
Thea Pot-Van Atta, Manager, School Support
Services Division
Anne Robertson, Manager, Cal Grant Operations
Brenda Van Pelt, Asst. Vice President, EdFund

ALSO PRESENT

Charles Masten, Ph.D., UC
Margaret Heisel, UC
George Montgomery, CDE

Introduction of New GAC Members and CSAC staff

Committee Chair Lindsey requested that due to the number of new committee members, the meeting begin with a round of introductions.

Tab 1: Approval of October 21 and 22, 2004 minutes

Committee member Robinson noted that the minutes do not accurately reflect a discussion about AB 205 or the action taken at the meeting. Chair Lindsey requested the minutes be revised with the additional items prior to her calling for approval.

Tab 2: Approval of December 16, 2004 minutes

Committee member Bowles moved to approve the minutes of the December 16, 2004 meeting with corrections. The minutes were approved with corrections.

Tab 3: Committee Chair's Report

Chair Lindsey noted that the Commission met on February 23, 2005. The Grants and Program committee had information only items so there are no actions to report on by the Commission.

Chair Lindsey also noted that the definition of remedial and recommendations regarding the four options to increase the number of the high school GPAs submitted to CSAC by the March 2nd deadline were heard by the full Commission at their April 14th meeting. All recommendations were approved, with the exception of the transcript evaluation service, which was not approved because CSAC has already begun a pilot project. Mr. Espinoza noted that staff is currently working to implement the change on the redefinition of remedial in publications and does not expect to have a problem implementing for the 2006-07 award cycle. Committee member Robinson asked if the recommendations included a statute change for removal of the remedial language. Mr. Espinoza indicated that Assemblywoman Barbara Matthews is in the process of inserting the deletion into a bill she's carrying.

Chair Lindsey inquired on the reason for the change in designation on agenda items for the committee's consideration. Mr. Espinoza indicated that this change was intended to clarify for committee members what the agenda item entailed. There was no intention to limit the discussion or the actions the committee might decide to take. If the original notice says information/action on all the items, and the actual agenda says information item only, action can still be taken.

Tab 4: Executive Director's Report

Diana Fuentes-Michel was called away to an Assembly Budget hearing so was not available to give an update.

Tab 5: Cal Grant Update

Mr. Espinoza updated the committee on the March 2nd award cycle. The chart included in the agenda breaks down the awards by segment and by program. Mr. Espinoza noted that in most cases there was a four percent increase in all Cal Grant offers over last year. Ms. Robinson confirmed that these numbers are as of April 8, 2005 and have not been updated. Committee member Jeffery inquired as to whether these numbers are due to increases in applications and enrollment or a change in eligibility. Mr. Espinoza noted that he would research her question and get the information to her.

Commissioner McClain asked if the roster is updated with new awards after the cutoff date. Anne Robertson noted that the school of origin report is available on the data transfer screen on WebGrants so high schools can go out and pull down their schools information each month. Chair Lindsey requested that this information be put into a memo that would be included with the paper roster that is sent. Commissioner McClain inquired as to why the grants are no longer identified as A's or B's. Mr. Espinoza noted that this information was deleted from the roster for privacy concerns as the schools were announcing this information during graduation ceremonies and the student must fall below a certain income to qualify for a Cal Grant B award. However,

because counselors would be able to use this information in discussions with the student as to their plans for school, Mr. Espinoza noted that staff will go back and review this policy.

Committee member Robinson inquired on the requirements for the GPA that is used for the community college transfer entitlement awards. Committee member Jeffery noted that it is a 2.4 or higher GPA submitted by a community college. Ms. Robertson noted that the Commission does not calculate an overall GPA for a student if GPA's are submitted by multiple campuses. Ms. Jeffery inquired if a student does not have a sufficient number of credits from a community college and the college does not submit a GPA for that student, does the student have the ability to appeal. Ms. Robertson noted that unless the student has a GPA submitted, the student will not be considered for Cal Grant A or B but will be considered for Cal Grant C because there is no GPA requirement for that award. The student would only be able to appeal if a GPA had been submitted by the award deadline.

Committee member Bonnell noted that this issue goes beyond the GPA submission and extends to a student's satisfactory academic progress at the college. If the college were to evaluate all transcripts prior to the student transferring to a four year college, it may have negative impacts on the student ability to receive financial aid while at the community college.

Chair Lindsey noted that this issue may be best resolved by referring it to the Enhancing Reporting and Analysis work group. Motion was made to refer to the Enhancing Reporting and Analysis work group a discussion and recommendation on the calculation of GPA's from multiple schools. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Espinoza reported that the Commission has processed and awarded the March 2nd GPA forms without problems and made the awards on time. The September GPA Verification forms were sent out to the colleges in May and 50 copies have been sent out to all accredited high schools. Mr. Bonnell thanked the staff for working with the Chancellor's Office to get the forms sent out in time for the May college events. Committee member Yamamoto thanked staff on behalf of CCCSFAAA for getting the forms out in time for the outreach activities in May.

Mr. Espinoza outlined the staff reorganization and division goals that took place during an offsite meeting of staff. Line staff reworked the mission and goals and developed a mission statement for the division as well as five goals for the division. A change team was formed and will be used to refine and assess the attainment of the goals.

A new branch was formed called the School Support Services branch. The new unit will deal with training as well as develop, review and seek guidance on program policy issues and communication. This unit will deal with GAC issues, advisory group issues and school issues. They will be charged with keeping abreast of issues affecting schools, be sensitive to school concerns and figure out ways to address those concerns in Commission operations.

Mr. Espinoza also noted that the Call Center Customer Service Unit has been renamed Student Support Services Branch. This branch deals with calls from students and student appeals. The focus of this branch will be more customer service rather than toward operational concerns. The flow chart details each branches roles and responsibilities.

Mr. Espinoza announced the appointment of a new manager to the School Support Services Branch, Ms. Thea Pot-Van Atta. She comes to the Commission from the University of California, Davis financial aid office. Ms. Van Atta has over 20 years experience in financial aid at the campus level.

Committee member Nadjarian mentioned that he would like to see a partnership with student representatives on GAC and the Student Support Services Branch to discuss duties and responsibilities and appeals so that they could answer questions from students on the campus about Cal Grants. Mr. Espinoza noted he would be happy to explore ways to include more student input.

Commissioner McClain inquired if there was a needs assessment in place for the high school workshops. Commissioner McClain noted that after having attended two or three, there was nothing new being presented and so counselors stopped attending, however, the needs of counselors are ever changing and the workshops need to reflect that. Mr. Espinoza noted that training used to be in a separate unit. Now that it has been incorporated into the School Support Services Branch, a better assessment tool can be developed for the workshops.

Commissioner McClain noted that she would like to see Financial Aid 101 for new counselors. Mr. Espinoza indicated that this is the same request that was brought out at the Cal Grant Forums. Committee member Bowles indicated that she would like to see a committee of high school counselors from across the state work with Ms. Pot-Van Atta to better address the needs of high school counselors.

Anne Robertson, manager Cal Grant Operations, updated GAC on the Cal Grant forums that took place across the state since January 20th. The Commission held nine forums to gather input on the administration of the Cal Grant program and what changes would be suggested to make the process smoother for the financial aid community. A budget update was given at these forums as well. Over 228 individuals attended the forums representing 146 institutions from high schools to colleges. Most of the feedback received was very positive. Staff is currently creating a special alert that will go out to the community and give an overview of the forums within the next month.

Ms. Robertson gave an update on the WebGrants for Students presentation that was given to the Commissioners at the last Commission meeting. A presentation will be given at the next A & E meeting to gather more input on the screens. WebGrants for Students is a new web-based application that will allow students to access their information regarding both the Chafee and Cal Grant program. It is hoped that this will help to alleviate phone calls to the Commission on address changes, school changes, award status, application status and payment history. Staff is currently in the process of testing WebGrants for Students. This is Phase I of the project and has some limitations because it is not real time and it is based upon the weekly cycle and batch processing. It is to be implemented in late spring, early summer. An Operations Memo, a postcard to the student as well as training to the institutions and internal staff are planned before the rollout.

Mr. Espinoza noted that many of the enhancements that the Commission would like to make are dependent upon the FSR that is currently in the Legislature and may or may not be approved. Also, this system has not been tested with a maximum numbers of users. It is not known what would happen to the system if one hundred thousand students logged on the system at once.

Catalina Mistler, acting manager of Student Support Services, gave an update on the Commission call center. With the successful outreach efforts and the increased number of students receiving Cal Grant, the Commission has received an increase in the number of calls. These calls range from 'What is a Cal Grant' to 'Where's my money'. Due to a shortage in staffing, the Commission had over a 20 percent abandon rate for 2004. In an effort to reduce the abandon rate and provide better customer service, improvement projects have been identified. One of the projects is to increase the student employees in the call center from 10 to 15. A Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to the Department of Finance has been submitted requesting five full-time positions.

Ms. Mistler also noted that the letters mailed out to students have been staggered so they will not all call the Commission at the same time with questions. A total of 117,000 letters were mailed out and they were released to mail in 30,000 letter increments.

Ms. Mistler also outlined that WebGrants for Students will assist in decreasing the number of calls to the Commission as this will allow the students access to their information at any time of the day, not just during business hours. An Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system is also being developed in conjunction with EdFund, to provide the student's information over the phone.

Mr. Espinoza noted that the system letter review is being developed. A letter from Executive Director Fuentes-Michel has gone out asking for representatives to serve on this committee. Two representatives from each segment as well as student representatives are invited to work on the letters. Once representatives have been

identified, the timeline will be formalized. It is hoped that the focus will be primarily the award and denial letters to try to simplify them. Staff has begun to start refining the letters this year. The denial letters for the competitive program were simplified for this year. Mr. Espinoza noted that travel expenses and meals will be covered by the Commission for all appointed representatives. Staff will take the lead on this project and be directing the work of the committee. Commissioner McClain strongly expressed the need to keep the language simple for students.

Tab 6: Update on Status of Commission Research Projects

Sam Kipp, Research Manager II, Governmental and Public Affairs Division, highlighted two research projects. The first project is on potential high school entitlement students who submit FAFSA's but do not submit a verified GPA. The question is who are these students, what are their characteristics, how many of them are there, etc. There was an initial attempt to identify the magnitude of this potential issue at the last Commission meeting. Approximately 81,795 students were identified as falling in to this category. This was a rough estimate using the income ceiling amounts but not determining whether the family income and family size qualified them. Using the family size and income qualifier, the number was reduced to 77,141 students who fit this category.

Mr. Kipp indicated there was an effort to look at the age composition of the group as well. Age 19 and under applicants fit into the immediate high school graduate or the 18 month graduation window. 20 year olds may fit into this category if they are not a GED recipient. The largest group are those students that fall under the Cal Grant B ceiling. This is a group of 49,445. If they met the minimum requirements they most likely would qualify for an award. For those who are above the Cal Grant B ceiling but below the Cal Grant A ceiling, it is more difficult to say how many students would be eligible for an award. Mr. Kipp noted that in providing these numbers, staff is not saying that all students would qualify for an award.

The largest single group listed a community college as their first choice then UC and CSU respectively, with nonpublic institutions following. The Commission received 230,462 verified high school GPA's. Of those, 80,739 were from students 19 and under and linked to a FAFSA. Another 2,000 were from 20 year olds. This leaves 143,000 plus GPAs from the high school for graduates who did not apply for financial aid. For the group falling into the above the Cal Grant B ceiling but below A, not having a 3.0 GPA is a major disqualifier among those students who did submit a GPA. Committee member Jeffery noted this is probably due to high schools submitting GPA's for their seniors, not the one year out graduates.

Mr. Kipp pointed out the students who listed no California school on their FAFSA were removed from the group. Committee member Jeffery inquired if there would be a clearinghouse follow-up on this group. Mr. Kipp noted that this was not the original intent for this item. This is approximately a \$60,000 proposition as well as a time issue and it was not addressed.

Committee member Robinson asked whether the California Department of Education (CDE) has any data on the distribution of GPA of high school graduates. Committee member Kopperud noted that CDE does not collect high school GPA as a data collection element.

Committee member DeMartini inquired whether this information has been shared with Assembly member Matthews for AB 1241. Mr. Espinoza reported that staff have been in discussion with Assemblywoman Matthews and sponsor of the bill CalPIRG.

Committee member Bonnell noted that if the high schools having problems that are not submitting the GPA's could be identified, the community college outreach may be able to assist them in gathering the information and transmitting it to the Commission.

Mr. Espinoza commented that it is his intention to further break down the information by zip code and if possible, by school. Staff will work closer with Sam Kipp and the research team addressing this issue. Committee member Kopperud noted that the CDE legal office indicated they would not support an MOU but would rather see a letter from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to high school principals and superintendents that would encourage them to send in the GPA verifications.

Mr. Kipp gave an update on a conversation from the last GAC meeting regarding the number of students who applied for and were awarded a Cal Grant but were not paid for the award. The question is what happened to these students. The data that is being analyzed is from the 2003-04 and 2004-05 academic years for approximately 60,000 students. These students were then matched against clearinghouse files. Approximately 92 percent of the 2003-04 students and 95 percent of the 2004-05 students have been matched. Then try to report back on what the impact is on student enrollment and the potential implications on the administration or reconciliation processes. It is hopeful that this research can be completed by the end of summer.

Mr. Kipp noted that there is another potential topic of research on the eligible non-recipients from the competitive program. In 2004-05, there were approximately 117,000 eligible non-recipients. The majority of these students were EL 2, 3 and 4. This project would analyze what happened to these students who did not receive a Cal Grant in comparison to those students who did. The issue of finding out whether the segments would be interesting in pursuing a match against the data to assist in determining if the selection criteria is working or if it is causing unintended consequences.

Tab 7: Work Group Updates

Committee member Jeffery, Co-chair of the Enhancing, Reporting and Analysis work group, noted that the group met with Sam Kipp and discussed earlier data from the research presented earlier. A discussion on what questions would be useful to answer and agreed upon what direction further analysis should go. Another meeting is planned when Sam Kipp has more information to present on the three issues that were outlined today. The work group also wanted to keep track of cost estimates that the Commission was preparing in response to Legislative bills.

Committee member Bossio, Co-chair of the Technology Needs and Enhancements work group, noted that their work group has not met yet. Ms. Bossio noted that she and Craig Yamamoto will be attending upcoming A & E meetings as it was believed they would have input on the Web Grants for Students program phase II presented at the meetings. It was not known if the work group would have official meetings or work within the A & E group.

Tab 8: High School GPA Initiatives

Mr. Espinoza indicated that this agenda item will continue the discussion on GPA issues, provide an update on initiatives that are currently underway and provide an orientation on a partnership with the University of California involving evaluation of transcripts to determine Cal Grant eligibility.

Mr. Espinoza noted that staff has made improvements to the processing of paper GPAs. For quality assurance purposes, three people have been assigned to be lead members of the team. An analyst will be hired to ensure the quality assurance process.

Mr. Espinoza also indicated that due to legal concerns in discussion with the Department of Education, there may not be a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the State Superintendent regarding the submission of GPA's. The MOU was being patterned after the community college MOU however, because the new, proposed MOU deals with minors, there are significant privacy issues that need to be dealt with first. Committee member Kopperud indicated that his legal office feels more comfortable with a letter from the superintendent that encourages the high schools to submit the GPAs. Commissioner McClain indicated that she was under the impression that a letter had already gone out to the schools. Mr. Kopperud explained that the letter was sent by Delaine Eastin when she was superintendent however it was felt the letter needed to be sent out each year, possibly targeting the high schools that are not doing a good job of submitting GPA's. Committee member Jeffery indicated that she was under the impression that the MOU was to cover high school concerns about Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and give them the consent for submission.

Dr. Charles Masten, Assistant Director Admissions and Outreach, University of California indicated that he previously worked at the Department of Education in Washington D.C. with Lee Rooker who is the Director of

the Family Compliance Office at the department. He is very knowledgeable on FERPA issues. State law, the Individual Practices Act (IPA), is actually silent on this issue with regard to the release of student records. It refers to the FERPA statute. Mr. Rooker indicated an openness to supporting a process that would not require the current process of positive parental authorization in order to release the GPA and social security information. The idea behind the new process would have five components. The first component is that the school filter out all GPA's below 2.00. This would not be considered a wholesale transmission. Secondly, the school could institute a negative permission process that basically allows parents to opt out but do not specifically opt in. Third, the data would be considered part of the financial aid award process. Fourth, since the data is being transmitted to the Commission, which is a state entity, the state would agree to not release the information except as part of the financial aid process. Last, the fact that there is a large number of students that are being denied access to postsecondary education because of the number of grants that are not being released is a major selling point for action.

Ms. Robertson outlined interim solutions for the GPA submission issue. The first project is the GPA imaging project. This project will allow the student to download the GPA form off the website to print out and send it to the Commission where the form will be scanned and accepted into the database. The downloadable form was specifically requested at the Cal Grant Forums by high school counselors. As long as the GPA was being submitted for financial aid purposes, the parental permission on the GPA Verification form was not considered necessary. This tool is being designed specifically for the high school student, as opposed to the adult student.

The second part of the project will entail having the student send an electronic request through the Commission to the school requesting the school submit the student GPA. This would provide the student with another option for the submission of the GPA. Committee member Cunha inquired who would be responsible for contacting the student if the school determined it could not verify the student's GPA. Mr. Espinoza indicated that staff would need to discuss this issue further.

Margaret Heisel and Charles Masten, from the University of California, gave a presentation on a transcript evaluation service project being developed in conjunction with the Commission. This presentation was an opportunity to give feedback about this project.

Ms. Heisel noted that the transcript evaluation tool was originally developed for UC's eligibility and local context program where a student can qualify for admission if they are in the top four percent of their high school class. The evaluation of the students needed to take place in a very short timeframe, at the end of the junior year and before the student's senior year so that they would be more informed of their admission status.

Ms. Heisel indicated that approximately 18 months ago, UC approached the Commission this project to see if this tool could assist in considering the eligibility for a Cal Grant. This tool calculates both the GPA as well as coursework eligibility term by term. The software allows the eligibility to be calculated each year so that the school and student can be informed of where they stand in terms of eligibility for CSU, UC and for receiving a Cal Grant. It is currently installed in 27 different pilot schools across the state and a trained group of outreach personnel from all the major outreach programs in the state have been trained. It has the potential to go out to all the schools in the state at some point. Last month was the first meeting of the advisory board.

Dr. Masten noted that approximately 60,000 transcripts were evaluated this year. Next year, they are looking to triple the evaluations to 180,000 and then double each year after. Next year, a student individual report will be added. This report would be given to the student and report whether they are on track for UC, CSU or basic college prep coursework. This tool gives a very accurate Cal Grant GPA. Because information provided by the high school is an electronic passage of information, the issue is with a school's capacity to provide the transcript information electronically. Approximately 65 percent of the high schools in the state can do that now. Next year, UC will partner with California School System Information System (CSSIS) in September.

Dr. Masten also indicated that all students' transcripts for the school would be evaluated. The school would then be able to review the report on the web that is accessible only by them. This allows the school to see any patterns of student ineligibility – for example, if students are having a difficulty in math or English. This allows the school to see how the A – G coursework is working at their school. The website for this tool is

www.transcriptevaluationservice.com. Dr. Masten noted that since this is the pilot year, the navigation is a little difficult but will be improved.

Dr. Masten indicated that in the next phase, they are planning to send out to parents and students a ready-for-college report card but want to work out the procedures with the schools first. The school can log on to the site and gain access to reports for their school which allows them to do analysis for their school. Committee member Nadjarian inquired if there were plans to translate information into other languages. Dr. Masten noted that this is something that is being reviewed but currently, the website is specifically designed for schools and school liaisons.

Commissioner McClain commented that this tool can be very useful but to remember that some students finish their high school senior year by taking credits at the community college, which if are not included in the transcript evaluation, could give the illusion that the student is borderline. Commissioner McClain went on to note that this tool may be an item that can be used even earlier than high school to assess the student's direction in seventh and eighth grade. Committee member Bossio cautioned that while this was a good tool, it should not mislead the financial aid community into thinking that this tool links all financial aid eligibility into one package.

George Montgomery, Counseling Consultant, California Department of Education, as an audience member, requested cost information on this program. Ms. Heisel noted that they are trying to secure grants from foundations but at this time the service was provided to the schools at no cost to them. The approximate set up cost for this program was in the one million dollar range. Committee member Thomas inquired if UC had access to all files in this tool. Mr. Masten noted that there are two MOU's with each school and the data is used for research only, not for recruitment purposes. Commissioner McClain noted that the Grants and Programs committee of the Commission may benefit from a presentation at the upcoming June Commission meeting.

Tab 9: State Legislative and Budget Update

Sam Kipp, Manager Governmental and Policy Affairs Manager, noted that there is an update in the agenda but because this presentation was given to him at the last minute, he was unable to give any further updates.

Committee member DeMartini noted that AB 700 has been placed in the Assembly Appropriation Committee's suspense file. It will move out of suspense file on May 25th because it will be amended to get appropriations. It essentially added 50 new competitive Cal Grants for \$150,000 while allowing the discussion to continue in the Senate.

Committee member Villalobos gave an update on AB 358 which is also stuck in the appropriations suspense file. The amendments would take up the B provision, it would put in the study on Cal Grant B students, and then it would provide a phase in approach for the Cal Grant maximum for students at independent private sector. The phasing would be in 2006-07 where the student will get 80 percent of the maximum, and then increases to 90 and then 100 percent. So there would be no cost for the bill next year, technically, but they're still concerned with the year end General Fund costs.

Tab 10: Federal Legislative and Budget Update

Michael Bolden, Federal Policy Liaison, outlined information regarding loans. It is provided it to the Committee for informational purpose to show how policies in the budget, at the federal level, towards the loan program, are also affecting grant programs as well. This information is provided as a courtesy.

Mr. Bolden explained about Congress's reaction to the budget and the work that has been done towards it. In late April they passed a Congressional budgetary resolution, which has got some implications for higher education. Basically, the House Committee received an instruction of 12.5 billion in cuts. On the Senate side it was 13.5 billion. There's still some debate going on between those committees as far as the actual figure. The budget resolution, in essence, is going to be discussed with committees reporting out towards the fall of this year. Now, regarding reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, which is in updates provided, there are two

paths, essentially, that authorization could take. Currently, Congress is focusing on the budget, and since it's near reconciliation, they're trying to balance the budget and reduce the deficit.

Mr. Bolden indicated that regarding reauthorization, there's two paths that the process could take. One would be, as part of the budget reconciliation bill to passed this year, the budget reconciliation instructions directed the Education Committees to find significant savings. The House version directs them to save 21.4 billion in any of four programs, and the student loan and pension guarantee programs are the two largest that would bear the brunt of these cuts. The Senate version has significantly smaller overall savings, so the final instruction will be likely less. The House Committee expects that they will have to produce some savings if the budget is adopted, and the deadline for action, again, is this fall.

The second path regarding reauthorization is similar to what was done last year, is Congress would pass another one-year extension regarding reauthorization. The Committee could extend this through the final appropriations process and then in July of next year changes in the student loan interest formula, which moves it from a variable to a fixed rate, would create a deadline for Congress to pass some form of reauthorization, so they may be forced into a position where they do have to reauthorize the Act next year.

Regarding legislation, the President introduced his budget, back in February, there have been a flurry of just over 80 bills regarding higher education. A condensed list of some of those bills that the division is tracking relative to grants is provided in the agenda.

Mr. Bolden explained there is information in the agenda regarding cuts that are being made to mandatory grant programs, such as LEAP, SLEAP, and the Byrd Scholarships Program. No information was included regarding the Chafee program. Mr. Bolden explained he has been working with Max to try to get some information on whether there is or isn't an affect on that program. To date, he has not been able to find anything.

Committee member Nadjarian inquired if the Byrd Scholarship Program is a cut in the teacher portion of the grant or is it affecting the whole program. Mr. Bolden explained that it's a scholarship program for the students and it's calling for the total elimination of that program.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:21 p.m.

Mary Lindsey, Chair