

GETTING WHAT YOU PAY FOR

What State Policymakers Should Know About Federal Higher Education Policy

David A. Longanecker

November 2008



NATIONAL CONFERENCE of STATE LEGISLATURES

The Forum for America's Ideas

WICHE

Western Interstate Commission
for Higher Education

With support from



Introduction

Every state policymaker knows the mantra: education is a state responsibility, not the federal government's. But just how true is that? In higher education it is certainly true that the states provide the lion's share of funding for capital construction of public colleges and universities, as well as most of the funding (about \$70 billion annually) for administrative and instructional purposes and a more modest \$7 billion for student financial assistance. Yet the federal government is also a significant actor, providing roughly \$25 billion annually in funding, primarily for student assistance and research.

As a result, whether they realize it or not, the state and the federal governments are significant partners in this American higher education enterprise. Therefore, it makes a lot of sense for state policymakers to understand the nature of the federal investment and the rationale behind it if they are to gain maximum advantage from synergies and avoid potential conflicts between state and federal investments. Harmonized state and federal efforts can complement each other. It simply makes good sense to design state policies in ways that maximize the take-up of federal dollars, both to benefit students and to relieve state fiscal pressures.

What Is the "Federal Interest" in Higher Education?

The federal role in higher education falls into three general categories: areas of federal responsibility, areas of national interest, and areas of particular political interest.

Areas of federal responsibility. The primary area in which the federal government has accepted major responsibility is in *ensuring equal educational opportunity*. The federal government became engaged in this area only about 50 years ago, with passage of the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965 as part of the Great Society programs, marshaled through Congress by President Lyndon Johnson. Though relatively new as a federal policy area, ensuring equal educational opportunity was tied back to the 14th Amendment of the Constitution, which ensures all citizens equal opportunity to benefit from the privileges of citizenship and equal protection against any abridgement of these privileges. Passage of the HEA, in essence, outlined the philosophy that citizens could not be ensured equal opportunity, as required by the Constitution, without being offered equal educational opportunity, because it had become evident that education was the primary avenue to equality, particularly for individuals who had traditionally been disenfranchised from full success in American society. Since the inception of the HEA, this federal responsibility has been pursued through two strategies: first, through enforcement of equal opportunity in education through civil rights rules, regulations, and litigation; and second, through the creation and support of a variety of federal student assistance programs.

Areas of national interest. The federal government's first foray into higher education actually came about as the result of a compelling

federal interest, rather than as a federal responsibility. The Morrill Act of 1862, which was the first federal engagement with higher education, provided an incentive for each state to establish a “land grant” institution to focus on advancing the industrial and agricultural revolutions of the time by preparing the high-skilled workforce and creating the applied research infrastructure necessary for this advancement. Many land grant universities remain among the most prestigious and invaluable state universities in the country today.

The dual federal interests of research and development (R&D) and workforce development have driven much of the federal interest in supporting higher education throughout history. The federal government continues to provide significant financial support for activities that it believes are in the national interest. Most significant among these is the area of federal research support. Federal funding for academic R&D currently amounts to \$30 billion annually, with the greatest support coming from the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation, along with significant affiliated research support coming from other federal offices, including the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy (though virtually every federal agency sponsors some level of R&D). Traditionally, these funds have been distributed to grantees through a peer-reviewed process, but in recent years an increasing share has been issued via proprietary earmarks designated by Congress in the appropriations process.

In the workforce domain, perhaps the most significant federal effort was the original G. I. Bill, which was designed not to do the right thing for veterans (as modern lore would have it), but rather to keep them out of the workforce, which simply could not have absorbed them without risking another depression. An added benefit came from the up-skilling of these veterans, whose college education allowed them to take on more productive jobs.

In the late 1950s, the federal government amped up its education efforts “in the national interest” with support of the National Defense Education Act, which was designed to address the perceived national threat to American leadership in science and technology – a threat underlined by the successful Soviet launch of the Sputnik, the

first Earth-orbiting space satellite. The federal government still provides direct support to various efforts that it believes to be in the national interest. The HEA, for example, includes sections that provide support to international education, developing colleges and universities, historically minority-serving institutions, graduate education, and teacher preparation. While these have never been claimed as a federal *responsibility*, it is clear that they are of interest to the federal government and have received support to advance that federal interest.

Areas of political interest. The federal government also pursues a number of higher education initiatives that are neither a federal responsibility nor a broad federal interest but simply reflect the political dynamics of the time. Two recent examples of this are the federal concern about the increasing cost of college and the perceived gap (by some federal policymakers) in higher education accountability.

The cost concerns, often couched in terms of “affordability,” have been addressed both through student benefits to reduce cost pressures and through regulatory schemes to prevent institutions from increasing costs too much. The various tax credits, deductions, and savings benefits for education that have recently been adopted, primarily to benefit the middle class, and the relaxation of limits on student grants to extend greater eligibility to the middle class do not truly address the federal responsibility of expanding educational opportunity: virtually all of the recipients would have gone to college anyway. But these benefits are politically popular.

With regard to accountability, Margaret Spellings, secretary of education under President George W. Bush, felt strongly that higher education was not being held accountable for how much students learned or for how likely it was that they would even graduate. She pursued federal initiatives to require greater accountability from institutions on the issue of student success. The results of her efforts are reflected in current practice and law, including a number of new reporting requirements and regulatory structures embedded in the HEA amendments passed in 2008, now to be known as the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA).

Federal Interests and Responsibilities and the Law

This policy brief focuses primarily on the federal role in higher education as it relates to student financial assistance. The other major federal areas of activity touched on above, while certainly important and germane to state policy, are not as key to state and federal policymakers as financial aid policy is.

The Higher Education/Higher Education

Opportunity Act. As previously mentioned, the primary federal role in American higher education is established by the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, as amended. The HEA is periodically reauthorized to keep it contemporary. It was most recently reauthorized in August 2008. This new act renamed the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008, thus ostensibly reflects contemporary thinking on the federal role in higher education.

Many folks in the higher education policy community and within the federal government breathed a sigh of relief with the act's passage because the reauthorization process had been delayed for many years. Truth be told, however, this long-awaited, reauthorized HEA/HEOA reflects only modest tinkering. In part this is because the delays in progressing reauthorization – a process that should have taken no more than five years, but actually took 10 – forced Congress to embed many of the necessary changes to federal higher education policy into other bills, most notably the Budget Reconciliation Acts of 2006 and the Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2008. The major outcomes of the 2008 reauthorization were:

- ▶ Virtually no significant programs were eliminated, despite research indicating that a number of programs accomplished little, but a number of new pet programs were adopted. Some observers have expressed concern that these new programs expand the role of the federal government and thus may dilute the limited resources likely to be available for the core federal programs, particularly given the difficult budget years that probably lie ahead. If the past is prologue, however, these concerns are unlikely to be warranted; many of these

new programs, though now authorized, will never be funded. And if they are funded, it will be at such low levels that it will not jeopardize either the integrity of the federal budget or other valued programs. There doesn't seem to be a groundswell of support for any of the new programs, nor do any of them suggest a radical new direction for the HEOA.

- ▶ Authorized funding levels for most of the programs in the act, such as the well-known Pell Grant program, were increased. It is unlikely, however, that these authorized levels will ever be reached. The current \$4,731 maximum federal Pell Grant remains substantially below the former authorized \$5,800 maximum, and far beneath the \$8,000 stipulated in the recently reauthorized law. A 70 percent increase from the current \$4,731 maximum to the authorized \$8,000 maximum over the intended four- to five-year life of this reauthorization would be unprecedented and highly unlikely in the current federal fiscal environment.

Truth be told, however, this long-awaited, reauthorized HEA/HEOA reflects only modest tinkering.

The new act includes a number of new mandates for states and institutions to abide by, many of which are focused on the federal interests discussed earlier, regarding concerns about the increasing cost of college and the perceived lack of adequate accountability. Many of these mandates will prove relatively benign with respect to state policy, but not all. One provision, for example, would eliminate state eligibility for the relatively new College Access Challenge Grant (CACG) Program if states do not maintain their current level of funding for higher education. Given the fiscal dilemma facing our nation, this could jeopardize funding for this program in a number of states. Unlike the new pet programs, these new mandates will almost certainly be put into effect. Even though they do increase the administrative burden – both for the reporting institutions and states and for the Department of Education that must regulate them – they carry no “fiscal note,” so do not need to pass through the legislative process again, meaning they simply fall to the Department of Education as an imperative implementation responsibility.

The appropriations process. While folks generally think of authorizing legislation as the guiding light

While folks generally think of authorizing legislation as the guiding light of public policy, at the federal level, appropriations law also greatly shapes the U.S. government's role in higher education.

of public policy, at the federal level, appropriations law also greatly shapes the U.S. government's role in higher education. Recently, in fact, the budget and appropriations processes have had a very significant influence on federal financial aid policy. This brief will not go into the complexities of those budget and appropriations processes, nor will it introduce you to the unique lexicon of federal budget terms. Rather, it will provide a fairly simple, straightforward analysis of how the budget and appropriations process have affected federal higher education policy in recent years and how this is particularly germane to state policy.

First, as alluded to earlier, federal appropriations are bounded by authorizing legislation, but appropriations are almost always substantially more frugal than would be allowed under that legislation. This should not be surprising. The authorizing committees come to passionately believe in the programs for which they are responsible, but the appropriations committees have to balance the passions of a variety of committees with the reality of available resources. So higher education programs, like almost all programs, receive less funding than they could receive under the parameters of the authorizing legislation.

As mentioned earlier, the major federal student grant program, the Pell Grant program, provides awards of up to \$4,731 for the 2008-09 academic year, an amount that is reduced depending upon how much a family has been determined to be able to contribute to their student's education. This maximum award appropriated increased substantially in recent years, from \$4,050 just three years ago. In addition, in the 2006-07 school year, Pell Grant recipients were eligible for an additional \$750-\$1,300 from the new Academic Competitiveness Grant during their first two years of college if they had taken a rigorous curriculum in high school. During their last two years of college, they were eligible for up to an additional \$2,000 from the new SMART Grant, if they selected a science, technology, engineering, mathematics (STEM) or designated foreign language field of

study. While the Pell Grant has been the primary program promoting the federal responsibility to expand educational opportunity, it has recently been blended with the federal interest in assuring that students prepare well for college and that more students focus on areas of critical need to our country.

One of the dilemmas with the Pell Grant program over time has been that its costs are highly sensitive to the nation's economic circumstances. When the national economy is sour, demand for Pell Grants increases substantially: many more students go to school because jobs for them simply aren't available. The result is that program costs soar at precisely the time when federal revenues become constrained. There may be a little politics at play here, as well; it seems that deficits in the Pell Grant program appear at the end of presidential terms, leaving the legacy of debt, and the responsibility for resolving this budget problem, to the new president. President George H. W. Bush, for example, left President Bill Clinton a \$1.5 billion hole in the Pell Grant program budget upon entering office. And while President Clinton did not leave such a gap for his successor, President George W. Bush will leave a projected \$6 billion deficit to repair.

One of the dilemmas with the Pell Grant program over time has been that its costs are highly sensitive to the nation's economic circumstances.

In addition to the Pell Grant program, the federal appropriations and budget processes have recently been the major vehicles for substantially changing the subsidy structures of the federal student loan program. Large increases in student borrowing in the 1990s and early 2000s drove the costs of the federal student loan programs up substantially. As a result, major changes have been made to reduce these costs without harming student borrowers. These changes have significantly altered the way lenders and guarantee agencies (including many state lenders and guarantee agencies) are recompensed for their services in managing student loans and the way in which students are subsidized for the benefits they receive.

In order to meet the limits imposed in the budget reconciliation and appropriations acts of 2006 and

2008, subsidies to lenders and guarantors of federal student loans have been substantially reduced – so much so, in fact, that many of the entities that have participated in the past have withdrawn or threatened to do so, either because they no longer find their student loan portfolio sufficiently profitable or because they simply can't afford to stay in business. While this has caused much consternation in the array of vendors that have participated in the program, it has not jeopardized access to federal student loans. Enough lenders, including the federal government through its Direct Student Loan Program, remain in the program to assure access to student loans for all eligible students, and large national guarantors are available to absorb the functions of smaller guarantee agencies that reduce or cease activity. Budget reductions and consolidations make good sense from the federal perspective because they retain equivalent service at a lower cost. But they have created havoc, particularly for states with programs that have benefitted substantially from the federal largess in the past.

Student borrowers have not been spared either. Part of the fix was to increase student loan interest rates modestly to rates that are more comparable to what was paid before the reauthorization act of 1998 reduced them. Some argue that these increases in interest rates did harm student borrowers,

so it is not correct to contend that the actions of Congress protected students. Yet all students who were eligible for loans remain eligible, and

the increased interest rate to 6 percent remains a reasonably good rate, compared to rates charged in the private sector. In fact, the variable rate loan structure established in the 1998 reauthorization bill (currently at 3.61 percent), combined with the fact that many students bear no interest on the loan while in school, has accounted, in part, for the exceptional increase in demand for such loans; with such generous terms, it was in the student's best economic interest to take advantage of such a loan whether they needed to or not.

Tax benefits also remain a substantial way in which the federal government addresses its political interest. Tax benefits have long helped both public and private higher education through a variety of provisions, such as: tax-exemption for public and

nonprofit organizations; tax benefits for businesses that pay educational expenses for employees; research and development tax credits that encourage industries to support university research; tax deductions for children who remain dependent on their parents while attending college; and tax benefits for college savings.

But there is increasing scrutiny of these myriad tax benefits. For example, the Senate Finance Committee has been reviewing two features of federal tax law that could substantially impact state policy. First, they have been examining the legitimacy of tax-exempt status for public and nonprofit institutions that pay "exorbitant" salaries to their chief executives and selected other employees (coaches). Second, they have been contemplating why college and university foundations, as philanthropic organizations, should not be required to spend a portion of their resources each year, as all other philanthropic trusts and foundations must do.

Other tax benefits have also come under increased scrutiny. A number of political candidates during the 2008 election cycle suggested consolidating redundant federal tax credits and deductions for tuition costs and savings plans into a more easily understood system. Some policy analysts have also raised questions about whether these programs actually serve the federal role in higher education,

given that the primary federal responsibility is to promote educational opportunity, not simply making it easier to go to college. And others have

suggested that the grant, loan, and tax programs should be better integrated to reduce redundancy and increase efficiency. While this makes a great deal of sense, it is very difficult to accomplish because tax policy is handled by an entirely different set of congressional committees than the authorizing and appropriations committees. These efforts are so divorced that it is hard to imagine they could be reconciled.

What This Means for State Policy

Four features of current federal policy need to be recognized as states develop their higher education policy.

States need to distinguish between myth and reality – the feds aren't going to solve your problems and challenges.

- ▶ Incremental changes may sound benign, but they are not.
- ▶ States can use federal policy to maximize their own policies.
- ▶ States need to distinguish between myth and reality – the feds aren't going to solve your problems and challenges.
- ▶ The federal philosophy for higher education engagement is in flux, and it is not very federalist.

Incremental changes are not necessarily benign.

Small changes can have pretty big effects, sometimes over a long period and sometimes almost immediately. Oftentimes, modest federal changes can have a significant impact on states. For example, the 1998 Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act created a modest new program known as GEAR-UP. Over the last 10 years, this program, which introduced the concept of early intervention to prepare at-risk youth for future success in postsecondary education, has become a mainstay of state policy around the nation. Likewise, the modest Academic Competitiveness Grant, implemented in the 2007-2008 school year, is a great incentive to high schools to provide – and to high school students to take – more rigorous courses, which research tells us will substantially improve those students' chances of attending and succeeding in college.

The most recent authorization also has a number of incremental changes that could have substantial effects – perhaps positive, perhaps not. A provision requiring that institutions providing distance learning must authenticate that students taking exams are indeed the students registered for the course may protect educational integrity but may also greatly impede the capacity to provide distance learning, if implemented in a way that hampers legitimate delivery of these services. Similarly, a “maintenance of effort” provision in the new CACG program, which is intended to dissuade states from reducing their support for higher education, could mean that many states facing substantial budget deficits, a portion of which will almost certainly redound to higher education as budget cuts, could lose their funding for this valuable new program. Also, increases in the required reporting that virtually all institutions will have to make to the National Center for Educational Statistics will, without doubt, boost institutional administrative costs – costs that will have to be funded either from

state or tuition funding or be carved out of existing program costs.

What can states do? In some cases, working with your state congressional delegation to seek reasonable amendments may make sense. In most cases, however, coordinating state efforts to respond to these measures so that each institution isn't inventing its own solution could lead to lower aggregate costs and less aggravation.

Perhaps the most common mistake that states make is wedding themselves to the federal need analysis for determining state financial aid.

Using federal policy to the state's advantage. The best recent example of how states missed the boat in this regard relates to federal adoption of the HOPE Scholarship and Life Long Learning Tax Credit and Deduction. This federal program, adopted in 1997 and first available to families paying taxes in 1999, provides more than \$8 billion in tax relief to middle-income students and their parents each year. A family with income below \$100,000 may claim a tax credit of up to \$1,650 for each child attending college at least half time for the first two years (100 percent of the first \$1,000 and 50 percent of the second \$1,000 of tuition paid) as part of the HOPE Scholarship. The Lifetime Learning Credit provides up to \$2,000 annually for students (20 percent of up to \$10,000 of tuition paid).

The kicker is that you have to pay tuition to receive a tuition tax credit. Yet for years after adoption of this federal tax credit, many states with merit scholarships “for tuition” failed to recognize that eligibility for their program precluded eligibility for the federal program. Thus, the states were paying entirely for a benefit, though the federal government was willing to share the costs.

Most of the states have changed their policies to allow students to receive both the state and federal benefits. Yet many states and institutions still provide tuition vouchers for special categories of students – most often, for employees or dependents of employees. Yet again, simply restructuring these tuition vouchers would make the students eligible for the federal tax credit. Another example: The California Community Colleges, which, by charging virtually no tuition, leave a huge amount of federal

unclaimed benefit on the table. These colleges, on average, charge about \$600 annually in fees. If they raised this amount to \$1,000, it would increase their fees by millions of dollars, allowing them to better serve their students without increasing the net cost to virtually any students enrolled greater than half-time. Yes, middle income families would pay an additional \$300 out of pocket, but their tax liability would be reduced by an equal amount.

Perhaps the most common mistake that states make is wedding themselves to the federal need analysis for determining state financial aid. Indeed, most states do this, believing that it makes no sense to replicate an assessment of need that has survived the test of time at the federal level. The problem is that the federal need analysis, which began as a reasonable assessment of what families could contribute, has been bastardized so much over time, primarily to incorporate more middle-income students and families and to accommodate to budget constraints and political interests, that it no longer truly reflects what students and their families can contribute.

Some states, however, have been quite wise in constructing their financial aid policies to take full advantage of the federal program. Oregon, for example, in creating its new shared responsibility grant program, has taken full advantage of all the aid available for its students but has fashioned its policy to meet need under its own estimates of what students and parents can contribute rather than following the federal methodology lockstep. Arizona has focused its university need-based aid, which is provided directly by its universities, on Pell Grant students, which effectively targets the aid on the financially neediest students. Similarly, Louisiana's new GO grant focuses on Pell Grant recipients, as well.

Many states are quite proud of their federal "partnership" activities in the student loan and 529 savings programs. In almost all cases, however, these states are simply vendors for private investment firms, providing no financial contribution to the programs and often relegating borrowers to investment instruments with notoriously low yields and high administrative expenses. Yet both loan and savings programs provide a unique opportunity

for states to partner financially with the federal government and in so doing increase the value of their programs to the beneficiaries. States, for example, could provide tax advantages or simple repayment of loans to students who leave the state but return after graduation – a great way to get some other state to educate your citizens and future residents. States could offer matching contributions to savings plans for working-class families, so they have an incentive to plan for their children's education. There are many ways in which states can partner with the federal government, even if the federal government doesn't recognize that they are a partner with the states.

Distinguishing myth from reality. Perhaps the greatest myth regarding the federal role in higher education is that the federal government takes care of access, so the states don't have to worry about financial aid. This may have been close to true in the 1970s, shortly after implementation of the original HEA, when federal funds for student aid were more plentiful and tuition at public institutions was much more affordable. But it is certainly no longer true. As valuable as the Pell Grant program is, it will never again cover the share of educational costs that it once did. A number of states have come to realize this and have created strong need-based financial aid programs, which when blended with the federal programs provide a strong safety net for the neediest students.

The myth is that poor students are covered by the feds, rich students are covered by their parents or trust funds, but the middle class is screwed.

Yet more than half of all states still languish with no or insufficiently funded need-based programs. The result is that many students

from low-income families still cannot afford to go to college without exceptional sacrifice on their own part or their family's. That's not what the current rhetoric is. The myth is that poor students are covered by the feds, rich students are covered by their parents or trust funds, but the middle class is screwed. Research, however, demonstrates clearly that this is a myth, not reality. Without doubt, many middle-income students face a greater burden from college costs than they did in the past. And it is not untoward to provide policies that help these students. But the students today that face true barriers to college attendance remain those students from very low-income families.

A second myth is that student access is all about cost. The truth is, poor academic preparation accounts for more students not going to college or not succeeding in college than does cost.

States can address both of these myths. A number of states are following the lead of Indiana and Oklahoma in creating scholarships for poor students who agree to take a rigorous set of courses in high school. These programs can effectively be blended with federal programs to increase their value. Likewise, some states, like Washington, build on the federal College Work Study program to offer state work study that can be blended into intentional cooperative work study programs, in which students earn their way through college in a program that blends their academic studies with work in the field for which they are preparing. These programs relieve pressure on traditional financial aid programs, provide relevance for the student in their academic pursuits, and are a great way of keeping students in the firms for which they work and, therefore, in the state that is paying handsomely to educate them.

Responding to a changing federal philosophy (one that's not very federalist). The implicit federal philosophy for higher education has been evolving in two ways since the inception of the HEA in 1965.

Perhaps the most significant shift has been away from helping the neediest students, consistent with the federal *responsibility* to ensure equal educational opportunity, to helping the middle class, consistent with the federal *political interest*. While many federal policymakers would be offended with this statement, the facts are clear. Today, through an array of federal programs – grants, loans, and tax credits – federal subsidies have shifted substantially away from the neediest to less needy students, and indeed the combination of tax credits and loan subsidies often provide greater overall benefits to middle-income students than to the lowest-income students.

This shift is not entirely inconsistent with implicit state policy. Virtually all states subsidize their prestigious research universities, which cater to the wealthiest students, much more heavily than community colleges, which serve the most academically and economically distressed students. And a number of states generously support merit scholarship programs, which also disproportionately serve the most advantaged students.

The workforce needs of the future, however, demand that we find ways to serve successfully a much larger share of our population in our state systems of higher education. Private and proprietary institutions can help (and can be incorporated intentionally in state policy to help), but the primary responsibility will fall on public institutions.

In addition to shifting its focus from the neediest students, the federal government has shifted away from a federalist approach to a much more federally controlled approach. Programs which used to be intentional federal/state partnerships have lost their verve, and more often the federal government appears to see itself as the director of activity, rather than as a partner. Examples include the diminished role of the explicit partnership programs, such as the Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership (formerly the State Student Incentive Grant program – SSIG), nationalizing the student loan program, and usurping control of the National Postsecondary Education Collaborative. New relationships with states have taken on a much more federally paternalistic tint. As mentioned earlier, for example, the CACG carries strings that naively require states to maintain efforts that may be nearly impossible.

How can and should states respond? One way is to follow federal legislation more closely and maintain a close relationship with members of Congress who serve on relevant committees. In many, if not most, cases, members of Congress began their political service in state legislatures. Thus, they are kindred spirits – if only they know what you are interested in. Absent your collegueship, though, they become captives to the federal process and frenzy. So remember your old friends and stay well acquainted.

Concluding Comments

Whether state or federal legislators realize it or not, the states and federal government are partners in providing access and quality in higher education. And from the state perspective, perhaps it is best if you recognize this more than your federal partners do, as it provides you with the ability to build upon federal efforts and use federal programs to maximize the intended impact of your state policies.

Being smart in this respect doesn't necessarily require carving out new ground. To some extent or another, you in your state and legislators in other states have already found clever ways to amplify

the positive effects of your state higher education policies by taking greater advantage of federal efforts. Sharing your ideas with your colleagues and borrowing from their intelligent efforts can make you a much more effective partner with the federal government, whether the feds realize it or not.

So pay attention to this federal stuff. It's mighty important to your state, even if higher education is a state responsibility.

About the Author

David A. Longanecker is the president of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) in Boulder, Colorado. WICHE is a regional compact between 15 Western states created to assure access and excellence in higher education through collaboration and resource sharing among the higher education systems of the West. Previously, Longanecker served for six years as the assistant secretary for postsecondary education at the U.S. Department of Education. Prior to that, he was the state higher education executive officer (SHEEO) in Colorado and Minnesota. He was also the principal analyst for higher education for the Congressional Budget Office. Longanecker has served on numerous boards and commissions. He has written extensively on a range of higher education issues. His primary interests in higher education are: access, promoting student and institutional performance, teacher education, finance, the efficient use of educational technologies, and academic collaboration in Canada, the United States, and Mexico. He holds an Ed.D. from Stanford University, an M.A. in student personnel work from the George Washington University, and a B.A. in sociology from Washington State University.

This set of policy briefs has been produced by the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) and the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), with support from Lumina Foundation for Education.

For further information, please contact:
Demarée K. Michelau, Director of Policy Analysis
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
3035 Center Green Drive, Suite 200, Boulder, CO 80301-2204
dmichelau@wiche.edu 303.541.0223 www.wiche.edu
