In the information age, a college education is often a job requirement. Many Americans believe they have no choice but to obtain a degree, yet the high cost of college bars some students from pursuing higher education and saddles many of those attending with the long-term burden of student loans. Student debt has quintupled from $330 billion in FY2003 to $1.6 trillion in FY2020 [1]. Bipartisan leadership at the state and local levels is turning to policy solutions that offer hope to students who are losing faith in their ability to use college as a vehicle for economic mobility. On the local and state levels, College Promise programs, which seek to make college as universally accessible and free as high school [2], are already having significant success improving college access and affordability. Yet now is the time to reexamine policies at the federal level, particularly Pell Grants, as we usher in a new administration.

Since 2011, the University of Alabama’s Education Policy Center has conducted 20 studies of Pell Grants. This brief reviews trends in Pell data and proposes three issue areas ripe for reexamination and improvement:

- The Pell Applicant-Awardee gap has quadrupled to over 8 million and growing.
- The Pell Grant has been subject to volatile funding and has not kept pace with rising costs. The average award of $3,400 in 1975-76 was not exceeded in real dollars until 2008-9—a third of a century later.
- The Pell Coverage Gap is large and growing. In 2017-18, the average Pell award did not cover basic costs for two-thirds of U.S. community college students.
President-Elect Joe Biden and Vice President-Elect Kamala Harris made college affordability a priority in 2020, proposing to double Pell Grants and make the first two years of college free.[3] With divided government probable, their loan forgiveness proposals face an uncertain future.[4] Targets of opportunity in the 117th Congress will likely be issues that have seen bipartisan cooperation in recent years. The Pell Grant, an essential part of every College Promise in the 35 states and 360 communities that have a program, is therefore a prime target. The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2017 passed with overwhelming bipartisan support and included provisions restoring year-round (Summer) Pell, which had previously been eliminated in 2012. Utilizing some of the growing Pell program surplus funds, a maximum $2,950 Summer Pell was added to the regular $5,950 grant, increasing both the total award amount and the flexibility of use for Pell. Policy-makers should capitalize on the success and momentum of bi-partisan support to address identified weaknesses in the Pell policy structure.

The Growing Pell Applicant-Award Gap

The Pell Applicant-Awardee Gap is the difference between students applying and receiving Pell. Figure 1 shows the gap has quadrupled from 2 million in the 1980s to 8 million and growing today. This indicates the Pell program’s ability to match demand has fallen.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Make Pell an Entitlement**
- **Re-institute Maintenance of Effort (MOE) provisions**
Volatile, Unstable Pell Grant Funding

In 2018 dollars, the value of the federal investment in Pell fell eight times from 1973-74 to 2017-18 only four drops coincided with recessions. Even if it can be argued that expanding Pell in recessions to help workers reskill is good public policy, the lack of consistency in Pell expansion and contraction strongly suggests a policy flaw exists within the program that is not tied to general economic conditions. The greatest drop in federal investment occurred immediately after the 2012 Pell eligibility restrictions were imposed. While Pell appropriations fluctuate, enrollment of students 18 to 24 years old has grown steadily from 26 percent in 1970 to 40 percent in 2018. [5] Tuition and fees did not decline in any of the eight periods of Pell funding contraction, further illustrating a disconnect between student need and Pell resource allocation.

Since the Great Recession, the Pell Coverage Gap Widens

For nearly a third of a century, the average 1975-76 Pell Grant --about $3,400-- was not exceeded. The average Pell Grant is perhaps the single most critical metric for states to use in assessing federal financial contributions as they align their state appropriations, tuition and fees, and state student aid policies. This is because assuring access to higher education is a responsibility of both states and the federal government, even if their roles are not as clearly defined as they should be. Additionally, most students do not receive the maximum Pell award amount. Low income, first-generation community college, regional university, flagship university, and nonselective liberal arts college students are price sensitive to the difference between the average Pell Grant and key cost components.
Figure 4, below, shows the average cost of tuition and fees at the three public institution sectors tracked alongside the average Pell Award since 1986-87. In 2010-11, the average award covered 34 percent of in-state tuition and fees for students at 108 Flagship Universities, 53 percent at America’s 461 Regional Universities, and 126 percent at 963 Community Colleges; by 2017-18, these percentages had declined to 30 percent, 45 percent, and 50 percent, respectively. The 2012 Pell eligibility restrictions did sharply increase the Pell coverage gap in all sectors, and these estimates are conservative, as they do not include room and board or books and supplies.
Conclusion and Recommendations

The historic Pell increases in the first Obama-Biden administration were part of a comprehensive Great Recession-fighting strategy to help millions of Americans upskill. From 2008-9 to 2011-12, Pell recipients grew from 6 to 9 million [6]. In addition to Pell investments, $2 billion of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds were invested in the Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training grant program, to help community colleges to address workforce challenges. However, a $2 billion shortfall prompted the 2012 Pell restrictions on Lifetime Eligibility, Expected Family Contribution, and Ability-to-Benefit.

The Great Recession revealed students flock to opportunity. The Pell increases spurred enrollment and graduation increases at community colleges and four-year institutions [7]. When Pell is cut, community college and regional university enrollments immediately fall. Graduations also soon fall as cash-strapped states cut appropriations, forcing tuition costs to increase and widening the Pell coverage gap [8].

At the root of the problem is volatility caused by ad hoc year-to-year Pell funding. Pell is by far the largest federal need-based aid program. In 2015-16 it comprised 72 percent of all federal grant aid to undergraduates, 53 percent of federal, state, and institutional undergraduate need-based grant aid, and 28 percent of total grant aid for undergraduates coming from federal, state, institutional, and private sources [9]. Senator Mike Enzi’s Republican Budget Committee staff note Pell funding is one of the most complex of any federal program: in 2018, $30.6 billion was awarded to 7.5 million students. Of that amount, 27 percent ($8.1 billion) came from two mandatory appropriations streams, while 73 percent ($22.5 billion) was discretionary [10]. The discretionary share increased to 81 percent for 2020-2021 [11].

It is therefore the recommendation of the authors that Congress:

- **Make Pell an entitlement**
  - Academically-talented, economically-challenged students need a reliable federal partner as they commit to forgoing income for two- to four-years to obtain certificates, associate’s degrees, and bachelor’s degrees. States need a reliable federal partner as they align their state appropriations, public college and university tuition, and state student aid policies -- which should include the role of private non-profit, regionally accredited colleges and universities. Institutions need a reliable federal partner as they align their wraparound support services -- services that have demonstrated clear track records of success in pulling students across the finish line to certificate and degree completions. Stable Pell Grant funding better ensures that the federal dollars invested provide access to higher education for the nation’s most disadvantaged students, supporting degree completion that promotes social mobility and sustainable workforce development.
Re-institute Maintenance of Effort (MOE) provisions

Requiring states to maintain spending levels on higher education in order to access federal Title IV student aid helps in three important ways:

- First, by keeping tuition stable, low-income students and their families can better plan their certificate and degree course-taking without loans. The Great Recession clearly showed how federal ARRA-MOE provisions held public college tuition increases steady through 2009, 2010, and 2011. The soaring tuition increases at public flagship and regional universities occurred immediately after federal MOE was ended and Pell eligibility restrictions imposed. Thus, MOE is not just an access tool; by maintaining Pell’s purchasing power it is perhaps the most powerful retention tool in the federal toolbox to improve college completion.

- Second, the stability federal MOE provisions bring makes state funding for higher education less volatile, just as it does for other federal-state matching programs including Medicaid, highways, and workforce training.

- Third, more stable, sustainable funding helps institutions to plan programs that help academically talented students enroll and complete.

The federal government must do better by academically-talented, economically-disadvantaged students to help them earn high-quality degrees and certificates. Stable, predictable Pell funding is key. Low-income students should not be subject to a dysfunctional budget process [13]. College access and completion can no longer be discretionary, it is time to fix Pell and make it an entitlement, including maintenance of effort provisions as a condition of receiving federal Title IV student aid.
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