

**FINANCIAL AID AND OLDER WORKERS:
SUPPORTING THE NONTRADITIONAL STUDENT**

**Bridget Terry Long, Ph.D.
Harvard Graduate School of Education and NBER
longbr@gse.harvard.edu**

Draft: November 2, 2007

**Prepared for:
"Strategies for the Improving Economic Mobility of Workers"
Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago
November 15-16, 2007**

I. THE INCREASING ROLE OF NONTRADITIONAL STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Educational trends increasingly highlight the growing numbers of older students who are seeking postsecondary training. According to figures from the 2006 *Digest of Education Statistics*, only 28 percent of the college population was age 25 or above in 1970. However, by 1995, this had risen to 43 percent of students; currently 39 percent of students are age 25 or above. These trends mirror an important need in the country. Changes in the labor market suggest that employers are demanding more educated workers with different types of skills. Therefore, it has become important for many older workers to "retool." Workers are increasingly expected to utilize a broad base of knowledge in their jobs as well as handle multiple responsibilities and changing procedures (U.S. Department of Commerce *et. al.*, 1999). Voorhees and Lingenfelter (2003) estimate that currently 56 percent of the American workforce needs education beyond a high school degree to do their jobs, and this proportion will most certainly increase in the future. They highlight studies that suggest that eight out of ten new jobs created over the next two decades will require some postsecondary education. For workers without these skills, the punishment is severe. As noted by Acs, Phillips, and McKenzie (2000), working full-time at a low wage job will not lead to long-term economic well-being. They estimate that 80 percent of families who are part of the working poor would be low-income even if all able-bodied adult members worked full-time.

The potential role of education, particularly postsecondary training, in improving outcomes for families is significant. The returns to college attendance are likely large for old workers. Leigh and Gill (1997) find that the returns to Associate degree and non-degree community college programs are positive and similar for returning adults as for recent high school graduates. Similarly, Jacobson, LaLonde, and Sullivan (2005) conclude that the impact of a year of community college schooling increased long-term earnings by seven percent for men and 10 percent for women. Carnevale and Desrochers (1999), focusing on welfare recipients with basic skills equal to a high school diploma, estimate that an additional 200 hours of education and training could lead to jobs that pay \$5,000 to \$10,000 more. This is equivalent to a semester of postsecondary courses.

Beyond trends in the labor market, demographic change related to the aging of the Baby Boomers also explains part of the increase in nontraditional, older students. As a larger cohort, even if this group were to attend college at the same rates as older students in the past, the proportion of college students who are older would have increased. However, it is also clear that larger percentages of older workers are returning to higher education than ever before. Pent up demand may also explain increased enrollments among older workers of women and racial minorities. Some suggest that opportunities for college attendance were more limited when these groups were of traditional college-age, but as norms have changed, these workers are now better able to access postsecondary training (Goldin, Katz, and Kuziemko, 2006). Changes in social policies such as welfare may also explain some of the fluctuation in trends.

However, the financial concerns of nontraditional students are a serious concern. Research suggests that the aid system, originally designed to meet the needs of traditional-age college students, does a poor job addressing the circumstances of older, nontraditional students. Particularly with such a diverse population in terms of background, situations, and goals, a key issue is whether one set of financial aid policies can meet all their needs? The following sections detail how the financial aid system currently works and the ways it does and does not address the

needs of nontraditional students. However, first the rest of this section gives additional background on the characteristics and enrollment patterns of nontraditional students.

Defining the "Nontraditional" Student

While age captures much of what is considered to define a nontraditional student, the definition has become much more nuanced with the growth of such a diverse population. In contrast to "nontraditional" students, researchers and practitioners often refer to "traditional" students as those who earn a regular high school diploma, enroll in college full-time immediately after graduation, depend on their parents for financial support, and either does not work during the school year or only works part-time. Therefore, the definition of nontraditional has become much more inclusive of students who do not fit the traditional mold. Using a much broader definition, Choy (2002) defines a nontraditional undergraduate as meet any of the following criteria:

- Delays enrollment after high school
- Attends part-time
- Works full-time while enrolled
- Considered financially independent
- Dependents other than a spouse
- Does not have a regular high school diploma (i.e., a GED or other certificate)
- Displaced workers/Unemployed
- Welfare recipients
- Immigrants

By her calculations, nearly three-fourths of undergraduates are nontraditional. This would include working adults, parents, welfare recipients, immigrants, displaced workers and the unemployed, and single, financially-independent students.

In terms of financial aid, this last group of financially-independent students is the most relevant. Independent students are treated differently in the calculation of need for government aid sources. Students can qualify for this designation in one of several ways. First, students age 24 or above are automatically consider independent. However, if the student is married, has dependents, or is a veteran, they also qualify as independent. Students whose parents are deceased or were wards of the court before the age of 18 are also automatically considered independent.

According to data from the National Center of Education Statistics, in 2002-03, approximately 68.5 million people took formal courses or training that was not part of a traditional degree, certificate, or apprenticeship program for reasons related to their job or career (O'Donnell 2005). These courses include seminars, training sessions, or workshops offered by businesses, unions, and government agencies, as well as classes taken at colleges or universities that were not part of a degree program. Most (90 percent) of these workers did so to maintain or improve skills they already had. Employers often required or recommended participation in the courses among those who were already employed. A fifth did so to secure a pay raise or promotion (DeBell and Mulligan, 2006). By the end of the decade, Voorhees and Lingenfelter (2003) estimate that more than half of American adults will take advantage of formal learning opportunities.

II. A DESCRIPTION OF AID RESOURCES FOR NONTRADITIONAL STUDENTS

Need Analysis and the Nontraditional Student

The financial aid process begins with the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA). The FAFSA collects information on family income and assets in order to determine the Expected Family Contribution (EFC), the amount the federal government determines a family is estimated to be able to contribute to higher education expenses. Other information that affects this calculation is the size of the family, the number of family members in college, and the age of the older head of household, as well as information on the student's earnings and assets. To calculate a student's financial need, the government subtracts the EFC from the total cost of attendance.¹ A student's financial need, in combination with his or her EFC, determines whether he or she is eligible for certain grants and loans. For example, students who have a low EFC and financial need are eligible for federal need-based aid, like a Pell Grant. While FAFSA is the federal application, it is also used by most states and institutions likely to enroll nontraditional students.

Being an independent (i.e. nontraditional) student affects the aid calculation in one important way. Because independent students may have their own dependents and are not expected to rely on parental contributions, the federal system does not expect them to contribute as much as the families of dependent students. Therefore, their EFCs tend to be lower. However, the amount an independent student is expected to contribute can be substantial and vary substantially with only small changes in income. A single adult with two children who made an income at the poverty threshold (\$16,242) would not be expected to contribute anything to their postsecondary training. However, at 150 percent of the poverty level (\$24,363), the EFC would be \$401, and at 200 percent of the poverty level (\$32,484), the amount would be \$2,116.² Meanwhile, a married adult with two children who made an income at 150 percent of the poverty level (\$30,666) would be expected to contribute \$718; the amount would be \$2,877 at 200 percent of the poverty level (\$40,888). Therefore, as also noted by Choitz and Widom (2003), although there is not much difference between 150 and 200 percent of the federal poverty line, the difference in EFC can be large.

There are several major criticisms of the way federal need analysis is applied to nontraditional student. Foremost is that the system was designed with a traditional, dependent student in mind. Therefore, it is assumed that the earnings of the potential student are relatively minor (i.e. the result of a summer job) and should be highly taxed to cover college expenses. Moreover, the calculation assumes that the parents' income, the main source of support for the child, will continue even while the student is in college and should be used to help cover expenses. In contrast, independent students do not have other major sources of support to rely upon. Most nontraditional students are formally engaged in the labor market when applying for financial aid, and while the government assumes this income level will remain the same even after college enrollment, the nontraditional student is actually likely to experience a reduction in earnings while pursuing a degree. Therefore, assumptions about the amount of earnings available to them while in school are incorrect. As an extension of this, the EFC for many

¹ Total cost of attendance, which is prorated based on the student's enrollment intensity (whether they attend full- or part-time), includes tuition, fees, room and board, and other costs at the institution the student attends.

² Source: <http://www.finaid.org/calculators/faefc.phtml>. The calculations assume the person is a resident of Illinois and is 30 years old. A single adult with one child who made an income at the poverty threshold (\$13,896) also would not be expected to contribute anything to their postsecondary training. However, at 150 percent of the poverty level (\$20,844), the EFC would be \$931, and at 200 percent of the poverty level (\$27,792), the amount would be \$1,974.

nontraditional students may be too high as they are penalized for their earnings the year before starting school.

Beyond the EFC and need calculation, independency is not a major consideration in the award of financial aid. However, other criteria can disproportionately reduce aid eligibility for nontraditional students. For example, some programs require students to be enrolled at least part-time, or even full-time. Due to the fact that nontraditional students often attend part-time or less-than-part-time, this excludes them from qualifying for some aid. Nontraditional students are also less likely to be enrolled in a degree program rather than pursuing a particular skill without the goal of completing a particular certificate or other credential. They are therefore excluded from programs requiring students to be enrolled in a degree program. Finally, some programs require a regular high school diploma while many nontraditional students instead have a GED or other certificate (Bosworth and Choitz, 2002). The next section describes several of the major financial aid programs and how they apply to nontraditional students.

Federal Financial Aid Programs and Nontraditional Students

The Pell Grant is the largest U.S. need-based aid program and serves as the foundation for other aid. This means that if students are eligible, the Pell Grant is awarded first. The majority of Pell recipients come from families with incomes in the lowest economic quartile; families earning between \$30,000 and \$40,000 begin to be phased out of Pell eligibility. The Pell Grant has been a particularly important program for nontraditional students. In 2006-07, 59 percent of Pell Grants went to independent students (College Board, 2007). However, students are required to attend at least part-time to receive a Pell Grant, and this excludes many working adults. According to analysis by Futureworks, few working parents who had an income less than 200 percent of the federal poverty level received a Pell Grant (Bosworth and Choitz, 2004). Additionally, students must be enrolled in an institution eligible for federal Title IV funds in order to receive aid like the Pell Grant. Students with financial need may also be eligible for Federal Work Study funds, which subsidize the wages of the students employed in on-campus jobs. However, these awards rarely go to nontraditional students.

Students with higher EFCs usually will not qualify for Pell Grants or Work Study funds, but they are eligible for government loan programs. The federal government sponsors several major loan programs. The largest is the Federal Stafford Loan Program, which offers subsidized and unsubsidized loans. Interest on subsidized loans, available only to needy students as determined by the FAFSA, is paid by the government while the student is in college. During their first year of undergraduate education, students may receive up to \$3,500; the limit increases in subsequent years and is higher for independent students. However, many community colleges, a common destination for nontraditional students, do not participate in the federal loan program due to penalties that would be incurred if their students had high default rates. The Perkins Loan Program is another federal program, and it is distributed by campuses on the basis of financial need. Finally, the Federal PLUS Loan Program (Parent Loan for Undergraduate Students) is available to the parents of dependent college students and independent students themselves. PLUS loans have no annual or aggregate limits, except that one may not borrow more than the cost of attendance, net other financial aid. All of the federal loan programs require repayment after the student stops attending college, regardless of whether or not he or she has completed a degree.

In addition to grant, loan, and work-study programs, the federal government offers aid through the tax code. The Hope and Lifetime Learning Tax Credits provide a benefit to families who pay tuition expenses and incur tax liability (Long, 2004). Relative to the Pell Grant, the higher education tax credits maintain a much higher level of income eligibility, phasing out at an adjusted gross income of \$90,000 to \$110,000 for joint filers, or \$45,000 to \$55,000 for single filers (IRS, 2006). The Lifetime Learning Tax Credit (LLTC) is particularly relevant for nontraditional students. It was designed for adults in their later years of postsecondary study and those returning to school to upgrade their skills or prepare for a new career. The student does not need to be enrolled in a particular degree program. The LLTC targets postsecondary study after the first two years of college and is equal to 20 percent of tuition expenditures up to a tax credit of \$2,000. However, the tax credits are not refundable, and therefore, lower-income workers without tax liability are not eligible for a benefit. Additionally, the more generous Hope Tax Credit requires at least part-time attendance and was designed to meet the needs of more traditional-age students while in their first two years of college.

There are also a number of tax benefits for families who save for college, such as 529 Plans and Coverdell Savings Accounts. The government does not tax investment gains in these accounts if they are used to pay for tuition. Finally, there are also several federal programs that indirectly target nontraditional students. Among them are Veteran's and Military benefits and job training programs, such as the Workforce Investment Act (WIA). The WIA is the primary national workforce development program, and it focuses on employment services and basic training for unemployed. While much of the funding is targeted for job search assistance for unemployed adults, there is also a little support to the training of current workers (Bosworth and Choitz, 2004).

State Financial Aid Programs and Nontraditional Students

Most state financial aid programs have eligibility requirements similar to those of federal programs. This in turn often makes them less accessible to nontraditional students for the reasons mentioned above: EFC cutoffs and enrollment requirements such as attending at least part-time and in a particular educational program. Additionally, many state programs are explicitly designed for students who recently graduated from high school meaning that they favor traditional students. However, according to Choitz and Widom (2003), approximately 15 have programs or policies that provide special funding to students who are enrolled less-than-part-time or do not exclude students at any enrollment intensity level (including less than half time). According to their survey, for example, Illinois and Minnesota allow less-than-half-time students to participate in the state's main need-based student grant program. Georgia, Ohio, Oregon, Washington, and West Virginia also have tuition-assistance programs for less-than-half-time students. Other states, such as Louisiana allow the use of TANF dollars for postsecondary training.

Golonka and Matus-Grossman (2001) also note examples of innovative state models. California used multiple aid sources to provide comprehensive financial support for students. Through the state's "75/25" Work-Study program, they combined state work-study funds for TANF students with employer and college contributions. Employers must pay at least 25 percent of students' off-campus work-study wages while colleges pay the rest. The work-study earnings are excluded from income when calculating TANF eligibility. Unfortunately, while Food Stamps, Medicaid, and other federal programs do not count federal work-study income in

determining eligibility, the same is not true for this state-created work-study program. Washington is an example of state that developed a program for working parents interested in job training. The Work-Based Learning Tuition Assistance Program gives aid to students who have a child and are TANF-eligible or have family income at or below 175 percent of poverty. The aid can support in any job-related vocational training or continuing education program.

The Role of Employers in Supporting the Training of Working Adults

Many question if employers have incentives to invest in the training of their workers. Economic theory suggest that firms will not bear the costs of general training because of the threat of losing the worker without reaping the benefits of the human capital investment (Becker, 1964). However, in many cases, the firms catering to working adults with little education do provide free skills training (Autor, 2003; Autor, Levy, and Murnane, 1999). Stokes (2006), citing *Training* magazine, notes American corporations spent more than \$51 billion on training in 2004. According to other estimates, seven out of ten businesses provide some form of formal employee training and between 35 and 65 percent of all workers participate (Lerman, McKernan, and Riegg, 1999). While the authors find training to be more common among worker with higher earning and levels of education, the training appears to more intensive for younger, part-time, and less-experienced workers.

While the majority went to the salaries of internal training staff, more than \$13 billion was devoted to purchasing services from third-party providers (Stokes, 2006). This includes commercial training companies, government agencies, and professional associations. Colleges and universities had only a five-percent share of these expenditures, according to estimates from Eduventures. Stokes suggests these institutions could therefore do much more to support older students by taking on this mission more seriously.

III. RESEARCH ON AID AND NONTRADITIONAL STUDENTS

Does the Aid System serve the Needs of Nontraditional Students? Unmet Financial Need

A key question about the current financial aid system is how well it meets the needs of nontraditional students. Numerous studies point to the significant unmet financial need traditional students face after accounting for all sources of government and institutional financial aid (ACSFA, 2001; ACSFA, 2002). Similar patterns are found for nontraditional, independent students. The total amount of unmet need was slightly lower on average for independent students (\$4,800) in comparison to dependent students (\$5,900) (NCES, 2006). However, the incidence of unmet need was higher among nontraditional, older students. After all forms of financial aid, 54.4 percent of independent students still had financial need, in comparison to 45.6 percent of dependent students.

To summarize, in comparison to their younger counterparts, nontraditional students appear to face as significant or higher financial hurdles to attending college. This develops from several of the design elements of the aid system and programs. As noted above, the EFC calculation assumes that students will continue to make the same income while attending college as they did during the year before. This income is then taxed at a very high rate with the assumption that a large proportion can be applied to the costs of college. Additionally, by attending part-time or less-than-part-time and not enrolling in a particular educational program,

independent students are often not eligible for financial aid. As noted by NCES (2006), the type of institution attended can also influence the aid and need calculations due to differences in the average cost of attendance. The need for aid is highest at private for-profit and not-for-profit colleges and universities.

The differences between dependent and independent students are also reflected in how aid is distributed among students. Though a similar percentage of dependent and independent students received some kind of grant aid in 2003-04 (50.4 and 51.0 percent, respectively), the average amount differed substantially. Dependent students averaged \$5,200 in grants while independent students received \$2,900 on average. Once controlling for enrollment intensity by limiting the sample to full-time/full-year undergraduates, the differences are not as large but still evident (\$6,100 versus \$4,600 for dependent and independent students, respectively) (NCES, 2006).

It is important to note that these numbers reflect the best case scenario in terms of unmet need. They are calculated based on those who actually make it into higher education and do not capture the unmet needs of adults who elected not to enroll in postsecondary study. Moreover, the unmet needs of older students are also likely understated due to their less intense enrollment patterns, which reduce the costs they face. The implications of this unmet need are significant in terms of participation. According to research by Eduventures, nearly a quarter of prospective adult learners who choose not to enroll cite costs as an obstacle (Stokes, 2006).

The Impact of Financial Aid on Older Students

While significant unmet need remains a major issue for independents, research suggests that nontraditional students do respond to financial aid policy. In fact, they appear to be more responsive than younger, dependent students. One study demonstrates this focusing on the Pell Grant. Seftor and Turner (2002) examine how the introduction of the Pell Grant impacted enrollment among students age 22 to 35. They compared the trends for these students before and after the 1972 introduction of the program using data from the October Current Population Survey. They conclude that the introduction of the Pell Grant increased the probability of attending college by 1.5 percentage points for men and 1.3 percentage points for women. Given mean enrollment rates at the time, this translates into 16 percent relative growth for men and 40 percent growth for women. In contrast, other work has found that Pell had little impact on attendance on traditional-age students, except for perhaps at community colleges (Hansen, 1983; Kane, 1995).

Given the family situations of nontraditional students, it may be the case that more than just grants applied to tuition could help them. Simmons and Turner (2004) instead focus on aid to help cover childcare costs. They hypothesize that the need to pay for childcare could impede participation in postsecondary training. To test this theory, they examine what happened when in 1988-89, up to \$1,000 in childcare costs were allowed in the calculations used to determine Pell Grant amounts. Using the 1979 National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, they find the policy change resulted in increasing the college enrollment rate of women with children. However, they did not find gain in educational attainment corresponding to the higher enrollment rates.

There are several reasons that might explain the greater responsiveness of older, nontraditional students to financial aid policy. First, as noted above, this group likely faces greater credit constraints than younger students due to the fact that their families are less likely to

contribution to their educations. Moreover, they may have dependents of their own and so cannot forego earnings while in school. Therefore, any amount of aid might make a large difference in their decisions. Also, because older workers have more experience with processes such as tax and government support forms, they may be more adept and less daunted by complex aid application processes (Seftor and Turner, 2002). Older students are also more likely to choose a convenient, local college, such as a community college, and so they do not have to cover major transition costs such as moving expenditures; tuition support is the main thing they need to attend college. Finally, the types of colleges many nontraditional students attend are unlikely to give aid or to respond to government policy by raising their prices. Therefore, government support may be more apt to have a substantial impact on the participation of independent rather than dependent students.

IV. SUPPORTING OLDER WORKERS: REFORMING COLLEGE FINANCIAL AID FOR THE FUTURE

There are many things that the government and other institutions could do to improve the financial support of older workers seeking postsecondary training. As noted above, many programs have been designed with the traditional-age, dependent student in mind, but in order to help older workers, aid programs need to take into account the enrollment patterns more common among older, nontraditional students. In terms of federal financial aid, Bosworth and Choitz (2002) suggest changing the eligibility criteria for aid programs to include students who attend less-than-half-time and those in short-term programs that do not necessarily result in a formal degree or certificate.³ New financing instruments could also be especially beneficial for older workers. In his Issue Paper for the Secretary of Education's Commission on the Future of Higher Education, Stokes (2006) supports programs such as Lifelong Learning Accounts and Career Advancement Accounts.

The interaction with other social programs is another thing to consider in aid reform. Bosworth and Choitz (2002) encourage policymakers to consider how social programs, such as Food Stamps and Medicare, interact with government financial aid programs so that one benefit does not adversely affect another. Voorhees and Lingenfelter (2003) note that states could also expand their use of TANF dollars, which often support only short-term training. Instead, they could "direct their flexible maintenance of effort funds to finance training that is longer than the 12 months designated by the federal standard. This would require collaboration between state agencies involved in higher education and those involved with implementing federal regulations" (p. 10).

There is also greater role that colleges and universities could take to enable the enrollment of older workers in postsecondary institutions. By providing more local, accessible options with flexible schedules and programs would enable more participation among nontraditional students. Online options may also be a way to expand access. There is also a need for more career-oriented programs tied to particular industries. Voorhees and Lingenfelter (2003) highlight the idea that community colleges could create employment-related programs that could be supported by the Workforce Investment Act's (WIA) One-Stop centers. These

³ On the other hand, the likelihood of successfully completing an educational program increases with enrollment intensity, and so it is important for the government to provide enough aid to enable students to take larger course loads and complete programs faster.

might not be as long as traditional offerings but could be more comprehensive than the brief programs typically supported through WIA.

Beyond academic programs, colleges and universities could do more to address the particular needs of older workers. This includes providing support for child care, both in terms of finances and capacity. As suggested by Simmons and Turner (2004), subsidies for child care could significantly impact the participation of nontraditional students. The government could help with these types of initiatives by providing grants to colleges that create such programs to support older workers. In the past, Congress has supported the federal program Child Care Access Means Parents in Schools (Yachnin, 2001).

Colleges and employers could also increase their level of partnership to support the postsecondary educations of older workers. Beyond increasing the general amount of support, changing the timing of tuition collection and employer support could also have important benefits for nontraditional students. Currently, institutions collect tuition payments prior to enrollment, but employers often will not reimburse employees until after the course is satisfactorily completed. By introducing more flexible reimbursement policies, along with more accommodating institutional collection policies regarding tuition, could increase participation in such programs (Voorhees and Lingenfelter, 2003).

REFERENCES

- Acs, Gregory, Katherin Ross Phillips, and Daniel McKenzie. (2000) *On the Bottom Rung: A Profile of Americans in Low-Income Working Families*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute, October.
- ACSFA. (2001) *Access Denied: Restoring the Nation's Commitment to Equal Educational Opportunity*. Washington, DC: Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance.
- ACSFA. (2002) *Empty Promises: The Myth of College Access in America*. Washington, DC: Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance.
- Autor, David. (2003) "Why Do Temporary Help Firms Provide Free General Skills Training?" *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116 (4).
- Autor, David H., Frank Levy, and Richard J. Murnane. (1999) "Skills Training in the Temporary Help Sector: Employer Motivations and Worker Impacts. A Report to the Department of Labor Education and Training Administration."
- Becker, Gary. (1964) *Human Capital*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bosworth, B., & Choitz, V. (2002). *Held Back: How Student Aid Programs fail Working Adults*. Belmont, MA: FutureWorks.
- Bosworth, Brian and Victoria Choitz. (2004) *Title X: A New Federal-State Partnership in Higher Education for Working Adults in the 21st Century*. Futureworks, January.
- Carnevale, Anthony P. and Donna M. Desrochers. (1999) *Getting Down to Business: Matching Welfare Recipients' Skills to Jobs That Train*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Choitz, Victoria and Rebecca Widom. (2003) *Money Matters: How Financial Aid Affects Nontraditional Students in Community Colleges*. MDRC, July.
- Choy, Susan (2002) "Nontraditional Undergraduates." Findings from the *Condition of Education 2002*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, National Center of Education Statistics.
- College Board. (2007) *Trends in Student Aid*. Washington, DC: The College Board.
- Condition on Education (2007) *Participation in Adult Education*. Washington, DC: Department of Education, National Center of Education Statistics.
- Creighton, S. and L. Hudson. (2002). *Participation Trends and Patterns in Adult Education: 1991-1999* (NCES 2002-119). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- DeBell, Matthew and Gail Mulligan. (2006) "Reasons for Adults' Participation in Work-Related Courses, 2002–03." *Education Statistics Quarterly*, vol. 7, issues 1 and 2.
- Goldin, Claudia, Lawrence F. Katz, and Ilyana Kuziemko. (2006) "The Homecoming of American College Women: The Reversal of the College Gender Gap." Harvard University mimeo.
- Golonka, Susan and Lisa Matus-Grossman (2001) *Opening Doors: Expanding Educational Opportunities for Low-Income Workers*. Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) and National Governors Association Center for Best Practices.
- Hansen, W. Lee. (1983) "Impact of Student Financial Aid on Access." In *The Crisis in Higher Education*, ed. Joseph Fromkin. New York: Academy of Sciences, pp. 84-96.
- Internal Revenue Service. (2006) *Tax Benefits for Education (Publication 970)*. Washington, DC: Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service.
- Jacobson, Louis, Robert J. LaLonde, and Daniel Sullivan. (2005) "The Impact of Community College Retraining on Older Displaced Workers: Should We Teach Old Dogs New Tricks?" *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 58(3): 398-415.

- Kane, Thomas J. (1995) "Rising Public College Tuition and College Entry: How Well do Public Subsidies Promote Access to College?" NBER Working Paper 5164.
- Leigh, Duane and Andrew Gill. (1997) "Labor Market Returns to Community Colleges." *Journal of Human Resources*, 32(2): pp. 334-53.
- Lerman, Robert, Signe-Mary McKernan, and Stephanie Riegg. (1999) *Employer-Provided Training and Public Policy*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. This paper was presented at America's Workforce Network Research Conference, June 27, 2001, Washington, DC.
- NCES. (2006) Student Financing of Undergraduate Education: 2003–04, With a Special Analysis of the Net Price of Attendance and Federal Education Tax Benefits (publication NCES 2006186). Washington, DC: Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- O'Donnell, K. (2005). *Tabular Summary of Adult Education for Work-Related Reasons: 2002-2003* (NCES 2005-044). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Seftor, Neil S and Sarah E. Turner (2002) "Back to School: Federal Student Aid Policy and Adult College Enrollment." *Journal of Human Resources*. Vol. 37 (2). p 336-52.
- Simmons, Sarah and Sarah E. Turner (2004) "Taking Classes and Taking Care of the Kids: Do Childcare benefits increase educational attainment." Unpublished manuscript.
- Stokes, Peter J. (2006) "Hidden in Plain Sight: Adult Learners Forge a New Tradition in Higher Education." Issue paper for The Secretary of Education's Commission on the Future of Higher Education.
- U.S. Departments of Commerce, Education, and Labor, the National Institute for Literacy, and the Small Business Administration. (1999). *21st Century Skills for 21st Century Jobs*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Voorhees, Richard and Paul Lingenfelter. (2003). *Adult learners and state policy*. Denver, CO: SHEEO and CAEL, February.
- Yachnin, Jennifer. (2001) "Congress Puts More Money Into Aid for Child-Care Centers on Campuses." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Government and Politics Section, pp. A22, February 2