

A Report on the Feasibility of Providing Off-Campus Work-Study Employment

September 2016

This page has been left blank intentionally.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board



Robert "Bobby" Jenkins Jr., CHAIR
Stuart W. Stedman, VICE CHAIR
David D. Teuscher, MD, SECRETARY TO THE BOARD
Arcilia C. Acosta
S. Javaid Anwar
Fred Farias III, OD
Ricky A. Raven
Janelle Shepard
John T. Steen Jr.
Haley E.R. DeLaGarza, STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE

Austin
Houston
Beaumont
Dallas
Midland
McAllen
Sugarland
Weatherford
San Antonio
Houston

Raymund A. Paredes, COMMISSIONER OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Agency Mission

The mission of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board is to provide leadership and coordination for the Texas higher education system and to promote access, affordability, quality, success, and cost efficiency through 60x30TX, resulting in a globally competitive workforce that positions Texas as an international leader.

Agency Vision

The THECB will be recognized as an international leader in developing and implementing innovative higher education policy to accomplish our mission.

Agency Philosophy

The THECB will promote access to and success in quality higher education across the state with the conviction that access and success without quality is mediocrity and that quality without access and success is unacceptable.

The Coordinating Board's core values are:

Accountability: We hold ourselves responsible for our actions and welcome every opportunity to educate stakeholders about our policies, decisions, and aspirations.

Efficiency: We accomplish our work using resources in the most effective manner.

Collaboration: We develop partnerships that result in student success and a highly qualified, globally competent workforce.

Excellence: We strive for excellence in all our endeavors.

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age or disability in employment or the provision of services.

Please cite this report as follows:

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. (2016). A Report on the Feasibility of Providing Off-Campus Work-Study Employment. Austin, TX.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Legislative Directive	1
Methods	2
Historical Background	2
Best Practices in Off-Campus Work-Study	5
State-Sponsored Work-Study Programs	5
Illinois Cooperative Work-Study Program	6
Promising Practices	8
Effective Industries for Off-Campus Work-Study	9
Barriers to Effective Off-Campus Work-Study	9
Impact of SB 1750	11
Campus Engagement vs. Career Aspiration	11
Private Sector Work-Study Pilot Program	12
Feasibility and Recommendations	15
Refine Eligible Employment in the Standard TX WS Program	15
Expand the Work-Study Student Mentorship Program	15
Create a Private Sector Work-Study Program Pilot	15
Increase Work-Study Funding	16
Appendix A: History of TX WS Funding by Institution	18
Appendix B: Text of Senate Bill, 84th Texas Legislature	21
Appendix C: Text of Senate Bill 1750, 84th Texas Legislature	22
Appendix D: References	24
 Table 1. Student and employer criteria for participation in the TX WS Program.	3
Table 2. History of Texas Work-Study Program funding.....	4
Table 3. State-sponsored work-study programs.	5
Table 4. Brief summary of state-sponsored work-study programs.	7

Executive Summary

Senate Bill (SB) 947 from the 84th Legislative Session mandated “a study and report by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board on the feasibility of providing off-campus employment positions through the Texas College Work-Study [TX WS] program.”

Unfortunately, there is dearth of research on work-study programs to inform SB 947.

Advocates of cooperative education describe it as beneficial for students. It helps students with motivation, career clarity, enhanced employability, and vocational maturity. However, as the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA) points out, there is little research that ties work-study programs, specifically, to student outcomes in higher education or in the workforce (NASFAA, 2016a).

In order to provide a perspective on the feasibility of off-campus employment positions through the TX WS program, this report provides the information required in SB 947:

- 1) Best practices for developing partnerships with employers to provide off-campus employment positions through the work-study program, including best practices learned from other apprenticeship, internship, or mentorship programs in this state or from similar programs in other states;
- 2) Any careers or industries that are well-suited for providing off-campus employment positions through the work-study program;
- 3) Current barriers that public junior colleges face in developing partnerships with employers to provide off-campus employment positions through the work-study program, including any staffing needs or limitations on the outreach capabilities of those colleges; and
- 4) Any public junior colleges that demonstrate strong potential for successful participation in a pilot program to develop partnerships with employers to provide off-campus employment positions through the work-study program.

Coordinating Board staff employed numerous methods to respond to the directives in SB 947. The study included a scan of internal sources, including an analysis of current Texas work-study policy and practice, an analysis of data in the *Academic Course Guide Manual* and the *Workforce Education Course Manuals*, and a review of data on federal work-study program funding, accessed through a Freedom of Information Act request in 2015. Policies and practices in other states were reviewed, followed by interviews with representatives from five salient states. In addition, Texas institutions were surveyed to gain insight on local and best practices, and Texas employers were surveyed to learn their perspectives on off-campus work-study. A scan of current literature was also integral to this research.

The TX WS program was created in 1989 to provide “eligible, financially needy students with jobs, funded in part by the State of Texas, to enable those students to attend eligible institutions of higher education, public or private, in Texas (TEC Sec. 56.072).” The program is based on a cost-sharing model: state appropriations pay for a portion of student wages (75% for on-campus and non-profit employment, and 50% for private sector employment), while the employer pays for the remaining share of wages and all other employment related costs. The TX WS program is available to all public, private, or independent institutions (as defined by TEC Sec. 61.003), other than theological or religious seminaries.

The program has remained relatively unchanged since its inception, with two notable amendments prior to the 84th Legislative session. In 2005, the program was amended to add

the Work-Study Student Mentorship Program (TEC Sec. 56.079) to create partnerships between institutions of higher education and school districts or non-profit organizations, in order to provide a specific focus on mentoring “students at participating eligible institutions or high school students in participating school districts; or counseling high school students at [GO Centers](#) or similar high school-based recruiting centers designed to improve student access to higher education.” In 2009, the program was amended to require institutions to provide easily accessible on-line listings of work-study employment opportunities.

While colleges and universities in every state participate in the Federal Work-Study (FWS) Program, a much smaller number of these institutions have the opportunity to participate in a state-sponsored work-study program. According to data collected by the National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs (NASSGAP) in their annual survey, there are only fourteen states sponsoring work-study programs. The Public Policy Research Institute (PPRI) provided the following summary of the elements driving the development of off-campus employment opportunities in these five state-sponsored programs:

“The [state interview] contacts emphasized that the major impetus for implementing their programs is the strategic understanding that partnerships between local employers and higher education institutions is essential and desirable for the economy of the state and helps reduce overall loan dependency for students. The off-campus work-study programs help students achieve their full social potential and may result in many students remaining with employers after they graduate. The practical experience gained from such employment may help set work-study students apart from other applicants. These programs also help states leverage funds by requiring the employers to match a percentage of each student’s salary. This in turn helps states offer a greater number of needy students work-study opportunities. Employers, for their part, receive employees at a reduced cost. The reduction of loan dependency benefits all parties and contributes to rising levels of educational attainment statewide.” (PPRI, 2016a)

While the resources utilized in developing this feasibility study identified best practices in off-campus work-study opportunities, no particular careers or industries stood out above the rest as being particularly well-suited for an off-campus work-study program. There are also numerous barriers that must be considered when developing off-campus programs. Input from institutions, employers, and other state programs through surveys, interviews, and focus groups conducted by both PPRI and NASFAA provide insight into these challenges. Particular barriers identified were: lack of leadership commitment, administrative burden, heightened marketing efforts required, competing mandates and lack of local jobs, difficulty projecting financial expenditures, and preventing worker displacement.

The best practices and barriers identified through the research conducted by both PPRI and NASFAA suggest that off-campus work-study programs are feasible, though complicated, endeavors. Since off-campus programs are not easily implemented, the Coordinating Board provides three recommendations for modification to the TX WS program which, in combination with increased appropriations, support the expansion of off-campus opportunities and tie the state’s work-study programs to the development of marketable skills.

- Refine eligible employment in the standard Texas College Work-Study Program
- Expand the Work-Study Student Mentorship Program
- Create a private sector work-study program pilot

Introduction

Senate Bill (SB) 947 from the 84th Legislative Session mandated “a study and report by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board on the feasibility of providing off-campus employment positions through the Texas College Work-Study program.” Shortly thereafter, *60x30TX*, the state’s higher education strategy for 2015-2030, was approved by the members of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. With goals focused on educational attainment, completion, marketable skills, and student debt, *60x30TX* is poised to benefit from expanded work-study opportunities. For example, work-study funding provides financial aid to help support student attainment and completion of postsecondary credentials. Also, work-study employees gain marketable skills through the work experience. In addition, mentorship (a particular sub-set of the state’s work-study program) helps bring students into the postsecondary educational pipeline. The state’s economy also benefits from the work-study program through the addition of student employees to the workforce.

Unfortunately, there is dearth of research on work-study programs to inform SB 947. In June 2016, the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA) conducted extensive [research on work-study programs](#) that included a literature review and policy scan, a national survey (n=1,885), and detailed focus groups (n=88). The culmination of this research led to national report with 17 recommendations, four of which specifically addressed areas of research needed to expand knowledge and improve work-study programs. While focused specifically on the Federal Work-Study (FWS) Program, these recommendations apply to state-sponsored programs, as well: (1) conduct further empirical research on FWS practices, (2) conduct more research on the real-life experiences of FWS students, (3) examine the types of jobs performed by FWS students and the associated outcomes, and (4) assess the effects of FWS awarded with different combinations of student aid (NASFAA, 2016a).

Advocates of cooperative education describe it as beneficial for students. It helps students with motivation, career clarity, enhanced employability, and vocational maturity. However, as NASFAA points out (NASFAA, 2016c), there is little research that ties work-study programs, specifically, to student outcomes in higher education or in the workforce. Some research ties working on campus to student engagement (Pike, Kuh, and Massa-McKinley, 2008), and, in 2009, a team of researchers conducted a comprehensive review of the extant research on how student financial aid affects undergraduate student persistence and graduation (Hossler et al., 2009). Hossler et al. found that “among the highly relevant, high-quality studies, 14 find the effects of college work-study to be either positive or nonsignificant and, thus, these studies interpret college work-study as enhancing the odds of recipients’ persistence. In some examples, work-study has the largest effect – or one of the largest effects – compared with any of the financial aid variables (p.405).” In another analysis using a national database, Villarreal (2012) found that work-study participation increased the probability of persisting to completion by approximately five percent, holding all other known characteristics constant. At the same time, it is important to note that several studies have identified that working over 20-25 hours can have a negative impact on grades and persistence; too many work hours can have a negative effect on students’ academic success (Astin, 1975; Pike, Kuh, & Massa-McKinley, 2008).

Legislative Directive

In order to provide a perspective on the feasibility of off-campus employment positions through the Texas College Work-Study program, this report provides the information required in SB 947:

- 1) Best practices for developing partnerships with employers to provide off-campus employment positions through the work-study program, including best practices learned from other apprenticeship, internship, or mentorship programs in this state or from similar programs in other states;
- 2) Any careers or industries that are well-suited for providing off-campus employment positions through the work-study program;
- 3) Current barriers that public junior colleges face in developing partnerships with employers to provide off-campus employment positions through the work-study program, including any staffing needs or limitations on the outreach capabilities of those colleges; and
- 4) Any public junior colleges that demonstrate strong potential for successful participation in a pilot program to develop partnerships with employers to provide off-campus employment positions through the work-study program.

In addition, this report begins with the historical background of the program to provide context for SB 947. This report will conclude with the agency's recommendations on how the state could further improve the Texas work-study program in light of this study.

Methods

Coordinating Board staff employed numerous methods to respond to the directives in SB 947. The study included a scan of internal sources, including an analysis of current Texas work-study policy and practice, an analysis of data in the *Academic Course Guide Manual* and the *Workforce Education Course Manuals*, and a review of data on federal work-study program funding, accessed through a Freedom of Information Act request in 2015. Policies and practices in other states were reviewed, followed by interviews with representatives from five salient states. In addition, Texas institutions were surveyed to gain insight on local and best practices, and Texas employers were surveyed to learn their perspectives on off-campus work-study. A scan of current literature was also integral to this research.

Historical Background

The Cooperative Education & Internship Association cites that work-study programs are grounded in [cooperative education](#), a structured method of combining classroom-based education with practical work experience (Cooperative Education & Internship Association, Nd). Cooperative education has a 200 year history in practice internationally, and a 112 year history in the U.S., with beginnings in technical education (engineering and architecture). A seminal study in 1961, commissioned by the Ford and Edison Foundations, led to the proliferation of cooperative education programs across the U.S. According to Campus Compact, this study also led to the inclusion of work-study programs in the [Economic Opportunity Act of 1964](#) (Campus Compact, Nd). The goal of the work-study program was to, "stimulate and promote the part-time employment of students in institutions of higher education who are from low-income families and are in need of the earnings from such employment to pursue courses of study at such institutions."

The Texas College Work-Study (TX WS) program was created in 1989 with the purpose of providing "eligible, financially needy students with jobs, funded in part by the State of Texas, to enable those students to attend eligible institutions of higher education, public or private, in

Texas (TEC Sec. 56.072).” The program is based on a cost-sharing model, whereby state appropriations pay for a portion of student wages (75% for on-campus and non-profit employment, and 50% for private sector employment), while the employer pays for the remaining share of wages and all other employment related costs. The TX WS program is available to all public, private, or independent institutions (as defined by TEC Sec. 61.003), other than theological or religious seminaries.

The program has remained relatively unchanged since its inception, with two notable amendments prior to the 84th Legislative session. In 2005, the program was amended to add the Work-Study Student Mentorship Program (TEC Sec. 56.079) to create partnerships between institutions of higher education and school districts or non-profit organizations, in order to provide a specific focus on mentoring “students at participating eligible institutions or high school students in participating school districts; or counseling high school students at [GO Centers](#) or similar high school-based recruiting centers designed to improve student access to higher education.” In 2009, the program was amended to require institutions to provide easily accessible on-line listings of work-study employment opportunities. In order to participate in the TX WS program, students and employers must meet specific criteria outlined in Table 1.

In the most recent legislative session, two amendments were added to the TX WS program. First, SB 947 called for the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to study and report on the “feasibility of providing off-campus employment positions through the Texas college work-study program.” The study specifically called for the identification of best practices, well-suited careers or industries, current barriers, and potential pilot program participants. The study also focused special attention on the state’s community college system. The study, for which this report is created, is due by December 1, 2016.

Table 1. Student and employer criteria for participation in the TX WS Program.

Student Eligibility (TEC Sec. 56.075)⁵	Employer Eligibility (TEC Sec. 56.076)
Be a Texas resident as defined by coordinating board rules	Provide part-time employment to an eligible student in nonpartisan and nonsectarian activities
Be enrolled for at least one-half of a full course load and conform to an individual course of study in an eligible institution	Provide, insofar as is practicable, employment to an eligible student that is related to the student's academic interests
Establish financial need in accordance with Coordinating Board procedures and rules	Use TX WS program positions only to supplement and not to supplant positions normally filled by persons not eligible to participate in the work-study program
Comply with other requirements adopted by the Coordinating Board	Provide from sources other than Federal Work-Study program funds a percentage of an employed student's wages that is equal to the percentage of a student's wages that the employer would be required to provide to the student in that academic year under the Federal Work-Study program
	Provide from sources other than Federal Work-Study funds 100 percent of other employee benefits for the employed student

⁵ Students receiving athletic scholarships or who are enrolled in a seminary or other program leading to ordination or licensure to preach are not eligible to participate.

Second, Senate Bill (SB) 1750 required institutions participating in the TX WS program to “ensure that at least 20 percent but no more than 50 percent of the employment positions provided through the work-study program in an academic year are provided by employers eligible under this section who are providing employment located off-campus.” SB 1750 also mandates a biennial report indicating the total number of students employed through the TX WS program, broken down by on- vs. off-campus employment, and for-profit vs. non-profit employers. The requirement took effect for institutions in August 2016, with the start of the 2016-2017 academic year.

While the TX WS program allows for off-campus employment, the option has been largely unutilized by institutions, with no campuses exercising this option in the past several years. Similarly, in the Federal Work-Study Program, only 56 of 3,239 institutions (less than 2%) reported earnings at for-profit employers based on data reported on the Department of Education’s 2014-2015 Fiscal Operations Report and Application to Participate (FISAP). Only 32 of these institutions appear to have employed more than one or two students based on estimates from the total wages reported.

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board administers the TX WS program using funds specified in biennial appropriations, and SB 1750 did not change appropriations for TX WS. The fiscal analyses for this bill assumed it, “would not have a state fiscal impact,” and “that any costs for institutions of higher education to implement the provisions of the bill could be absorbed within current resources (Legislative Budget Board, 2015).” Table 2 provides a history of TX WS funding since the 2004-2005 award year, while Appendix A provides campus allocations for the TX WS Program for the past three years.

Table 2. History of Texas Work-Study Program funding.

Award Year	Appropriations (\$thousands)	Allocations (\$thousands)	Awards to Students (\$thousands)	Number of Recipients	Average Grant	Number of Participating Institutions
2004-05	\$4,420,097	\$4,408,605	\$6,283,070	5,606	\$1,121	120
2005-06	\$5,000,000	\$4,650,000	\$5,966,146	5,376	\$1,110	119
2006-07	\$5,000,000	\$4,649,999	\$6,472,634	5,505	\$1,176	119
2007-08	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$6,199,802	5,288	\$1,172	120
2008-09	\$7,500,000	\$7,488,792	\$6,232,089	4,937	\$1,262	119
2009-10	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	\$6,365,572	4,578	\$1,390	120
2010-11	\$7,500,000	\$7,000,000	\$9,348,999	5,751	\$1,626	123
2011-12	\$7,529,639	\$9,229,639	\$7,096,453	4,770	\$1,488	121
2012-13	\$7,529,639	\$7,500,000	\$5,926,922	4,053	\$1,462	119
2013-14	\$9,404,639	\$9,404,639	\$7,975,527	4,798	\$1,662	126
2014-15	\$9,404,639	\$9,404,637	\$8,628,560	5,089	\$1,696	131
2015-16	\$9,404,639	\$9,654,639	Data Has Not Yet Been Reported At This Time			
2016-17	\$9,404,639	\$9,404,585	Data Has Not Yet Been Reported At This Time			

Best Practices in Off-Campus Work-Study

The study must identify best practices for developing partnerships with employers to provide off-campus employment positions through the work-study program, including best practices learned from other apprenticeship, internship, or mentorship programs in this state or from similar programs in other states.

State-Sponsored Work-Study Programs

While colleges and universities in every state participate in the Federal Work-Study (FWS) Program, a much smaller number of these institutions have the opportunity to participate in a state-sponsored work-study program. According to the data collected by the National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs (NASSGAP) in their annual survey, there are only fourteen states sponsoring work-study programs (see Table 3).

Table 3. State-sponsored work-study programs.

State Name	Total Dollars Disbursed in FY 2014
Colorado	\$17,196,587
Florida	\$1,377,287
Idaho	\$1,185,999
Illinois*	n/a
Indiana	\$121,713
Iowa*	--
Kansas	\$972,534
Kentucky	\$394,211
Minnesota	\$14,164,757
Montana	\$863,001
Nevada	\$181,691
New Mexico	\$6,522,490
Pennsylvania***	\$9,281,009
Texas	\$7,975,527
Washington	\$12,182,109

* Figures for Illinois were unavailable

** Iowa's program has not been funded since FY 2009

*** Combined funding for Pennsylvania's three state-sponsored work-study programs

The federal and state work-study programs each have their own unique characteristics, but there are significant similarities across the programs. In their spring 2014 Policy Brief, the Working Poor Families Project summarized key elements that are shared between most federal and state programs (Altstadt, 2014):

- Funds allocated directly to universities and colleges;
- Eligibility is based on a student demonstrating financial need;
- Earnings are limited to a student's unmet financial need;
- Work-study earnings do not impact a student's eligibility for financial aid in future years;
- Work can be on- or off-campus, at public, non-profit, or for-profit employers [though it may not involve partisan or sectarian activities];
- Work hours should not interfere with classes scheduled;
- Employers must pay a matching share of the wages; and
- Academic credit is allowed under certain circumstances.

In order to gain a broader understanding of state-sponsored work-study programs, the Coordinating Board engaged the services of the Public Policy Research Institute (PPRI) at Texas A&M University. PPRI provided an analysis and overview of the similarities and differences between state programs, with a specific focus on identifying best practices in private sector work-study placements. In conducting a literature review of the fourteen states with state-sponsored work-study programs, PPRI identified six states with prominent programs in the private sector: Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and Washington. These states were targeted for more in-depth research, including phone interviews with state officials responsible for administering the programs. Five of the six states participated in the interview process, with Colorado declining because their program is fully decentralized with no direct state oversight.

In their March 2016 report, PPRI provided the following summary of the elements driving the development of off-campus employment opportunities in these five state-sponsored programs:

"The [state interview] contacts emphasized that the major impetus for implementing their programs is the strategic understanding that partnerships between local employers and higher education institutions is essential and desirable for the economy of the state and helps reduce overall loan dependency for students. The off-campus work-study programs help students achieve their full social potential and may result in many students remaining with employers after they graduate. The practical experience gained from such employment may help set work-study students apart from other applicants. These programs also help states leverage funds by requiring the employers to match a percentage of each student's salary. This in turn helps states offer a greater number of needy students work-study opportunities. Employers, for their part, receive employees at a reduced cost. The reduction of loan dependency benefits all parties and contributes to rising levels of educational attainment statewide (PPRI, 2016a)."

Table 4 provides an overview of the private sector state-sponsored work-study programs in each of the five states.

Illinois Cooperative Work-Study Program

Of particular interest is the state-sponsored work-study program in the state of Illinois, due to its competitive grant structure, its assessment requirements, and its focus on providing institutions authority to administer the program. Illinois supports its state work-study program through a competitive grant process, whereby institutions apply for a grant (PPRI, 2016a). These grant funds can be used for student wages and for a required annual audit, but not for administrative salaries. Undergraduate students at grantee institutions are eligible for the Illinois work-study program. Employers pay up to half of these students' salaries, with the

expectation they will hire “well-educated interns at a reduced cost of normal wages (Illinois Board of Higher Education, 2015).”

Table 4. Brief summary of state-sponsored work-study programs.*

	Illinois	Indiana	Minnesota	Pennsylvania	Washington
Eligible Students	Undergraduate Only	Undergraduate Only	Undergraduate and Graduate	Undergraduate and Graduate	Undergraduate and Graduate
Required Enrollment Status	Determined by institution	Full-time only	Half-time	Half-time	Half-time
Maximum Allowed Weekly Work Hours	Varies according to grant specification	20 hours while school is in session; 40 hours during breaks	Determined by institution	40 hours work week all year	19 hours while school is in session; 40 hours during breaks
Employer Contract Authority	Institution	State	Institution	State	Institution or State
Funding Distribution	Grants	Direct State Funds	Direct State Funds	Direct State Funds	Grants
Most Recent Average Award	\$862	\$932	\$1,048	\$4,000	\$2,700
Most Recent Annual Number of Students	993	650	10,828	3,200	4,500
Private Sector Employer Matching	50%+ of Student Wages Paid by State; up to 50% Matched by Employers	50% of Student Wages Paid by State; 50% Matched by Employers	75%+ of Student Wages Paid by State; up to 25% Matched by Employers	30% of Student Wages Paid by State; 70% Matched by Employers	40% of Student Wages Paid by State; 60% Matched by Employers
Most Recent Yearly Program Amount	\$1,114,500	\$606,099	\$15,490,604	\$5,700,000	\$12,182,109

*Amounts given are total of both on-campus and off-campus awards. No state had stand-alone off-campus figures available.

The Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) evaluates grant applications based on the program objectives (Illinois General Assembly, 1991; IBHE, 2015):

- Expand opportunities for students to pursue internships, clinical placements, and other cooperative programs with business and industry, and other work opportunities linked to a student’s academic program (particularly in high-demand fields, such as STEM);
- Strengthen cooperation between higher education, business, industry, and other government (including K-12);

- Encourage social and community service;
- Maximize use of matching contributions from businesses and industry and governmental and social agencies;
- Create new opportunities for public/private partnerships;
- Integrate other components of financial aid to reduce reliance on student loans; and
- Encourage students to seek permanent employment in Illinois.

These objectives support the [Illinois higher education strategic plan](#) by addressing college affordability, educational attainment, and the economic health of the state and regions (IBHE, 2007). The IBHE prioritizes programs that target local, regional labor market demands. Other focus areas include: how applicants leverage resources in their work-study programs; how they enhance academic, employment, and community relationships; how clearly they explain the program to students; how well the program is monitored (i.e., evaluation and assessment); and the appropriateness of the proposed budget (IBHE, 2015).

The Illinois work-study program is titled “cooperative work study.” According to the authorizing statute ([110 ILCS 225](#)) from the Illinois General Assembly (IGA), “cooperative work study” means an academically related work and study experience with business, industry, government or other agencies and organizations. Cooperative work study can include, but is not limited to, summer internships, clinical placements, internships and work experiences during the academic year (IGA, 1991).” Grant applicants (institutions) must include a letter of commitment from each possible employer with their proposals. IBHE encourages (but does not require) employers to be academically related to a student’s field of study.

According to the [Center for Public Policy Priorities](#), the Illinois off-campus work-study program “placed 1,187 students at 665 business across the state and that 70 percent of program participants seeking regular jobs were offered permanent employment by the work-study internship employer (Villanueva, 2015).”

Promising Practices

Currently, there are no Texas institutions utilizing the off-campus opportunity within the TX WS Program, nor are there any Texas institutions utilizing the off-campus opportunity for Federal Work-Study Program funding in the private sector. And, in the surveys completed by PPRI, few institutions indicated their awareness of any internships, practicums, apprenticeships, or mentorships currently available to students that could serve as models for an off-campus work-study program. Thus, there was limited opportunity to identify best practices within institutions of higher education in Texas.

The surveys completed by PPRI and NASFAA do, however, provide insight into the promising practices that institutions have identified as being important for success. Many of these promising practices align with the recommendations provided by the five states interviewed as part of PPRI’s research. Ideas include better marketing to employers, participation in local community engagement activities to facilitate partnerships, a solid infrastructure for administering the program at the institution, financial incentives for employers, and well developed, though streamlined, state guidelines. “Almost half of the [employer] respondents talked about the importance of educating and informing the employers about the program through networking events, information meetings, targeted advertising, etc. (PPRI, 2016b).” All of the groups surveyed indicated the importance of a structured effort to assess program performance.

Effective Industries for Off-Campus Work-Study

The study must identify any careers or industries that are well-suited for providing off-campus employment positions through the work-study program.

While the resources utilized in developing this feasibility study identified best practices, as well as current barriers, in off-campus work-study opportunities, no particular careers or industries stood out above the rest as being particularly well-suited for an off-campus work-study program.

In the research conducted by PPRI, “none of the [other] state [work-study program] leads could identify any occupation that seems better suited for the off-campus work-study program” in their state (2016a). Instead, they identified a number of elements that appeared to be important in the creation of strong programs that benefit institutions and their students:

- Well-defined eligibility and application procedures and marketing strategies;
- Long-term, established relationships between institutions and local employers, industries, or local workforce; and
- Student intern programs, as well as academic programs with student internships or practicums.

Ultimately, the best careers or industries for a state-sponsored, off-campus work-study program are likely to be unique to each region of the state (based on workforce demands), and even to each institution of higher education (based on their individual missions). An agency review of the *Academic Course Guide Manual* and the *Workforce Education Course Manuals* revealed hundreds of courses categorized as cooperative education, practicum, practical experience, cooperative work experience, internship, or clinical experience. The thousands of individual enrollments in these types of courses may provide institutions with further guidance on careers or industries that would be best suited for work-study. A cursory review of work-study websites nationally showed that messaging to students encourages them to find a work-study opportunity that fits the students’ career interests, versus identifying an industry that is well-suited for work-study employment.

Barriers to Effective Off-Campus Work-Study

The study must identify current barriers that public junior colleges face in developing partnerships with employers to provide off-campus employment positions through the work-study program, including any staffing needs or limitations on the outreach capabilities of those colleges.

The best practice information provided demonstrates that off-campus work-study programs *can* be effectively implemented, but there are numerous barriers that must be considered when developing these programs. Input from institutions, employers, and other state programs through surveys, interviews, and focus groups conducted by both PPRI and NASFAA provide insight into these challenges. In particular, “community college participants in the focus groups expressed a greater frustration with barriers to successful FWS implementation and innovation than their four-year institutional peers due to the multi-mission nature of community colleges,

the complexity of the student populations they serve, and the comparative lack of institutional resources,” according to NASFAA (2016a).

Off-campus work-study programs are challenging to implement, execute, and maintain, and a **lack of leadership commitment** can cause the entire endeavor to fail. It is not uncommon for work-study to be overlooked and under-resourced given the small nature of work-study relative to other primary financial aid programs (grants and loans) (NASFAA 2016a, 2016d). Without commitment from an institution’s senior leadership, individuals attempting to implement and innovate off-campus programs face a daunting task.

In tackling this daunting task, **administrative burden** is one of the primary barriers to effective work-study programs. These programs are staff intensive, requiring significant effort across a variety of program elements: identifying employment opportunities, executing contracts with employers, maintaining and marketing job postings, processing hiring documents, monitoring worksites, processing payroll, monitoring expenditures, and assessing and reporting on program outcomes, to name a few (NASFAA, 2016d; PPRI, 2016b). In PPRI’s survey of community college financial aid directors, 75 percent of respondents indicated that administrative burden would hinder participation in a pilot study regarding off-campus work-study, with over 50 percent indicating that inadequate staffing, complicated eligibility requirements, or the absence of specific state guidelines would impact their ability to participate (PPRI, 2016b).

Off-campus work-study programs require **heightened marketing efforts** to attract employers, which are essential to its success. The time and effort necessary to execute this marketing can create significant barriers. While the opportunity to utilize work-study on-campus is usually well-known throughout the college or university (with word-of-mouth often the only marketing tool necessary), it is less well known off-campus, requiring ongoing effort to recruit new employers into the program. Once recruited, marketing those employment opportunities to students raises an additional set of challenges, since off-campus opportunities do not have the same comfortable familiarity that an on-campus job may provide, given the need to coordinate transportation and work hours around a class schedule and extra-curricular activities (NASFAA, 2016b; PPRI, 2016b).

Competing mandates and a **lack of local jobs** are additional barriers faced by institutions. The FWS Program requires all participating institutions to spend at least 7 percent of their annual allocation on community service positions, as well as ensuring involvement in a reading tutor or family literacy project. Institutions already face challenges meeting these federal mandates, thus limiting the institution’s ability to focus on other work-study opportunities. Community service positions are often located off-campus, thus reducing the number of opportunities that might be available for a state work-study program. This is especially true for institutions located in more rural locations. Focus groups convened for NASFAA’s research on the FWS Program identified several challenges faced in meeting the community service requirement:

- “Difficulty spending FWS funds because schools cannot offer enough jobs, especially remote schools that do not have easy access to off-campus employers.
- First-year students tend to need a lot of support in both finding jobs and in being successful in those jobs.
- Difficulty publicizing jobs and lackluster job fairs that don’t translate into more robust FWS opportunities or better matches.
- Huge administrative burdens created by time sheets for off-campus employment.

- Homegrown or inefficient data collection systems and processes that are not set to collect or manage larger amounts of data (NASFAA, 2016b).”

The **financial projections** required for work-study program funding create an additional challenge faced by both the institutions and the states sponsoring the programs (PPRI, 2016a). While all financial aid programs (grants, scholarships, loans, work-study, exemptions, etc.) face the challenge of predicting how many students will be eligible in a given year, the work-study programs face the additional challenge of predicting how much students will actually earn in wages through the program. If a student is awarded a grant, institutions can assume with a high level of confidence that the student will accept the funding and thus plan for that expenditure. But when a student is awarded work-study eligibility, there is no guarantee the student will accept the funding, find a job, or work the number of hours necessary to earn the full award. For this reason, work-study programs need greater flexibility than other programs in how funds can be utilized.

One final challenge worth noting is the importance of **preventing worker displacement** through off-campus work-study programs. Federal and state work-study programs are clear in the expectation that students working through the programs will supplement, rather than supplant, an employer’s current workforce (34 CFR 675.20; TEC 56.076). Unfortunately, not all employers understand this, and off-campus employers may be more likely to misunderstand this critical concept given their lack of prior involvement in the program. In order to be fully effective, work-study programs must create jobs that would not have existed otherwise, rather than simply convert existing opportunities into work-study opportunities.

Impact of SB 1750

The recent requirement of off-campus work-study placements, introduced by SB 1750, provides an opportunity to learn more about the barriers faced in implementing an off-campus work-study program. While roughly a dozen institutions have historically chosen not to participate in the TX WS Program each year, an additional eleven institutions dropped out of the program for FY 2017. In discussing their decision to withdraw from the TX WS, three common reasons were identified.

First, **FWS program requirements** were cited. The most common reason for dropping out of the program was the fact that these institutions, especially rural campuses, were already struggling to meet the community service and other requirements of the FWS Program. Since their communities could not support additional required positions, institutions chose to protect their FWS allocations, which were significantly larger than their TX WS allocations. Second, work-study incurs a high **administrative burden**. Many institutions also indicated that the administration of the new off-campus requirement led to their decision to withdraw. Institutions indicated that staffing necessary to ensure off-campus positions were handled appropriately was beyond their means. Finally, institutions identified **minimal funding** as a reason for dropping out of TX WS. The administrative cost associated with running the program, especially in light of the new off-campus requirement, was often greater than the amount of the allocation itself, making the program fiscally impractical. (Eight of the eleven institutions that dropped out received FY 2016 allocations of less than \$20,000.)

Campus Engagement vs. Career Aspiration

Campuses also face the question of balancing **campus engagement** with **career aspiration** in evaluating whether to focus work-study placements on- or off-campus. In discussing these sometimes competing principles, the logical framework for **campus engagement** is that on-

campus work assignments suggest more time on campus, which leads to greater engagement, and thus greater success. On the other hand, off-campus work assignments allow for more time working in a chosen field, which leads to more successful job placement, and greater support for student **career aspiration**. Unfortunately there is no way to know which approach is more effective because of the dearth of research on this topic, though many would argue that both on- and off-campus employment can lead to improved “soft skills” or “life skills,” which prepare students to enter the workforce.

Given the magnitude and number of barriers, broad implementation of off-campus work-study is a challenging prospect. A more focused approach may allow for greater success. An outline of what this more focused approach could look like is provided in the next section of this report.

Private Sector Work-Study Pilot Program

This study must identify any public junior colleges that demonstrate strong potential for successful participation in a pilot program to develop partnerships with employers to provide off-campus employment positions through the work-study program.

Despite the barriers outlined in the last section, institutions, particularly community colleges, would like to engage in a more effective work-study program. According to NASFAA, many colleges believe a “more effective” work-study program would be one that engages the **private sector**. “When asked about the traits of an ideal community college FWS program, participants described a program that would be purposefully aligned with academic programs, [and] structured to encourage off-campus employment and incentivize innovation (NASFAA, 2016b).” Community colleges described, “...the ideal program would be valued by the institution as part of the broader student development process and as a core part of the broader financial narrative that currently focuses on grants and loans (NASFAA, 2016b).” Developing a work-study program around these concepts provides institutions with an additional mechanism to support the marketable skills goal in the 60x30TX strategic plan.

According to the employers who responded to the PPRI survey, off-campus work-study opportunities are viewed as beneficial to the employer, beneficial to the student, and aligned with the mission of many companies (PPRI, 2016b). Considering these factors, as well as the challenges that institutions already face meeting the community service requirements of the Federal Work-Study Program, it is advantageous for Texas to design a work-study pilot that **engages the private sector**, rather than not-for-profit agencies.

The concept of a private sector work-study program has been suggested by many organizations and implemented in several states. In their 2015 report, “Beyond Campus: Connecting Community College Students to Meaningful Employment,” the Center for Public Policy Priorities indicates that “the state now has an opportunity to improve and expand on the current Texas Work-Study program by linking students to off-campus jobs that help businesses while providing meaningful work experience for low-income, nontraditional students enrolled in public two-year institutions (Villanueva).” In 2014, the Working Poor Families Project issued a policy brief titled “Earn to Learn: How states can reimagine and reinvest in work-study to help low-income adults pay for college, enhance their academic studies, and prepare for post-college careers.” In this report, they identify the importance of meaningful, skills-building job assignments; support for school-work-life balance; and commitment to increased earnings; and

they highlight not only the need for expanded investment in work-study programs, but strengthening the programs to enhance academics and career development, including a focus on off-campus opportunities (Altstadt). PPRI's research has indicated that employers in Texas have expressed interest in participating in a private sector work-study program, and, as seen in the best practices section of this report, states such as Illinois and Indiana have taken steps to craft their programs to focus specifically on off-campus opportunities (PPRI, 2016a).

In developing a private sector program, it is important to allow institutions to tailor their programs to the local needs and labor market demands. The cost (both in staff time and labor) associated with developing private sector opportunities and effectively administering a successful program must also be taken into account. Time and attention are necessary to develop effective marketing strategies. Almost half of employers responding to the PPRI survey "talked about the importance of educating and informing the employers about the program through networking events, information meetings, targeted advertisements, etc. (PPRI, 2016b)." Institutions also explained they will have to, "vet off-campus opportunities to ensure elements such as job rigor, clear delineation of the marketable skills to be gained, and appropriate support at the job site (PPRI, 2016b)." For these reasons, including funding for administrative costs to institutions is critical for off-campus work-study programs to succeed.

A successful program also must avoid creating competing mandates. For example, the FWS Program already requires a portion of an institution's funding to go toward wages in community service positions, and many institutions fulfill this requirement through off-campus employment. NASFAA focus groups identified the need to be selective as to how many off-campus partnerships to pursue, since institutions have encountered difficulties effectively executing the program when too many partners are involved (2016b). For these reasons, focusing specifically on the private sector is important for success, in order to avoid direct competition for placements with the federal program, as well as to avoid simply converting FWS jobs into state work-study jobs. Utilizing a pilot approach also helps ensure that future program expansion can occur without creating competition between institutions for limited partnerships.

Evaluation of the pilot program is also important, and this type of formal assessment is a time-consuming, yet critical component to ensure the ongoing growth and development of a successful program. Supporting this assessment is another key reason for the inclusion of funding for administrative costs to the institution. NASFAA suggests a wide variety of assessment opportunities, and while the list below focuses on suggestions specifically from the community college focus groups that NASFAA conducted, the questions are similar to those raised by the Center for Public Policy Priorities, the Working Poor Families Project, and through internal discussions at the Coordinating Board:

- "Comparisons between FWS students and non-FWS students: Are FWS workers stronger academically than their non-FWS peers?
- Retention data: Does FWS help support student persistence and retention?
- Alumni engagement: Do FWS students donate more than others?
- Better data to match students to employers: What are the best practices associated with ensuring that students have work that is relevant to their area of study?
- Better data on labor-market outcomes: Do graduates with FWS experience do better in the labor market than others?
- Data on student decision making: What makes students want to apply for FWS, and what deters students from applying?

- Data related to equity: Are FWS students representative of the institution's student population, and under what conditions are FWS programs particularly beneficial for historically disadvantaged populations?
- Data on the outcomes and impacts of on-campus vs. off-campus employment: Do FWS students with off-campus employment have an easier time finding full-time employment after graduation (NASFAA, 2016b)?"

The importance of keeping any off-campus work-study program simple and straight-forward cannot be underestimated. Institutions, state agencies, and potential off-campus employers all indicated that clearly understood and easily implemented rules and expectations are essential to the success of a private sector work-study program (PPRI, 2016a; PPRI, 2016b). Within a simple and straight-forward model, there were two critical elements identified. The first is to maintain the need-based nature of work-study eligibility. Multiple states, associations, and non-profit organizations, including NASFAA and the Working Poor Families Project, recommend the utilization of work-study programs to help reduce student reliance on loans to cover the costs of education, and thus the need-based component of the work-study program is an important element in the private sector pilot. The second important element is to provide students guidance on employment placements. While allowing for institution flexibility is critical, providing guidance as to the most appropriate utilization of funding is also important. For example, Washington's state-sponsored work-study employment placements must consider the following elements:

- Relevant and beneficial work experience to the student;
- Exposure to the realities of work in career path relevant to the student;
- Interaction with professionals in career path relevant to student;
- Pay rates comparable to what a non-student would earn in the same position;
- Opportunity to exercise knowledge, skills, and abilities gained from the classroom; and
- Flexible work schedules that accommodate the needs of students and employers (PPRI, 2016a).

A number of approaches were utilized to identify institutions for potential pilot program participation. First, THECB reviewed the *Academic Course Guide Manual* and the *Workforce Education Course Manual*, to identify institutions based on the number of credit-based experiential opportunities offered. Brazosport College, Midland College, and South Texas College were identified through this process. Second, PPRI's survey asked institutions to indicate a willingness to participate in a work-study pilot project. Paris Junior College, St. Phillip's College, Tyler Junior College, and Victoria College all indicated this interest (PPRI, 2016b). FWS Program expenditures at for-profit employers were also reviewed, however, further inquiry clarified that none of the Texas institutions identified through this review had private sector programs that would qualify for the TX WS Program.

However, utilizing a grant application approach, such as exists in the Illinois program, rather than a funding allocation approach, provides an opportunity to identify institutions who demonstrate both their interest and their ability to support a successful private sector work-study program. NASFAA (2016d) identified two key elements to innovative work-study programs: a dedicated staff position to implement innovative practices; and leveraging partnerships with other offices on or off campus. Support from both the campus President, as well as the system Chancellor, are also critical elements to success.

While including an administrative cost allowance in the pilot will provide some assistance, participating institutions need to demonstrate their ability to dedicate the resources necessary

for success. In the focus groups administered by NASFAA (2016b), one participant indicated that “there’s no reward for being innovative.” Establishing a private sector off-campus work-study program funded through a competitive grant application process is one way to ensure that innovative ideas are rewarded.

Feasibility and Recommendations

The best practices and barriers identified through the research conducted by both the Public Policy Research Institute and the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators suggest that off-campus work-study programs are feasible, though complicated, endeavors. Since off-campus programs are not easily implemented, the Coordinating Board provides three recommendations for modification to the TX WS program which, in combination, support the expansion of off-campus opportunities. Suggested appropriations are also provided to support these recommendations. While SB 947 did not explicitly ask for recommendations, the Coordinating Board believes it is prudent to share how the information learned from this research can inform state policy.

Refine Eligible Employment in the Standard TX WS Program

The agency recommends removing the private sector off-campus component from the standard work-study program. This recommendation is not meant to eliminate private sector off-campus work-study from statute. Instead, it allows the standard allocated program to focus on providing marketable skills through on-campus work, while a separate program is established by which institutions apply for block grants to be used solely for private sector off-campus work-study programs.

Expand the Work-Study Student Mentorship Program

NASFAA’s research on the FWS Program identified peer mentoring as one of the most promising practices in student employment. Their research noted that “many of the existing innovative programs from our surveys had ties to mentorship,” and that existing research points to the “powerful influences of mentorship (NASFAA, 2016a).” Given the pre-existing Work-Study Student Mentorship Program in the TX WS statute, the state is uniquely positioned to expand on this innovative approach. The agency recommends expanding the Work-Study Student Mentorship Program to include greater opportunity for academic advising, as well as additional support for financial literacy activities. This expanded capacity for the program supports all aspects of the *60x30TX* strategic plan: encouraging attainment and completion, developing marketable skills, and addressing student debt.

Create a Private Sector Work-Study Program Pilot

A separate private sector work-study program pilot allows for a focused effort to develop a successful model for future expansion, while ensuring the ongoing success of the standard work-study and mentorship programs. The private sector program would initially focus on community colleges, with emphasis on developing marketable skill in support of the *60x30TX* strategic plan, using the following general structure:

- Five to ten institutions participating in a four-year pilot, allowing for one year of preparatory work (establishing the necessary marketing, assessment, and administrative structure, along with identifying the necessary private sector partners), followed by three years of work-study placements and evaluation;

- First-year grants to support the preparatory activities necessary to ensure private sector placements are available for participants;
- Second, third, and fourth year grants, of which at least 80 percent would provide wage subsidies, while up to 20 percent would be available for ongoing administrative and evaluation activities;
- Student wages subsidized 50 percent by the state, with employers contributing 50 percent of wages, as well as 100 percent of all employer-based taxes, benefits, and other employment costs;
- Employment opportunities structured in various lengths (e.g. summer employment, semester placements, or year-long opportunities) that clearly link the students desired career path with the marketable skills that will be acquired through the work-study placement;
- Grants based on a competitive application process in which community colleges demonstrate their ability to succeed through factors such as: the support they are receiving from the campus President, system Chancellor, and the local business community; the manner in which the pilot would support local workforce needs; innovative marketing approaches that are planned; their ability to execute the marketing, placement, and other administrative aspects of the program; and the evaluation structure that will be utilized to assess the program's success and identify opportunities for ongoing improvement.

Given the nature of the grant application process, if the pilot were authorized during the 85th Legislative Session, the grant application process would start in early 2018, in order to allow the creation of appropriate rules and for institutions to assess their ability to provide the necessary administrative structure to support their participation. Grant recipients would be identified in the summer of 2018, allowing selected institutions to start preparatory activities. The first work-study placements through the program would start in the fall semester of 2019.

Increase Work-Study Funding

The TX WS program has historically been funded at levels significantly below that of other programs. Expanding the number of work-study recipients through relatively small investments in the program could lead to significant improvements. Various studies have indicated that financial aid recipients employed through the work-study program, in addition to their other financial aid, graduate at higher rates than financial aid recipients who do not work through a work-study program (NASFAA, 2016c). Given the small size of institutional work-study allocations (see Appendix A), the programs are often overlooked, and the effort required to execute a strong program often results in less emphasis given to innovation in this arena, especially at resource-strapped institutions.

This feasibility study was completed after the agency's Legislative Appropriations Request (LAR) was submitted, and thus the recommendations developed as part of this study were not reflected in the Exceptional Item Requests submitted as part of the LAR process. The agency recommends the TX WS program be funded as follows:

- Standard TX WS program: Rather than splitting the current appropriation between the standard TX WS program and the Work-Study Student Mentorship program, dedicate the full \$18,809,278 biennial appropriation to the standard college work-study program; thus increasing funding for the standard program by \$5 million over the course of the biennium. This would provide employment opportunities for almost 1,500 additional students each year.

- Work-Study Student Mentorship Program: Create a separate \$10 million strategy for the Work-Study Student Mentorship Program in the coming biennium, thereby doubling the size of the current program. Funding for the mentorship program benefits not only the recipient, through additional financial aid and experience, but also all of the individuals the student mentor interacts with in his/her role. Increased funding would allow over 200 additional college students to be employed through the program each year, impacting over one hundred thousand students through the work of the peer mentors.
- Private Sector Work-Study Program: Provide an initial appropriation of \$2 million in the coming biennium to fund a strategy specifically focused on the private sector work-study program pilot, as described above. Up to five hundred students would be placed in private sector work-study opportunities in each year of the pilot funding.

Appendix A: History of TX WS Funding by Institution

INSTITUTION	FY15 Allocation Amount - TX WS	FY15 Allocation Amount - Mentorship	FY16 Allocation Amount - TX WS	FY16 Allocation Amount - Mentorship	FY17 Allocation Amount - TX WS	FY17 Allocation Amount - Mentorship
Public Universities						
Angelo State University	39,506	-	44,02	-	45,454	-
Lamar University	80,853	-	84,95	-	94,830	-
Midwestern State University	31,126	-	32,69	-	35,035	-
Prairie View A&M University	65,489	-	69,20	-	72,111	-
Sam Houston State University	108,747	-	116,35	-	122,822	-
Stephen F. Austin State University	82,180	-	82,13	-	84,451	-
Sul Ross State University	18,108	-	18,34	-	20,116	-
Tarleton State University	71,964	20,000	69,61	19,500	74,771	19,500
Texas A&M International University	48,522	50,000	51,55	50,000	56,181	50,000
Texas A&M University	175,483	-	194,04	-	212,090	-
Texas A&M University at Galveston	7,393	-	8,791	-	9,234	-
Texas A&M University-Commerce	68,413	25,000	69,71	50,000	76,269	50,000
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi	62,145	110,000	65,74	110,000	68,578	110,000
Texas A&M University-Kingsville	79,606	100,000	52,53	100,000	50,734	100,000
Texas A&M University-San Antonio					33,306	-
Texas A&M University-Texarkana	8,905	-	8,974	-	9,945	-
Texas A&M-Central Texas	14,111	-	14,59	-	16,381	-
Texas Southern University	77,950	100,000	75,77	125,000	78,836	125,000
Texas State University	179,813	100,000	206,72	100,000	220,735	100,000
Texas Tech University	145,726	50,000	153,15	-	164,096	-
Texas Woman's University	89,875	100,000	92,67	100,000	94,784	100,000
The University of Texas at Arlington	178,306	100,000	181,27	100,000	192,788	100,000
The University of Texas at Austin	196,318	-	195,47	-	191,609	-
The University of Texas at Brownsville	56,170	100,000				
The University of Texas at Dallas	75,089	50,000	84,59	60,000	94,448	60,000
The University of Texas at El Paso	166,832	110,000	177,35	110,000	177,633	110,000
The University of Texas at San Antonio	183,465	100,000	175,61	100,000	183,641	100,000
The University of Texas at Tyler	39,829	-	42,02	50,000	45,726	50,000
The University of Texas of the Permian Basin	20,851	25,000	22,70	37,500	26,309	37,500
The University of Texas-Pan American	142,998	135,000				
The University of Texas-Rio Grande Valley**			214,81	125,000	229,246	125,000
University of Houston	222,317	-	217,44	-	232,502	-
University of Houston-Clear Lake	38,343	-	39,34	-	40,239	-
University of Houston-Downtown	90,204	20,000	95,55	25,000	99,051	25,000
University of Houston-Victoria	23,356	-	24,41	-	26,957	-
University of North Texas	210,079	135,000	198,05	150,000	202,682	150,000
University of North Texas - Dallas	-	20,000		25,000	-	25,000
West Texas A&M University	41,220	100,000	44,33	87,500	45,801	87,500
Public Health- Related Institutions						
Texas A&M University System-HSC	14,939	-	16,39	-	17,786	-
The University of Texas Medical School, San Antonio	22,019	-	23,33	-	24,482	-
The University of Texas Southwestern School of Health Professions	8,932	-	9,423	-	9,084	-
University of North Texas Health Science Center	13,835	-	14,50	-		-
Public Community Colleges						
Alvin Community College	10,259	-	12,01	-	11,917	-
Amarillo College	-	50,000	-	50,000	-	50,000
Angelina College	30,266	-	31,26	-	28,107	-
Austin Community College	118,612	20,000	112,82	50,000	109,396	50,000

INSTITUTION	FY15 Allocation Amount - TX WS	FY15 Allocation Amount - Mentorship	FY16 Allocation Amount - TX WS	FY16 Allocation Amount - Mentorship	FY17 Allocation Amount - TX WS	FY17 Allocation Amount - Mentorship
Brazosport College	12,832	20,000	12,914	25,000	13,623	25,000
Central Texas College	50,459	30,000	51,646	25,500	46,860	25,500
Cisco College	23,080	-	22,554	-	20,128	-
Clarendon College	6,782	-	7,603	-	7,077	-
Coastal Bend College	17,917	-	18,569	25,000	20,064	25,000
College of the Mainland Community College District	17,588	-	16,932	-	-	-
Collin County Community College District	88,824	-	90,427	-	89,643	-
Dallas Community College District	249,192	225,000	240,315	200,000	246,587	200,000
Del Mar College	52,349	-	49,210	25,000	48,785	25,000
El Paso Community College District	170,239	-	157,341	50,000	151,624	50,000
Frank Phillips College	5,482	-	5,372	-	5,631	-
Galveston College	9,595	-	8,630	-	7,274	-
Grayson County College	29,459	-	29,364	-	28,391	-
Hill College	25,235	-	23,875	-	22,510	-
Houston Community College	262,481	20,000	246,231	30,000	287,353	30,000
Howard College	19,169	-	16,061	-	14,288	-
Kilgore College	30,091	-	29,247	-	28,061	-
Laredo Community College	60,665	20,000	67,823	40,000	56,840	40,000
Lee College	21,897	-	22,282	-	39,672	-
Lone Star College System District	250,094	150,000	255,576	-	266,606	-
McLennan Community College	59,619	-	54,559	-	52,596	-
Midland College	15,942	-	15,140	-	15,404	-
Navarro College	61,652	-	63,694	-	61,148	-
North Central Texas College	46,591	20,000	47,706	-	46,686	-
Northeast Texas Community College	22,226	25,000	20,989	50,000	21,857	50,000
Northwest Vista College	74,649	-	69,066	-	65,432	-
Odessa College	18,421	50,000	17,554	50,000	18,405	50,000
Palo Alto College	40,238	-	37,866	-	39,296	-
Panola College	13,772	-	15,134	-	15,855	-
Paris Junior College	36,571	-	35,208	-	34,815	-
Ranger College	9,829	-	10,633	-	-	-
San Antonio College	119,297	-	113,026	-	97,779	-
San Jacinto College Central Campus	123,988	-	124,897	-	120,388	-
South Plains College	53,102	-	53,538	-	-	-
South Texas College	154,005	30,000	155,587	37,500	159,407	37,500
Southwest Texas Junior College	29,868	-	30,518	-	32,219	-
St. Philip's College	46,957	15,000	43,332	-	39,875	-
Tarrant County College District	251,580	-	258,251	40,000	250,918	40,000
Temple College	35,796	-	35,396	-	33,589	-
Texarkana College	17,874	-	18,886	-	18,948	-
Texas Southmost College	31,089	-	26,345	-	26,980	-
Trinity Valley Community College	37,011	-	37,588	-	36,185	-
Tyler Junior College	62,023	-	61,680	-	62,946	-
Vernon College	17,879	-	18,958	-	18,717	-
Victoria College	22,507	25,000	19,924	-	18,139	-
Weatherford College	26,710	-	26,983	-	-	-
Western Texas College	5,307	-	5,583	-	-	-
Wharton County Junior College	29,741	-	30,002	-	29,316	-
Public State Colleges						
Lamar Institute of Technology	12,684	-	12,731	-	12,241	-

INSTITUTION	FY15 Allocation		FY16 Allocation		FY17 Allocation	
	Amount - TX WS	Amount - Mentorship	Amount - TX WS	Amount - Mentorship	Amount - TX WS	Amount - Mentorship
Lamar State College-Orange	11,368	-	10,162	-	10,535	-
Lamar State College-Port Arthur	13,735	-	12,132	-	11,703	-
Public Technical Institutes						
Texas State Technical College	87,492	100,000	88,468	125,000	81,502	125,000
Independent Junior Colleges						
Jacksonville College	3,184	-	2,830	-	3,145	-
Independent Universities and Colleges						
Abilene Christian University	12,461	-	14,135	-	15,045	-
Austin College	5,679	-	5,872	-	6,337	-
Baylor University	53,888	-	52,617	-	53,885	-
Concordia University Texas	17,688	-	18,292	-	18,838	-
Dallas Baptist University	24,816	-	25,190	-	25,089	-
East Texas Baptist University	8,746	-	8,741	-	8,858	-
Hardin-Simmons University	13,055	-	12,831	-	12,177	-
Houston Baptist University	14,403	-	15,373	-	17,081	-
Howard Payne University	7,982	-	8,519	-	8,049	-
Huston-Tillotson University	9,266	25,000	10,378	37,500	11,674	37,500
Jarvis Christian College	4,994	-	6,482	-	7,199	-
Letourneau University	17,232	-	11,643	-	11,772	-
Lubbock Christian University	12,748	-	11,882	-	12,322	-
McMurry University	9,128	-	8,436	-	7,644	-
Our Lady of the Lake University of San Antonio	22,948	-	23,170	-	29,784	-
Paul Quinn	1,900	-	-	-	-	-
Rice University	8,937	-	8,452	-	-	-
Schreiner University	8,125	-	8,003	-	8,563	-
Southern Methodist University	26,286	-	26,095	-	26,425	-
Southwestern Adventist University	4,076	-	4,484	-	4,961	-
Southwestern Assemblies of God University	9,494	-	9,962	-	10,084	-
Southwestern Christian College	934	-	888	-	919	-
Southwestern University	5,466	-	6,859	-	6,909	-
St. Edward's University	24,269	15,000	23,747	17,500	23,487	17,500
St. Mary's University	24,460	-	24,746	-	24,083	-
Texas Christian University	20,437	25,000	19,108	50,000	-	50,000
Texas College	38,725	25,000	8,680	-	8,800	-
Texas Lutheran University	8,778	-	9,190	-	8,910	-
Texas Wesleyan University	17,142	35,000	12,315	47,500	12,385	47,500
Trinity University	6,114	-	6,271	-	-	-
University of Dallas	5,546	-	5,861	-	-	-
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor	21,409	-	22,665	-	23,956	-
University of St. Thomas	14,669	-	14,307	-	14,519	-
University of the Incarnate Word	51,600	-	51,041	-	-	-
Wiley College	7,133	25,000	8,369	-	8,095	-
Private Health Related						
Parker University	7,812	-	9,312	-	9,529	-
Total:	6,904,637	2,500,000	6,904,639	2,500,000	6,904,585	2,500,000

Appendix B: Text of Senate Bill, 84th Texas Legislature

AN ACT

relating to a study and report by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board on the feasibility of providing off-campus employment positions through the Texas college work-study program.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS:

SECTION 1. Subchapter E, Chapter 56, Education Code, is amended by adding Section 56.081 to read as follows:

Sec. 56.081. STUDY ON FEASIBILITY OF PROVIDING OFF-CAMPUS WORK-STUDY EMPLOYMENT. (a) In this section, "public junior college" has the meaning assigned by Section 61.003.

(b) The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board shall conduct a study to examine the feasibility of providing employment positions located off-campus through the Texas college work-study program.

(c) The study must identify:

(1) best practices for developing partnerships with employers to provide off-campus employment positions through the work-study program, including best practices learned from other apprenticeship, internship, or mentorship programs in this state or from similar programs in other states;

(2) any careers or industries that are well-suited for providing off-campus employment positions through the work-study program;

(3) current barriers that public junior colleges face in developing partnerships with employers to provide off-campus employment positions through the work-study program, including any staffing needs or limitations on the outreach capabilities of those colleges; and

(4) any public junior colleges that demonstrate strong potential for successful participation in a pilot program to develop partnerships with employers to provide off-campus employment positions through the work-study program.

(d) Not later than December 1, 2016, the coordinating board shall submit to the governor, the lieutenant governor, the speaker of the house of representatives, and the standing legislative committees with primary jurisdiction over higher education a report on the results of the study and any recommendations for legislative or other action.

(e) This section expires September 1, 2017.

SECTION 2. This Act takes effect immediately if it receives a vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to each house, as provided by Section 39, Article III, Texas Constitution. If this Act does not receive the vote necessary for immediate effect, this Act takes effect September 1, 2015.

Appendix C: Text of Senate Bill 1750, 84th Texas Legislature

AN ACT

relating to the requirements for employment positions provided through the Texas college work-study program.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS:

SECTION 1. Section 56.076, Education Code, is amended to read as follows:

Sec. 56.076. ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER. (a) An eligible institution may enter into agreements with employers that participate in the work-study program. To be eligible to participate in the work-study program, an employer must:

(1) provide part-time employment to an eligible student in nonpartisan and nonsectarian activities;

(2) provide, insofar as is practicable, employment to an eligible student that is related to the student's academic interests;

(3) use Texas college work-study program positions only to supplement and not to supplant positions normally filled by persons not eligible to participate in the work-study program;

(4) provide from sources other than federal college work-study program funds a percentage of an employed student's wages that is equal to the percentage of a student's wages that the employer would be required to provide to the student in that academic year under the federal college work-study program; and

(5) provide from sources other than federal college work-study funds 100 percent of other employee benefits for the employed student.

(b) Each eligible institution shall ensure that at least 20 percent but not more than 50 percent of the employment positions provided through the work-study program in an academic year are provided by employers eligible under this section who are providing employment located off campus.

SECTION 2. Section 56.079(l), Education Code, is amended to read as follows:

(l) Notwithstanding Section 56.076(a) [~~56-076~~], a participating entity that employs a student mentor under the work-study student mentorship program shall provide from sources other than federal college work-study funds:

(1) not less than 10 percent of the employed student's wages; and

(2) 100 percent of other employee benefits for the employed student.

SECTION 3. Subchapter E, Chapter 56, Education Code, is amended by adding Section 56.082 to read as follows:

Sec. 56.082. BIENNIAL REPORT. (a) Not later than January 1 of each odd-numbered year, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board shall submit to the standing legislative committees with primary jurisdiction over higher education and post on the coordinating board's Internet website a report on the Texas college work-study program. The report must include the total number of students employed through the program, disaggregated by:

(1) the employment position's location on or off campus; and

(2) the employer's status as a for-profit or nonprofit entity.

(b) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board shall submit its initial report under that subsection not later than May 1, 2019. This subsection expires September 1, 2019.

SECTION 4. The changes in law made by this Act to Sections 56.076 and 56.079, Education Code, apply to participation in the Texas college work-study program beginning with the 2016-2017 academic year.

SECTION 5. This Act takes effect immediately if it receives a vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to each house, as provided by Section 39, Article III, Texas Constitution. If this Act does not receive the vote necessary for immediate effect, this Act takes effect September 1, 2015.

Appendix D: References

- Altstadt, D. (2014). *Earn to learn: How states can reimagine and reinvest in work-study to help low-income adults pay for college, enhance their academic studies, and prepare for post-college careers*. The Working Poor Families Project Policy Brief, Spring 2014. Retrieved August 13, 2016 from <http://www.workingpoorfamilies.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/WPFP-Spring-2014-Brief.pdf>.
- Astin, A. W. (1975). *Preventing students from dropping out*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Campus Compact. (Nd). *A brief history of the Federal Work-Study Program*. Retrieved April 16, 2015 from <http://compact.org/earn-learn-and-serve-getting-the-most-from-community-service-federal-work-study/a-brief-history-of-the-federal-work-study-program/>.
- Cooperative Education & Internship Association. (Nd). *History of cooperative education and internships*. Retrieved April 16, 2015 from <http://www.ceiainc.org/about/history/>.
- Department of Education. (2015). Federal Work-study Award Notifications 2015-2016. *Acquired through Freedom of Information Act request*.
- Hossler, D., Ziskin, M., Gross, J. P. K., Kim, S., and Osman, C. (2009). Student aid and its role in encouraging persistence. In Smart, J. C., (Ed.) *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* (389-425). New York: Springer.
- Illinois Board of Higher Education. (2007). *The Illinois Public Agenda for College and Career Success*. Retrieved on August 16, 2016 from http://www.ibhe.org/masterPlanning/materials/070109_PublicAgenda.pdf.
- Illinois Board of Higher Education. (2015). *Illinois Cooperative Work Study Program Fiscal Year 2015 Grant Allocation: Board Item #V-13*. Retrieved on August 16, 2016 from <http://www.ibhe.org/Board/agendas/2015/April/Item%20V-13%20FY2015%20IL%20Cooperative%20Work%20Study.pdf>.
- Legislative Budget Board. (2015). Fiscal Note, 84th Legislative Regular Session: SB1750 by West (Relating to the requirements for employment positions provided through the Texas college work-study program.), Conference Committee Report. Retrieved April 16, 2015 from <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/tlodocs/84R/fiscalnotes/html/SB01750F.htm>.
- National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA). (2016a). National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators' Federal Work-Study Research: Executive Summary. Retrieved August 13, 2016 from https://www.nasfaa.org/uploads/documents/NASFAA_2016_Advocacy_Executive_Summary.pdf.
- National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA). (2016b). National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators' Federal Work-Study Research: Focus Group Report. Retrieved August 13, 2016 from http://www.nasfaa.org/uploads/documents/NASFAA_2016_Advocacy_Focus_Groups_Findings_Report.pdf.
- National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA). (2016c). National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators' Federal Work-Study Research: Literature Review & Policy Scan. Retrieved August 13, 2016 from

http://www.nasfaa.org/uploads/documents/NASFAA_2016_Advocacy_Literature_Review_and_Policy_Scan.pdf.

- National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA). (2016d). National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators' Federal Work-Study Research: National Survey Report. Retrieved August 13, 2016 from http://www.nasfaa.org/uploads/documents/NASFAA_2016_Advocacy_Online_Survey_Findings.pdf.
- Pike, G. R., Kuh, G. D., and Massa-McKinley, R. C. (2008). First-year students' employment, engagement, and academic achievement: Untangling the relationship between work and grades. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice* 45(4): 560-582.
- Public Policy Research Institute. (2016a). Off-campus state work study programs: Perspectives from leading states. Prepared for the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board.
- Public Policy Research Institute. (2016b). Feasibility of providing off-campus work-study employment. Prepared for the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, July 31, 2016.
- Villanueva, C. K. (2015). Beyond the campus: Connecting community college students to meaningful employment. Center for Public Policy Priorities. Retrieved August 13, 2016 from http://forabettertexas.org/images/EO_2015_03_WorkStudy.pdf.
- Villarreal, P. (2012). Structuring economic opportunities for college success: Estimating the causal effects of work-study on postsecondary education outcomes [PowerPoint Slides]. Retrieved April 16, 2015 from <https://education.ufl.edu/content-collaboration-series/files/2012/01/Structuring-Economic-Opportunities-for-College-Success.Estimating-the-Causal-Effects-of-Work-Study-on-Postsecondary-Education-Outcomes.pdf>.

This page has been left blank intentionally.



This document is available on the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board website:
<http://www.thecb.state.tx.us>

For more information contact:

Charles W. Puls, Ed.D., Deputy Assistant Commissioner
Student Financial Aid Programs
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
P.O. Box 12788
Austin, TX 78711
PHONE (512) 427-6365
charles.puls@thecb.state.tx.us