

FINAL REPORT

Southern Ohio Agricultural and Community Development
Foundation

Educational Assistance Grants Program Impact Evaluation

Through
Mailed Questionnaires

Thomas M. Archer

June 5, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Executive Summary3

Purpose.....5

Procedure5

Data Analysis5

Limitation.....5

Findings:

 Response Rate6

 Characteristics of Respondents.....6

 Respondents Background with SOACDF Educational Assistance7

 Student Status of Respondents9

 Changes in the Lives of Respondents.....13

 Best Features of the Educational Assistance Program18

 Suggestions for Improvement of the Educational Assistance Program20

Conclusions.....21

Appendix A

 Ability to Generalize to All Educational Assistance Grant Recipients.....23

Appendix B

 Questionnaire.....25

Appendix C

 Suggestions for Improvement from Question 2028

Executive Summary

Southern Ohio Agricultural and Community Development Foundation Educational Assistance Grants Program Impact Evaluation through Mailed Questionnaires

Purpose: To review the process of funding Educational Assistance Grants by the Southern Ohio Agricultural and Community Development Foundation (SOACDF) and to identify changes made, outcomes achieved, and future aspirations of the grant participants.

Procedure: A mailed questionnaire was sent to the 760 recipients who received Educational Assistance Grants from 2005 through 2007. The questionnaire was reproduced in a front-back, legal size paper format and included questions relating to: Respondents' background with SOACDF educational assistance; Respondents' student status; Changes that had occurred in respondents' lives; and Demographics.

Data Analysis: Quantitative data were entered into Excel and imported into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), where data were cleaned, variables named, and value levels labeled. T-tests and Chi-Square statistical tests were performed to detect statistical significant differences. Procedures were used to confirm that the findings could be generalized to the entire population of Educational Assistance Grants recipients 2005-2007.

Major Findings: The response rate was 49.3%. The counties with the most respondents were: Brown (36.4%); Adams (14.9%); Highland (13.3%); Gallia (12.2%); Clermont (12.2%); and Lawrence (5.4%). Over 70% of the respondents were 29 years old or younger. Fifty-nine percent (59%) of Educational Assistance Grant recipients have yet to be married, while about 39% were married, and 2% were divorced. Two-thirds of the respondents were growers or the immediate family members of growers, while one-third were quota owners or the immediate family members of quota owners.

Almost 47% (46.7%) of the respondents decided to obtain further formal education (*Obtain a non-degree license or certificate; Attend a technical school for an Associate Degree; Go to a 4-year school for a Bachelor Degree; or Obtain an advanced degree*) as the result of the availability of the SOACDF Educational Assistance program while 45.4% of the respondents' educational goals did not change as the result of the availability of the SOACDF Educational Assistance program. Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the respondents were either in high school or a freshman in college when they received their first Educational Assistance Grant; 17.8% were not enrolled in any schooling. Almost 80% of the further education pursued was for a degree, while 21% was for non-degree programs.

Over \$2.4 million was received in SOACDF Educational Assistance dollars by 363 people. The average amount received since 2003 was \$6680 per respondent. About two-thirds of the respondents have used SOACDF Educational Assistance funds to pay 40% or less of their total cost of classes and coursework. Almost 82% of respondents have student loans of less than \$20,000.

Increases in knowledge (74.2%) and skills (63.6%) were reported by the highest percentage of respondents as benefits of the Educational Assistance Grant(s) they received. Other benefits included: 56.3% are qualified to apply for better jobs; 32.3% have obtained a higher paying job; 16.8% obtained a job with better working conditions; 53.5% respondents feel better about themselves; and 42.9% of the respondents say that their family members are more proud of them.

The amount received by the average grant recipient (\$6740) is almost equaled by the increase in annual gross income in one year (\$6061), and across the average remaining productive work years (35.2 years), for each grant dollar, there is a return in gross income to the respondents of

\$31.65. Most (69.4%) of respondents plan to continue to live in their home county, while only 2.2% plan to move out of the State of Ohio. Almost three-fourths of respondents plan to take more classes/ coursework in the future. The Educational Assistance Grants provided the incentive for 65.4% of the respondents to enroll in classes/ coursework, take more expensive classes/ coursework, take more classes/ coursework, and take classes/ coursework over a shorter period of time. The three highest percentages of employment goals of respondents were: {1} Health Care (24.2%); {2} Teacher (20.9%); and {3} Farming, Forestry (14.2%).

About one-fifth of the respondents stated that the SOACDF Educational Assistance Program was a “Great program; Big help”. Another one-fifth stated that they pursued or achieved education or training opportunities that they may not otherwise have pursued without the SOACDF Educational Assistance program. Over one-third of the suggested improvement responses were changes in the Educational Assistance Program. These changes fell into the categories of General, Application Process, Eligibility, More Money, and Market Program Better.

Conclusions:

- [1] The information from the responses summarized in this report is representative of all the Educational Assistance Grant recipients for the years 2005-2007.
- [2] About half of the people who received Educational Assistance Grants would not have pursued further, formal education without the incentive that these grant provided.
- [3] Nearly 60% of the recipients of Educational Assistance Grants were in high school or college freshmen when they first received the grant.
- [4] Almost 80% of the further education pursued by Educational Assistance Grants was for a degree, while 21% was for non-degree programs
- [5] The average Educational Assistance Grant received by participants since 2003 was \$6680.
- [6] Two-thirds of those who have used SOACDF Educational Assistance funds use the money to pay 40% or less of their total cost of classes and coursework.
- [7] 56.3% of grant recipients are qualified to apply for better jobs. Recipients also have obtained higher paying jobs (32.3%) or jobs with better working conditions (16.8%). Many grant recipients feel better about themselves (53.5%) and 42.9% say that their family members are more proud of them.
- [8] The annual increase in income per year is \$6061 as reported by Educational Assistance Grant recipients
- [9] Most (69.4%) grant recipients plan to continue to live in their home county, while only 2.2% plan to move out of the State of Ohio. About 1 in 5 do not know about their future residence plans
- [10] Almost three-fourths Educational Grant recipients plan to take more classes/ coursework in the future.
- [11] The Educational Assistance Grants provided the incentive for 65.4% of grant recipients to enroll in classes/ coursework, take more expensive classes/ coursework, take more classes/ coursework, and take classes/ coursework over a shorter period of time.
- [12] Many people pursue or achieved education or training opportunities that they may not otherwise pursue without the SOACDF Educational Assistance program.
- [13] The majority of people who have received funds through the SOACDF Educational Assistance program either gave strong encouragement to continue the program or could not think of any suggestions for improvement of the program.

Purpose:

To review the process of funding Educational Assistance grants by the Southern Ohio Agricultural and Community Development Foundation (SOACDF) and to identify changes made, outcomes achieved, and future aspirations of the program participants.

Procedure:

A written questionnaire was created. The questions included: Background descriptions of respondents' association with SOACF Educational Assistance; Student Status; Educational funding dimensions of respondents; Changes in respondents' lives – Benefits; Changes in respondents' lives – increase in respondents' annual gross income that can be attributed to the coursework completed through the Educational Assistance program; A request for the best thing that respondents can say about the Educational Assistance Program; Suggestions that respondents may have to improve the Educational Assistance Program; and Demographic information. See Appendix B for complete content of questionnaire.

The questionnaire was reproduced on the front and back of legal size paper, and a cover letter developed. The SOACDF staff generated mailing address labels for all Educational Assistance Grant recipients from 2005 through 2007. The cover letter, questionnaire, and a return envelop with postage affixed was mailed March 5, 2008 to 760 potential respondents. In addition, a web-based version of the questionnaire was created, and the cover letter included the URL to access the web format.

Data Analysis:

The questionnaires were returned to the SOACDF office in Hillsboro, and quantitative data entered from March 10 through April 11 into a Excel spreadsheet created by Dr. Archer. On April 14 the spreadsheet was transferred to Dr. Archer. The Excel spreadsheet was imported into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), and data cleaned, variables named, and value levels labeled. It should be noted that in the Findings section below, the totals do not include missing data. That is, not all respondents answered every question.

The qualitative data (responses to Q19 & Q20) were keyed into a separate Excel document, and each response individually analyzed and sorted into categories developed as responses were reviewed. Counts were made for each of the categories, and representative statements were included in this report.

Limitations:

Efforts were made to prove that non-respondents were similar to respondents so that the generality of results was possible (See Appendix A.). It appears that Brown County may be under-represented in the results, and that the respondents were more likely to be those who received grants in 2005 rather than 2007. However, when comparisons were made between late and early respondents and between respondents and respondents who were contacted a second time (identified as similar to non-respondents), the only statistically significant difference on any variable was that Gallia County was over-represented in the non-respondent group (See p. 24).

Findings:

Response Rate:

A total of 359 usable mailed questionnaires were returned through April 11. Nine people responded to the web version of the questionnaire, for a total of 368 usable questionnaires. There were also 13 questionnaires returned as undeliverable from the 760 originally mailed. Therefore, the response rate was 49.3%.

Characteristics of Respondents:

County in which respondents' applications were submitted:

Table 1 reflects the distribution of respondents by the county in which applications were submitted. The counties with the most respondents are: Brown (36.4%); Adams (14.9%); Highland (13.3%); Gallia (12.2%); Clermont (12.2%); and Lawrence (5.4%). For a comparison of the respondents by county compared to applicants who received Educational Assistance funding by county, see Appendix A.

Table 1: Respondents by County		
<i>County</i>	<i>Respondents</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Adams	55	14.9%
Brown	134	36.4%
Clermont	34	9.2%
Gallia	45	12.2%
Highland	49	13.3%
Jackson	5	1.4%
Lawrence	20	5.4%
Monroe	2	.5%
Noble	3	.8%
Pike	5	1.4%
Ross	1	.3%
Scioto	13	3.5%
No County Noted	2	.5%
Total	368	100%

Age of respondents:

Respondents were asked to write their age in a blank provided. Three hundred sixty-four (364) people provided their age. The mean age was 29.8 years. The range of ages was from 18 through 91. For display purposes, age categories are reported in Table 2. Over

70% of the respondents were 29 years old or less. There was one 91 year old who took advantage of the Educational Assistance Grant program.

Table 2. Age Distribution of Respondents		
<i>Age Range</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Less than 20 Years Old	28	7.7%
20-29 Years Old	227	62.4%
30-39 Years Old	25	6.9%
40-49 Years Old	36	9.9%
50-59 Years Old	33	9.1%
60-69 Years Old	14	3.8%
70 and older	1	0.3%
Total	364	100.0%

Marital status of educational assistance grants recipients:

Table 3 illustrates that almost 59% of Educational Assistance Grant recipients have yet to be married, while about 39% were married, and 2% were divorced.

Table 3. Marital Status of Educational Assistance Grants		
<i>Marital Status</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Married	144	39.2%
Divorced	8	2.2%
Never Married	215	58.6%
Total	367	100.0%

Respondents Background with SOACDF Educational Assistance

Year in which respondents received Educational Assistance Grants:

Table 4 reports the number of grants received each year by the respondents. It should be noted that although the Educational Grants program began in 2003, only those who received the Educational Assistance grants in 2005 through 2007 received the questionnaire. To help clarify, Table 4 shows two percentage comparisons: (1) The Percentage of Grants Represented by 368 Respondents by year; and (2) Percentage of Grants Represented of All Grants Funded. Observe that 2005-2007 is better represented by these respondents than 2003 and 2004, although there is relative consistency of respondents' representation in 2003-2004 and 2005-2007.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Number of Respondents Receiving Educational Assistance Grants</i>	<i>Percentage of Grants Represented by 368 Respondents</i>	<i>Number of Educational Assistance Grants Awarded</i>	<i>Percentage of Grants Represented of All Grants Funded</i>
2003	106	28.8%	502	21.1%
2004	162	44.0%	766	21.1%
2005	227	61.7%	574	39.5%
2006	266	72.3%	585	45.5%
2007	239	64.9%	513	46.6%

Qualifying requirement that allowed respondents to be eligible to receive an Educational Assistance grant:

People qualified for application for Educational Assistance Grants by either being tobacco growers or tobacco quota owners, or the immediate family members of growers or quota owners. Table 5 shows that two-thirds of the respondents were growers or the immediate family members of growers. Of the growers, 44.6% were the growers themselves, while of the quota owners, 27% were the quota owners themselves.

<i>Qualifier</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage of Growers and Quota Owners</i>	<i>Percentage of Total Respondents</i>
A tobacco grower	108	44.6%	29.7%
In the immediate family of a tobacco grower	134	55.4%	36.8%
Sub-Total	242	100%	66.5%
A tobacco quota owner	33	27%	9.1%
In the immediate family of a tobacco quota owner	89	73%	24.5%
Sub-Total	122	100%	33.6%
Total	364		100.0%

How the respondents' educational goals changed as a result of the availability of the SOACDF educational assistance program:

Although 45.4% of the respondents' educational goals did not change as the result of the availability of the SOACDF Educational Assistance program, 46.7% decided to obtain further formal education (Obtain a non-degree license or certificate; Attend a technical school for an Associate Degree; Go to a 4-year school for a Bachelor Degree; or Obtain an advanced degree). Four out of five who decided to obtain further formal education pursued some sort of degree program (Associate, Bachelor, or Advanced).

<i>Change in Educational Goal</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Educational goals did not change	166	45.4%
Decided to obtain a non-degree license or certificate	33	9.0%
Decided to attend a technical school for an Associate Degree	25	6.8%
Decided to go to a 4-year school for a Bachelor Degree	82	22.4%
Decided to obtain an advanced degree	31	8.5%
Other	29	7.9%
Total	366	100.0%

Student Status of Respondents

Student status of respondents before they first received Educational Assistance Grants:

Two interesting facts are illustrated in Table 7. First, over 58% of the respondents were either in high school or their freshman year in college when they received their first Educational Assistance Grant. Secondly, 17.8% were not enrolled in any schooling.

<i>Prior Student Status</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Not enrolled in any schooling	65	17.8%
High School Junior	1	.3%
High School Senior	128	35.1%
College Freshman	85	23.3%
College Sophomore	24	6.6%

College Junior	14	3.8%
College Senior	13	3.6%
Masters Program	24	6.6%
Doctoral Program	2	.5%
Other Professional Degree Program	9	2.5%
Total	365	100.0

Training, licensure, certification, or degree program for which respondents used the Educational Assistance dollars:

Table 8 reports the distribution of respondents' answers the question, "For which of the following DID YOU USE the Educational Assistance dollars? Non-degree training program; Non-degree licensure program; Non-degree certification program; Associate degree; Bachelor degree; Masters degree; Other Professional degree." Respondents were permitted to select all that apply. Almost 80% of the further education pursued was for a degree, while 21% was for non-degree programs.

Table 8. Training, Licensure, Certification, or Degree Program for which Respondents Used the Educational Assistance Dollars:		
<i>Type of Program</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Non-degree training program	51	11.6%
Non-degree licensure program	16	3.6%
Non-degree certification program	25	5.7%
Sub-Total	92	20.9%
Associate degree	80	18.2%
Bachelor degree	206	46.8%
Masters degree	38	8.6%
Other Professional degree	24	5.5%
Sub-Total	348	79.1%
Total*	440	100.0%
*Respondents could select more than one response		

Respondents progress in coursework:

One-hundred seventy-one (171) of the 368 respondents to this survey indicated they are still working on classes or coursework, as described in Table 9.

To estimate a completion rate for each of the categories of certificates/ licenses and degrees, the data in Table 8 was used. When this estimation was made, from 43.8% to 55% of respondents have completed their particular educational pursuit, except that 29.2% of those pursuing other professional degrees have finished.

Table 9. Since First Receiving the Educational Assistance Dollars, the Respondents' Progress in the Coursework for the Programs/ Degrees

<i>Progress to Date</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage of each program/ degree*</i>
Still working on classes or coursework	171	---
Received Certificate/ License	45	48.9% ¹
Received Associate Degree	44	55.0% ²
Received Bachelor Degree	90	43.8% ³
Received Masters Degree	22	52.6% ⁴
Received Other Professional Degree	7	29.2% ⁵
Other	43	

*Percentages calculated from Type of Program pursued in Table 8; ¹Combined non-degree training, licensure, & certification programs = 92; ² Associate Degree = 80; ³ Bachelor Degree =206; ⁴ Masters Degree = 38; ⁵ Other professional degree = 24

Total funding since 2003 respondents received from the Educational Assistance Program:

SOACDF Educational Grant recipients can receive a grant in more than one year. In Table 10 it can be seen that over \$2.4 million has been received in SOACDF Educational Assistance dollars by the 363 people who chose to respond to this question. The average amount received since 2003 was \$6680 per respondent. The level of funding received the most was \$6000 (by 75 respondents), the second highest level was \$9000 (by 60 respondents). Fifty-five respondents received \$12,000 each.

Table 10. Total Funding Since 2003 Respondents Received from the SOACDF Educational Assistance Program.

<i>Total Amount of Educational Assistance per Respondent</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percent of Total</i>	<i>Total for Funding Level</i>
\$1000	22	6.1%	\$22,000
\$2000	14	3.9%	\$28,000
\$3000	47	12.9%	\$141,000
\$4000	30	8.3%	\$120,000

\$5000	12	3.3%	\$60,000
\$6000	75	20.7%	\$450,000
\$7000	15	4.1%	\$105,000
\$8000	19	5.2%	\$152,000
\$9000	60	16.5%	\$540,000
\$10000	7	1.9%	\$70,000
\$11000	7	1.9%	\$77,000
\$12000	55	15.2%	\$660,000
Total Funding Since 2003	363	100.0%	\$2,425,000
Average SOACDF Funding Received by Each Respondent Since 2003			\$6,680

Approximate percentage of the total cost of the classes/ coursework respondents have taken beyond high school that the SOACDF Educational Assistance Program has paid:

SOACDF Educational Assistance grants have paid for between 1-20% of the total costs for classes/ coursework for 45.6% of 362 respondents. Another 22.7% of respondents stated that these grant funds have paid between 21-40% of the total costs. Therefore, about two-thirds of the respondents have used SOACDF Educational Assistance funds to pay 40% or less of their total cost of classes and coursework. Specific data are in Table 11.

Table 11. Percentage of the Total Cost of the Classes/ Coursework that Respondents Have Taken Beyond High School that the SOACDF Educational Assistance Program Has Paid

<i>Percent Category</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1-20%	165	45.6%
21-40%	82	22.7%
41-60%	50	13.8%
61-80%	17	4.7%
81-100%	48	13.3%
Total	362	100.0%

Estimated student loan burden of respondents:

To obtain a sense of how much loan burden was being carried by grant recipients, a question was included to estimate the amount for each potential respondent. In Table 12 it is interesting to note that 44.4% of the respondents have no student loans, 19.7% who have loans of less than \$10,000, and another 17.8% who have student loans of between

\$10,000 and \$19,999. That is almost 82% of respondents have student loans of less than \$20,000.

Table 12. Estimated Student Loan Burden of Respondents		
<i>Loan Category</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
None	162	44.4%
Less than \$10,000	72	19.7%
\$10,000 - \$19,999	65	17.8%
\$20,000 - \$29,999	36	9.9%
\$30,000 - \$39,999	13	3.6%
\$40,000 - \$49,999	4	1.1%
\$50,000 - \$59,999	5	1.4%
\$60,000 or more	8	2.2%
Total	365	100.0%

Changes in the Lives of Respondents Due to the SOACDF Educational Assistance Grants

Benefits as reported by respondents that have resulted from receiving an Educational Assistance Grant:

Increases in knowledge (74.2%) and skills (63.6%) were reported by the highest percentage of respondents as benefits of the Educational Assistance Grant(s) they received. Other benefits highlighted in Table 13 included 56.3% of respondents who said they are qualified to apply for better jobs. Respondents have obtained a higher paying job (32.3%) or a job with better working conditions (16.8%). Many respondents feel better about themselves (53.5%) and 42.9% of the respondents say that their family members are more proud of them. Only 9.2% reported the benefit that they now have more free time.

Since 66 respondents indicated “Other” benefits, these qualitative data were further analyzed and summarized. There were six categories identified (number of respondents within each category in parentheses): {1} Less expense for me for college; College more affordable (24); {2} Still taking coursework (13); {3} Now able to work in my career of choice (8); {4} Learned skills that do not have to pay someone else to do (3); {5} Completed degree (3); and {6} Other comments that did not logically fit into any category (14). Other comments included such things as: “*Now have health insurance*”; “*More study time*”; “*New interests*”; and “*I am able to help others with my job.*”

Table 13. Benefits as reported by respondents that have resulted from receiving an Educational Assistance Grant

<i>Benefit</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage of 368*</i>
I am qualified to apply for better jobs	207	56.3%
I am more likely to be promoted within my job	98	26.6%
I obtained a job with better working conditions	62	16.8%
I obtained a higher paying job	119	32.3%
I have more skills	234	63.6%
I have more knowledge	273	74.2%
I feel better about myself	197	53.5%
Family members are prouder of me	158	42.9%
I now have more free time	34	9.2%
Other	66	17.9%

Estimated increase in annual gross income that respondents could attribute to the coursework completed through the Educational Assistance program:

Respondents were asked to select the appropriate range of their estimated increase in annual gross income that could be attributed to the coursework completed through the Educational Assistance program. The results are reported in Table 14. To calculate the “Total Income Increase by Income Increase Category” the mid-point of each category was multiplied by the number of respondents who selected that category.

If over \$10,000, respondents were asked to estimate that amount and write it in a blank provided. Fifty-three (53) respondents indicated increases in annual gross income of over \$10,000, of which 32 provided an estimate. The actual figures were used for those who provided them, and the multiplier was \$10,000 for all others who chose “More than \$10,000”, but did not provide an estimate.

Referring back to Table 10, the average Educational Assistance grant received by respondents was \$6740, and the average age of respondents was 29.8 (From Table 2). If we assume that people work to the age of 65, that is an average of 35.2 productive work years for the average respondent. Across all respondents, the annual increase in income per year is \$6061 (Table 14). In today’s dollars, the total work life increase in gross income due to the coursework completed through the Educational Assistance program per respondent would be \$213,347.

The amount received by the average grant recipient (\$6740) is almost equaled by the increase in annual gross income in one year (\$6061), and across the average remaining

productive work years (35.2 years), for each grant dollar, there is a return in gross income to the respondents of \$31.65.

Table 14. Estimated Increase in Annual Gross Income that Respondents Could Attribute to the Coursework Completed through the Educational Assistance Program			
<i>Income Increase Category</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Total Income Increase by Income Increase Category</i>
No Increase	123	36.7%	\$0
\$1 - \$1000	26	7.8%	\$13,000
\$1001 - \$2000	21	6.3%	\$31,500
\$2001 - \$3000	19	5.7%	\$47,500
\$3001 - \$4000	9	2.7%	\$31,500
\$4001 - \$5000	16	4.8%	\$72,000
\$5001 - \$6000	16	4.8%	\$88,000
\$6001 - \$7000	3	.9%	\$19,500
\$7001 - \$8000	9	2.7%	\$67,500
\$8001 - \$9000	5	1.5%	\$42,500
\$9001 - \$10,000	35	10.4%	\$332,500
More than \$10,000	21	6.3%	\$252,000
Estimates Over \$10,000	32	9.5%	\$1,033,000
Total	335	100.0%	\$2,030,500
Average Annual Increase in Income by 212 Respondents Reporting an Income Increase			\$9578
Average Annual Increase in Income by All 335 Respondents			\$6061

Future residence plans of respondents:

Most (69.4%) of respondents plan to continue to live in their home county, while only 2.2% plan to move out of the State of Ohio. About 1 in 5 “do not know” about their future residence plans. Exact data on residence plans is provided in Table 15.

Table 15. Future Residence Plans of Respondents		
<i>Future Residence Plans</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Continue to live in my home county	252	69.4%
Move to an Ohio location outside my home county	34	9.4%
Move to a location outside of Ohio	8	2.2%
Don't Know	69	19.0%
Total	363	100.0%

Plans to take more classes/ coursework in the future:

Almost three-fourths of respondents plan to take more classes/ coursework in the future. About one-fifth (19.8%) of respondents are undecided about taking additional classes or coursework. These data are presented in Table 16.

Table 16. Plans to Take More Classes/ Coursework in the Future		
<i>Plans to Take More Classes/ Coursework</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Yes	264	73.7%
No	23	6.4%
Don't Know	71	19.8%
Total	358	100.0%

Anticipated progress in respondents' classes/ coursework if educational assistance funds had not been received:

The Educational Assistance Grants provided the incentive for 65.4% of the respondents to enroll in classes/ coursework, take more expensive classes/ coursework, take more classes/ coursework, and take classes/ coursework over a shorter period of time. This is supported by the data in Table 17. Twenty-eight and a half percent (28.5%) of the respondents stated that without the Educational Assistance funds, they would have taken the same classes, but spread over a longer time. The percent of respondents who stated they would have taken the same classes/ coursework in about the same amount of time was 34.5%.

Table 17. Anticipated Progress in Respondents' Classes/ Coursework if Educational Assistance Funds Had Not Been Received

<i>Anticipated Progress in Classes/ Coursework without Educational Assistance Grants</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percent</i>
I would not have enrolled for the classes/ coursework that I completed	83	22.7%
I would have taken less expensive classes/ coursework	22	6.0%
I would have taken fewer classes/ coursework	30	8.2%
I would have taken the same classes/ coursework, but spread over a longer time	104	28.5%
I would still have taken the same classes/ coursework in about the same amount of time	126	34.5%
Total	365	100.0%

Respondents' primary employment goals:

The respondents were presented with a list of sixteen employment goals from which they were asked to select their primary employment goal. The results are presented in Table 18. The three highest percentages of employment goals are: {1} Health Care (24.2%); {2} Teacher (20.9%); and {3} Farming, Forestry (14.2%). No respondent chose the category, "Food Preparation/ Service".

Actually, 66 people reported under the "Other" heading. These were reviewed, and most were re-assigned to existing categories. Two other categories were created: Accountant and Professional. All but eight were placed into existing or created categories.

Table 18. Respondents' Primary Employment Goals

<i>Primary Employment Goal</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Farming, Forestry	51	14.2%
Health Care	87	24.2%
Legal Services	6	1.7%
Office Personnel	7	1.9%
Personal Care/Service	2	0.6%
Process, Plant or Machine Operation	3	0.8%
Transportation	1	0.3%
Protective Services (police, fire)	1	0.3%
Management/ Senior Official	35	9.7%

Military or Government	5	1.4%
Sales or Customer Service	13	3.6%
Social Work	8	2.2%
Skilled Trades	23	6.4%
Teacher	75	20.9%
Accountant	6	1.7%
Professional	28	7.8%
Other	8	2.2%
Total	359	100.0%

Best Features of the Educational Assistance Program

One of the two final questions asked was, “What is the best thing that you can say about the Educational Assistance Program?” Three hundred twenty-nine (329) of 359 respondents chose to respond to this question. These responses were sorted into categories that were identified by reviewing all responses, and are reported in Table 19. Over 21% of the responses fell into the category of “Great Program; Big help”. Response categories related to decreasing higher education financial burden (13.7%), reducing student loans (20.4%), and lessening the financial burden of families (7.3%) were all well represented.

One of the highest numbers of responses was that many people stated they pursued or achieved education or training opportunities that they may not otherwise have pursued without the SOACDF Educational Assistance program (21.3%). There were also several comments that fell into the category of “More time for intense study” (3.0%) or “Reach goals in a shorter time” (3.0%).

<i>Best Thing</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percent</i>
People get education/ training opportunities they may not have otherwise pursued	70	21.3%
Great program; Big help	70	21.3%
Reduced student loans	67	20.4%
Less financial burden of higher education	45	13.7%
Less expenses for my family	24	7.3%
More time for intense study	10	3.0%
Reach goals in shorter time	10	3.0%
Other	33	10.0%

REPRESENTATIVE EXAMPLES OF COMMENTS FROM TABLE 19:

People get education/ training opportunities they may not have otherwise pursued

“The program motivated me to attend Ohio State ATI. Knowing that the grant money was available made my decision to attend ATI easier. The grant helped me a lot because I am paying my way through college. Without the grant I would not have been able to attend ATI.”

Great program; Big help

“It has been a blessing. My family worked hard in tobacco for many years & its been great to know how much the income helped our family then, and has helped pay for my education. Thanks!”

Reduced student loans

“The program has helped me tremendously. I have been paying my own way through college and the grant has helped pay part of my tuition. When you are in college, \$3000 means a lot less to borrow on a loan. Without the grant, it would have been difficult if not impossible for me to attend Miami University. I hope it will be available for medical school this fall. Thanks!”

Less financial burden of higher education

It helps out a lot because working a minimum wage job while going to school will not pay for my college alone. Considering I have to pay for college on my own it helps out a great deal.

Less expenses for my family

“This program helped to lessen the financial burden on my family. It helped to make me a self sufficient successful young adult.”

More time for intense study

“It has helped me tremendously with paying for college. I can focus more on my school work and grades and not have to worry about working all the time to pay for school.”

Reach goals in shorter time

“It was a great benefit to me to be able to get my license quickly and increase our family's income due to the loss of tobacco income.”

Other

“It was easy to complete the paperwork and very easy to receive the money. There were no hassles compared to other grants or scholarships.”

Suggestions for Improvement of the Educational Assistance Program

The last question requested suggestions for the improvement of the Educational Assistance Program. Two hundred forty-four (244) people wrote a response. The categories of these responses are highlighted in Table 20. Over one-third (92) of the responses were suggested changes in the Educational Assistance Program. These changes were divided into the categories of General, Application Process, Eligibility, More Money, and Market Program Better. The second highest number of responses was simply “No Comment” or “No Suggestions.” Almost one-fourth of the responses were statements to continue the Educational Assistance Program, and there were a few (16) comments that complimented the program administration.

Table 20. Suggestions by Respondents to Improve the Educational Assistance Program		
<i>Suggestion</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Suggested Changes in the Educational Assistance Program – General	17	7.0%
Suggested Changes – Application Process	16	6.6%
Suggested Changes – Eligibility	18	7.4%
Suggested Changes – More Money	29	11.9%
Suggested Changes – Market Program Better	12	4.9%
Sub-Total	92	37.7%
Continue the Program	59	24.2%
No suggestions	70	28.7%
Compliments about Program Administration	16	6.6%
Other Comments	7	2.9%
Total	244	100.0%

REPRESENTATIVE EXAMPLES OF COMMENTS FROM TABLE 20:

Suggested Changes in the Educational Assistance Program – General

“Possibly tier the program based on program/university cost. (i.e. university costs \$30,000.00 receive \$5000.00. If degree program costs \$2000 receive \$500-\$1000.)”

Suggested Changes – Application Process

“Move application process up til May or June so money could get to school by the time tuition is due for fall semester.”

Suggested Changes – Eligibility

“It should not matter whether your schooling is 2 yr or 4 yrs - the amounts should be equal. My two year "certificate" is going to cost me 30,000.00. I should get just as much help as the person going 4 year. After all 2 year or 4 year - you're still furthering your education.”

Suggested Changes – More Money

“As tuition increases there is a greater need for an increase in the amount of money from the Educational Assistance program.”

Suggested Changes – Market Program Better

“Make the Educational Assistance Program more marketable. I was not able to find out about the program until my sophomore year in college.”

Continue the Program

“Continue on. Help our farm folk my change to a better education, income. Help our young people stay on a path of education to become independent and self supporting stronger individuals make stronger county and state.”

No suggestions

“No improvements needed.”

Compliments about Program Administration

“The Educational Assistance Program helped me achieve not only my education goals but also a personal goal, graduating debt free. I would have loved to have thanked you in person!”

Conclusions:

- [1] The information from the responses summarized in this report is representative of all the Educational Assistance Grant recipients for the years 2005-2007.
- [2] About half of the people who received Educational Assistance Grants would not have pursued further, formal education without the incentive that these grant provided.
- [3] Nearly 60% of the recipients of Educational Assistance Grants were in high school or college freshmen when they first received the grant.

- [4] Almost 80% of the further education pursued by Educational Assistance Grants was for a degree, while 21% was for non-degree programs
- [5] The average Educational Assistance Grant received by participants since 2003 was \$6680.
- [6] Two-thirds of those who have used SOACDF Educational Assistance funds use the money to pay 40% or less of their total cost of classes and coursework.
- [7] 56.3% of grant recipients are qualified to apply for better jobs. Recipients also have obtained a higher paying job (32.3%) or jobs with better working conditions (16.8%). Many grant recipients feel better about themselves (53.5%) and 42.9% say that their family members are more proud of them.
- [8] The annual increase in income per year is \$6061 as reported by Educational Assistance Grant recipients.
- [9] Most (69.4%) grant recipients plan to continue to live in their home county, while only 2.2% plan to move out of the State of Ohio. About 1 in 5 do not know about their future residence plans
- [10] Almost three-fourths of the Educational Grant recipients plan to take more classes/ coursework in the future.
- [11] The Educational Assistance Grants provided the incentive for 65.4% of grant recipients to enroll in classes/ coursework, take more expensive classes/ coursework, take more classes/ coursework, and take classes/ coursework over a shorter period of time.
- [12] Many people pursue or achieved education or training opportunities they may not otherwise pursue without the SOACDF Educational Assistance program.
- [13] The majority of people who have received funds through the SOACDF Educational Assistance program either gave strong encouragement to continue the program or could not think of any suggestions for improvement the program.

APPENDIX A

Ability to Generalize to All Educational Assistance Grant Recipients:

The findings of this study would be more powerful if they can be extrapolated to the entire population of six years of SOACDF Educational Assistance grantees, rather than just to those who responded. The challenge of doing this is summarized by the phrase, “non-response error”. That is, are the results generated by only the respondents different from those that would be produced by the people who did not respond? There are several ways to address “non-response error” (Miller and Smith, 1983). Four of these methods include: [1] Getting as many responses as possible, i.e. a high response rate; [2] Compare respondents to the population; [3] Compare early to late respondents; and [4] Compare respondents to non-respondents.

High Response Rate: The response rate of this survey was 49.3 %. This is a good response, and is better than most one-contact, mailed surveys, but not good enough to allow the results to be generalized to all Educational Assistance grant recipients.

Compare Respondents To The Population: Two factors already known about the population of all grant recipients were *county of residence* and *year grant awarded*. The number of respondents was compared to the number of grants awarded in the twelve largest participating counties. The twelve largest participating counties were used because the overwhelming majority of the projects funded were from these twelve counties. The number of respondents was compared to the number of grants awarded in the years 2005 through 2007. The results are shown in Table A-1. The rank order of the “Respondents” is very similar to the rank order of the “Grants Awarded 2005-2007”, with very similar percentages. By observing the percentages (particularly those of the top seven counties which comprise 94.9% if he responses), it appears that Adams County may be slightly under-represented in the survey responses.

RESPONDENTS			GRANTS AWARDED 2005-2007		
County	Number	%	County	Number	%
Brown	134	36.40%	Brown	193	33.60%
Adams	55	14.90%	Adams	113	19.70%
Highland	49	13.30%	Gallia	74	12.90%
Gallia	45	12.20%	Highland	65	11.30%
Clermont	34	9.20%	Clermont	55	9.60%
Lawrence	20	5.40%	Lawrence	38	6.60%
Scioto	13	3.50%	Scioto	12	2.10%
Jackson	5	1.40%	Pike	9	1.60%
Pike	5	1.40%	Monroe	5	0.90%
Noble	3	0.80%	Noble	5	0.90%
Monroe	2	0.50%	Ross	3	0.50%
Ross	1	0.30%	Jackson	2	0.30%
No County Noted	2	.5%		--	--
Total	368	100.0%		574	100.0%

In Table A-2, it appears that the respondents were more likely to be those who received grants in 2005 rather than 2007. This can also be observed by the data in Table 2 of the main report.

Table A-2: Number and Percentage of Respondents Compared to Number and Percentage of Grants Actually Awarded 2005-2007

RESPONDENTS			GRANTS AWARDED		
Year	Number	%	Year	Number	%
2005	79	38.9%	2005	107	26.9%
2006	72	35.5%	2006	159	39.9%
2007	52	25.6%	2007	132	33.2%
Total	203	100.0%	Total	398	100.0%

Compare Early To Late Respondents: Respondents were tracked by the date of response. The first 50 respondents were compared to the last 50 respondents on all variables through April 11. T-tests were employed on the scale variables, and chi-square test on all nominal variables. There were no statistically significant differences on any of these variables between early and late respondents at the .05 level.

Compare Respondents To Non-Respondents: In an attempt to investigate the non-respondents, 100 addresses of Educational Assistance grant recipients were randomly selected from the non-respondents as of April 29, and a second mailing with modified cover letter, questionnaire, and pre-addressed return envelope with postage affixed was mailed to them. Through May 19, 2008, 27 were returned. The response from this group was considered to be an indication of the larger group of non-respondents. T-tests were employed on the scale variables, and chi-square test on all nominal variables. There was a statistically significant difference on only one variable between respondents and non-respondents at the .05 level – “County”. Eleven (11) of the 27 non-respondents were from Gallia County, which was inordinately high. However, given that the number of respondents from Gallia County as shown in Table A-2 was similar to the educational grants awarded in Gallia County, it was concluded that the non-respondents were similar to respondents.

Reference:

Miller, L. E., & Smith, K. L. (1983). Handling non-response issues. *Journal of Extension* [Online], 21(5). Available at: <http://www.joe.org/joe/1983september/83-5-a7.pdf> (pdf)

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire Content:



**Educational Assistance
Questionnaire
2008**



YOUR BACKGROUND with SOACDF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE:

[1] COUNTY in which you applied for an Educational Assistance grant: *(Please circle only one.)*

- | | | | | | | | |
|-------|----------|----------|----------|--------|-------|--------|--------|
| Adams | Clermont | Gallia | Jackson | Meigs | Noble | Ross | Warren |
| Brown | Clinton | Highland | Lawrence | Monroe | Pike | Scioto | |

[2] YEAR(S) you received an Educational Assistance grant: *(Please circle all that apply.)*

- | | | | | |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 |
|------|------|------|------|------|

[3] You were ELIGIBLE to receive an Educational Assistance grant because you were: *(Please check only one.)*

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> A tobacco grower | <input type="checkbox"/> In the immediate family of a tobacco grower |
| <input type="checkbox"/> A tobacco quota owner | <input type="checkbox"/> In the immediate family of a tobacco quota owner |

[4] HOW DID YOUR EDUCATIONAL GOALS CHANGE as a result of the availability of the SOACDF Educational Assistance Program? *(Please check only one.)*

- Educational goals did not change
- Decided to obtain a non-degree license or certificate
- Decided to attend a technical school for an Associate Degree
- Decided to go to a 4-year school for a Bachelor Degree
- Decided to obtain an advanced degree
- Other; Please Describe: _____

YOUR STUDENT STATUS:

[5] BEFORE you first received Educational Assistance grant, indicate your student status: *(Please check only one.)*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not enrolled in any schooling | <input type="checkbox"/> College Junior |
| <input type="checkbox"/> High School Junior | <input type="checkbox"/> College Senior |
| <input type="checkbox"/> High School Senior | <input type="checkbox"/> Masters Program |
| <input type="checkbox"/> College Freshman | <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral Program |
| <input type="checkbox"/> College Sophomore | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Professional Degree Program |

[6] For which of the following DID YOU USE the Educational Assistance dollars: *(Please check all that apply.)*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-degree training program | <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor degree |
|--|--|

- Non-degree licensure program
- Non-degree certification program
- Associate degree
- Masters degree
- Other Professional degree

[7] Since first receiving the educational assistance dollars, what has been the PROGRESS IN THE COURSEWORK for the program/degree you selected in the previous question? *(Please check all that apply.)*

- Still working on classes or coursework
- Received Certificate/ License
- Received Associate Degree
- Received Bachelor Degree
- Received Masters Degree
- Received Other Professional Degree
- Other, Please Describe: _____

[8] Approximately how much TOTAL FUNDING SINCE 2003 have you personally received from the Educational Assistance Program? *(Please check only one.)*

- \$1000
- \$2000
- \$3000
- \$4000
- \$5000
- \$6000
- \$7000
- \$8000
- \$9000
- \$10000
- \$11000
- \$12000 or more

[9] What is the APPROXIMATE PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL COST of the classes/ coursework that you have taken beyond high school that the SOACDF Educational Assistance Program has paid? *(Please check only one.)*

- 1%-20%
- 21%-40%
- 41%-60%
- 61%-80%
- 81%-100%

[10] What is your current ESTIMATED STUDENT LOAN burden? *(Check the best response.)*

- None
- Less than \$10,000
- \$10,000 – \$19,999
- \$20,000 – \$29,999
- \$30,000 – \$39,999
- \$40,000 – \$49,999
- \$50,000 – \$59,999
- \$60,000 or more

CHANGES IN YOUR LIFE:

[11] What BENEFITS have resulted from you receiving an Educational Assistance Program grant? *(Please check all that apply.)*

- I am qualified to apply for better jobs
- I am more likely to be promoted within my job
- I obtained a job with better working conditions
- I obtained a higher paying job
- I have more skills
- I have more knowledge
- I feel better about myself
- Family members are prouder of me
- I now have more free time
- Other, Please List: _____

[12] Estimate how much INCREASE in your ANNUAL GROSS INCOME that you can attribute to the coursework that you completed through the Educational Assistance program: *(Please check only one.)*

- No Increase
- \$1 to \$1000
- \$1001 to \$2000
- \$2001 to \$3000
- \$3001 to \$4000
- \$4001 to \$5000
- \$5001 to \$6000
- \$6001 to \$7000
- \$7001 to \$8000
- \$8001 to \$9000
- \$9001 to \$10,000
- If \$10,000 or more, Please Estimate \$ _____

[13] Once you complete(d) all requirements for the certificate or degree program in which you enrolled, please indicate YOUR FUTURE RESIDENCE PLANS: *(Please check only one.)*

Continue to live in my home county Move to a location outside of Ohio
 Move to an Ohio location outside my home county Don't Know

[14] Do you PLAN TO TAKE MORE CLASSES/ COURSEWORK in the future? *(Circle one.)*

Yes No Don't Know

[15] How would you have progressed in your classes IF YOU HAD NOT RECEIVED the Educational Assistance funds? *(Please check the BEST description.)*

I would not have enrolled for the classes/ coursework that I completed
 I would have taken less expensive classes/ coursework
 I would have taken fewer classes/ coursework
 I would have taken the same classes/ coursework, but spread over a longer time
 I would still have taken the same classes/ coursework in about the same amount of time

[16] Once you complete(d) all requirements for the certificate or degree program in which you enrolled, please indicate YOUR PRIMARY EMPLOYMENT GOAL: *(Please check only one.)*

<input type="checkbox"/> Farming, Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/> Protective Services (police, fire)
<input type="checkbox"/> Food Preparation/ Service	<input type="checkbox"/> Management/ Senior Official
<input type="checkbox"/> Health Care	<input type="checkbox"/> Military or Government
<input type="checkbox"/> Legal Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Sales or Customer Service
<input type="checkbox"/> Office Personnel (secretarial)	<input type="checkbox"/> Social Work
<input type="checkbox"/> Personal Care/Service (e.g. hair salon)	<input type="checkbox"/> Skilled Trades (constr'n, automotive, etc.)
<input type="checkbox"/> Process, Plant or Machine Operation	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher
<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation (driver, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Other, Please Describe: _____

AND FINALLY:

[17] How old are you? *(Please write in number of years.)* _____ Years Old

[18] Current marital status: *(Please check only one.)*

Married Divorced Separated Widowed Never Married

[19] What is the best thing that you can say about the Educational Assistance Program?

[20] What suggestions do you have to improve the Educational Assistance Program?

THANK YOU!!
Please Return to: SOACDF
PO Box 47
Hillsboro, OH 45133

Code # _____

APPENDIX C

Suggestions for Improvement from Question 20:

Suggested Changes in the Educational Assistance Program – General

1 Offer more opportunity (not just quota growers, owners or family members) somehow extend availability of EAP. Offer \$ on a more frequent basis for those that are on quarter hours or those that go all year round. So that they can benefit from EAP.

2 Extend availability of EAP to others in family. Offer \$ on a more frequent basis for those that are on a quarter hour or those that go all year round so that they can benefit from the EAP.

3 I took the computer class and was well satisfied with the teacher and class, but the computer I got was another matter. As I'm not fully dependent on a computer, it worked fine for the 90 day warranty period, but shortly after I couldn't use the internet at all. In the end I had to hook up my old one. Suggestion - provide a voucher for \$xxx amount to be used for the purchase of a computer of one's choice.

4 Would love to see the grant expanded to age 25. I cannot get it next year because I cannot be a dependent on my parents' taxes. Thank you so much for the grants. They have been heaven sent.

5 Include horse training again.

6 Continue the programs with more and more intense and in-depth classes. Thank you.

7 More diverse classes.

8 Continue program and expand to allow continued educational opportunities.

9 I have a son who is in college with full tuition paid by an academic scholarship. It would be nice if this money was available for other expenses related to college (eg, housing)!

10 Continue with "hands on" type courses & class work.

11 Pre pay for certificate classes.

12 More classes.

13 Possibly tier the program based on program/university cost. (i.e. university costs \$30,000.00 receive \$5000.00. If degree program costs \$2000 receive \$500-\$1000.)

14 Consider alternate energy courses

15 Persuade state officials not to make anymore budget cuts.

16 The classes should be longer (more hours)

17 When the award money is sent to the university it is listed as a scholarship. A true "scholarship grant" is not taxed. It needs to be listed as other since I pay taxes on the award money.

Suggested Changes – Application Process

18 Move application process up til May or June so money could get to school by the time tuition is due for fall semester

19 Save information from year to year! There is so much information to send. Start process in June instead of July. My school starts early in Aug.

20 I think the applications need to go out earlier, so the grant money is available for the first quarter of the school year.

21 If you could send notification by mail or email when applications are available this would keep the phone calls down & frustration level for applicant.

22 Extend timeline so students can better qualify for summer classes.

23 I think that the school should be able to process all applications. Instead of pre application process at the office.

24 Faster turn around after paperwork is complete.

- 25 None, except at times it was difficult to register for classes when the University had to have payment before I could sign up.
- 26 Have the application process earlier in June so one can rely on money available or not. Thank you very much!
- 27 Being able to receive/submit the application for grant earlier in the year so that the grant will be applied at the beginning of the school year instead of in the middle of the semester.
- 28 Earlier application process. No I pick up the application in July. This current school year I started in August with the fall semester. So the funds could not be applied to my tuition until after that.
- 29 Not to have to complete the FAFSA
- 30 Improve the speed of notifying the recipient of the grant. It took 3-4 months before I received notification.
- 31 I sent the application in in Oct. I still have not gotten it approved. There seems to be personnel problems in Portsmouth. They say they will call back on a recording and in person but never do. They have been difficult to contact and in general have had very poor communications in getting the application processed and approved.
- 32 If the applying part was easier it would have been more helpful too.
- 33 The red tape! Our daughter's college did not keep up with getting the paper work completed in a timely manner!

Suggested Changes – Eligibility

- 34 I have taken a career training class which costs over \$12,000 for the year. I feel the program needs to consider the course study. I am only eligible for the \$1000 grant even though it is a strong and expensive course.
- 35 Remove the restriction on degreed vs. non-degreed. Not everyone needs a degree.
Christopher D. Rogers
- 36 Keep it going. Allow children who have grown & no longer dependents to receive money because they help as a family unit even if their name wasn't on the list as grower.
- 37 Give same amount to quota owners as growers.
- 38 Allow immediate family members continue to receive the grant after marriage and/or living outside of the tobacco grower's home.
- 39 It should not matter whether your schooling is 2 yr or 4 yrs - the amounts should be equal. My two year "certificate" is going to cost me 30,000.00. I should get just as much help as the person going 4 year. After all 2 year or 4 year - you're still furthering your education.
- 40 Should be an equal amount per person instead of per family.
- 41 Allow candidates to take more courses up to the amount of the grant. Start a trust fund for children of eligible candidates who are not of age for secondary education. Since my children are younger I am unable to get college funding for them. While others can. This is age discrimination.
- 42 Offer my farming course locally to improve farming. Let your children use your unused money to finish their educational goals.
- 43 I was planning to take more of these classes, but now I will not be able to since I will not have the money necessary because the amount was reduced for those not seeking a degree. Maybe there could be a difference between regular college classes and farm classes.
- 44 To have an understanding that not all who apply will come out with a degree. That there are different types of certifications or licenses that a person can receive to attach to the degree that they currently have, especially if that person is a teacher.
- 45 Keep the funding equal for all bother growing and quota owners.
- 46 Extend program to students that are married. Thank you for helping me with getting a better education.

- 47 If you plan to stay in college for a long time you should be able to get more money for tuition.
- 48 LPN programs should get the full \$3000/yr just as hard & expensive as RN program.
- 49 LPN education should get the full 3,000.00
- 50 I suggest that the money be for tuition and books, not just tuition. Books can be very expensive in a person's college career.
- 51 Offer more towards non-degree such as firefighter.

Suggested Changes – More Money

- 52 To be able to apply & receive additional funds to help pay for college.
- 53 Of course, more money each year.
- 54 College tuition is so high and increasing every year - it would be very helpful to increase the amount eligible in the Educational Assistance Program.
- 55 Wish it was more money.
- 56 Increase funding.
- 57 Let there be an option for parents allotment to be used for additional education assistance for their children (about the \$10,000) if they don't have any plans of going to college. An example is my parents are both over 50 and don't have any intention to further their education so I could use that money to finish college.
- 58 More \$ available for graduate school. Not having to claim it a income on parent's tax return!
- 59 I think taking the financial award from 3000.00 to 1000.00 was not a good decision. Our Governor Ted Strickland believes that education is the primary building block for the student. The are I live in but due to the profession I choose the fund was reduced by 66%. Year before I would have received full 3000.00.
- 60 Increase the amount of money given to tobacco grower/owners' dependents.
- 61 As tuition increases there is a greater need for an increase in the amount of money from the Educational Assistance program.
- 62 Could always increase the annual award amount.
- 63 More money. Financial assistance to help live after graduation until find employment. (short term assistance)
- 64 Need funding for 4 quarter not just three.
- 65 Some kids need more money for school with the price of gas so they can get back and forth.
- 66 I'd like to get my PhD but \$3000 is not enough to make a dent!
- 67 Give more assistance.
- 68 Since I'm in professional school the tuition is about double. It would be great if this assistance program would increase w/it.
- 69 Please keep it going & possibly increase available amounts since college tuition is increasing so much.
- 70 More money
- 71 More money
- 72 Increase the monetary amount for graduate degrees.
- 73 Continue the program and maybe pay more for advanced education i.e. master's, PhD.
- 74 If possible, increase the amount and continue the program so I can get my PhD.
- 75 Provide more money during the academic year.
- 76 More money for varied expenses.
- 77 A full year grant would be nice so I don't have to worry about all the school loans when I get out.
- 78 I wish it could pay for everything and if you don't get the grades you have to repay.
- 79 Any increase in the amount paid out is always a plus.

80 I would like to see the amount increased to \$5000 per year.

Suggested Changes – Market Program Better

81 Make the Educational Assistance Program more marketable. I was not able to find out about the program until my sophomore year in college.

82 A website where you could have access to the forms and be able to fill them out online and send to you.

83 Better communication on program availability and qualification.

84 Be more publicized so everyone is aware of all classes & date. The only way to find out about those is word of mouth. Advertise in the paper so everyone has a fair chance at the assistance program.

85 Increased visibility of the program and it's workings, as well as increased availability of funds.

86 Make more people aware of this assistance and make help available for them to apply.

87 Letting public know about the program.

88 The schools need to know more about the program. It's always a fight to get UC to get the money.

89 It was hard to find and luckily stumbled across it. It could be more easily accessed.

90 We found out about the program by chance thru conversation on another topic. Perhaps if I knew about it earlier a few more classes.

91 To let more farm students know this is available to them as freshmen. Thank you for having this available for me.

92 I suggest that the SOACDF promotes this grant to FFA Chapters or 4-H clubs in the counties included in the program.