



Policy Analysis on College Access for Low-Income Students in the United States

Mengchen Li

Department of English, School of Foreign Languages, Renmin University of China, Beijing,
100872, P.R. China

Email: iris.limengchen@outlook.com

Abstract. Higher education is a crucial pathway for social mobility and economic growth. College access for low-income students has thus gained major attention. This study examines U.S. policies supporting college readiness for children from low-income backgrounds. Findings show these policies effectively expand educational opportunities. They establish support systems, implement long-term tracking, and promote cross-sector collaboration. The impact appears in higher college enrollment rates. Policies also shift educational perceptions and improve intergenerational mobility among low-income families. However, the burden of complexity in policy implementation and systemic imbalances in resource allocation limit their effectiveness. To address these issues, this study suggests two main strategies: creating a differentiated empowerment framework and developing streamlined, transparent policy designs. These measures aim to improve policy impact through institutional innovation. Findings offer theoretical and practical insights to rebuild educational support systems, promote educational equity, and advance social mobility.

Keywords: Higher Education; College Access; Low-Income Families; Education Policy; Educational Equity

1 Introduction

Higher education plays a crucial role in advancing individuals' socioeconomic status and driving overall national economic growth. Despite significant progress in expanding access to higher education in the United States over the past decades, inequalities in college enrollment opportunities remain a pressing issue [1].

This inequality reflects broader socioeconomic disparities. In the U.S., students from high-income families (top 20%) are 5.3 times more likely to attend college than those from low-income families (bottom 20%) [2]. Many low-income students face limited educational resources and poor learning environments. They often lack vital information about college applications and financial aid [3]. These barriers severely restrict their opportunities for upward social mobility.

Recognizing the gravity of this issue, the U.S. government and educational institutions have implemented a series of intervention policies. These policies focus on early

intervention, providing low-income students with academic support, financial aid, and college guidance [4]. Research indicates that students who participate in these programs show significant improvements in academic performance and enrollment rates [1] [4]. However, inequalities in college access persist, and some disparities have even worsened [5].

Thus, a thorough examination of these intervention policies is essential. This study aims to systematically analyze U.S. pre-college intervention policies targeting children from low-income families. It reviews policy features, evaluates outcomes, and explores implementation challenges. Based on these findings, the study offers recommendations to optimize policies. The findings aim to provide valuable insights for policymakers and serve as a reference for other regions facing similar challenges.

2 Literature Review

The United States has long worked to close gaps in educational opportunity, with particular focus on policies targeting low-income groups. Research on policies supporting college readiness for low-income students in the U.S. primarily centers around three main areas: financial support, student skill development, and the institutional policy environment.

2.1 Research on Financial Support Policies

Federal grants and other financial aid programs are widely recognized as effective means to increase college access for low-income students [6]. Denning et al. found that an increase of \$1,000 in grants raises the college graduation rate of low-income students by 4.7 percentage points [7]. A study by Smith et al. confirms the lasting impact of financial support, showing that a degree from a public four-year university significantly improves future income for these students [8]. However, funding levels and coverage remain limited, and many low-income students still face heavy debt [9]. Regarding resource allocation efficiency, studies show that funding effectiveness varies with institution type and use. The impact of additional education funding varies by institution type and how funds are utilized. For example, in community colleges, allocating extra funds to student services rather than instructional expenses yields better outcomes [10]. This insight offers implications for optimizing resource allocation.

2.2 Research on Skill Development

While financial aid reduces economic barriers, low-income students still face challenges in academic preparation, social-emotional skills, and self-efficacy [4]. Early interventions improve cognitive skills with long-term effects [11]. Structured academic mentoring enhances academic performance and course completion rates. In non-cognitive areas, social-emotional programs help students build interpersonal and emotional skills [12]. A nationwide study by Yeager et al. shows that a growth mindset strengthens

students' resilience in academic challenges, especially among disadvantaged groups [13].

2.3 Research on Institutional Policy Environment

At the macro level, studies on institutional policy environments assess the impact of policy frameworks. Nationally, educational accountability policies have improved education quality for disadvantaged groups [14]. Programs like GEAR UP play a key role in enhancing readiness and easing the transition to college [15]. State-level innovations, such as the "Early College" model, reduce barriers by allowing credit transfers and other flexible mechanisms [16].

Despite these insights, gaps remain. Research is often fragmented, lacking a comprehensive framework. Most studies focus on single policies or programs and rarely examine the combined effects of different interventions. There is also limited attention to challenges in policy implementation, which restricts the practical impact of research findings. This study aims to integrate current policies, identify shared characteristics, and assess their effectiveness, providing theoretical and empirical support for policy optimization.

3 Overview of U.S. College Readiness Policies for Low-Income Students

U.S. policies on college readiness for low-income students date back to the 1960s' "Great Society" initiatives, aimed at addressing the educational disadvantages faced by low-income and minority students. In the early 1960s, students from high-income families (top 25% income bracket) were 2.5 times more likely to attend college than those from low-income families (bottom 25%) [17]. This disparity prompted policymakers to implement systematic interventions, leading to key initiatives like the TRIO and GEAR UP programs. Current U.S. college readiness policies are characterized by three main features: comprehensive support, long-term intervention, and cross-sector collaboration.

3.1 Comprehensive Support

U.S. college readiness policies emphasize broad support. Perna and Thomas introduced a conceptual model for college readiness and success. It shows that college enrollment and achievement are influenced by personal, family, school, and societal environments [18]. Studies have found that programs offering multiple services are more effective at increasing college enrollment and academic achievement than single-service programs [19]. TRIO is a prime example. It includes sub-programs like Upward Bound, Talent Search, and Student Support Services, each targeting specific needs in academics, college information, and post-enrollment support. TRIO provides tutoring and develops critical thinking skills, leading to significant gains in test scores and advanced course participation [20]. It also builds social-emotional skills, helping students gain cultural

and social capital for understanding higher education. Increased family engagement also boosts student enrollment [21].

3.2 Long-Term Intervention

A key feature of college readiness policies is sustained support. Students receive guidance and resources throughout their educational journey. St. John et al. explain that low-income students' success requires building academic, social, and cultural capital [22]. GEAR UP starts as early as seventh grade and continues into the first college year, offering targeted support to help students build essential skills. Long-term intervention has proven effective. GEAR UP students show improved graduation and college enrollment rates [23]. TRIO's Student Support Services further assist students after enrollment, helping them complete their degrees.

3.3 Cross-Sector Collaboration

College readiness policies require tight coordination across federal, state, and local levels. This approach combines resources from government, educational institutions, and community organizations into a unified support system. GEAR UP, for example, requires partnerships with businesses and colleges to extend services. Collaboration also covers funding and policy oversight. The federal government funds GEAR UP, supporting local agencies in project setup, while local agencies manage daily operations. Joint evaluation mechanisms ensure effective program implementation [24].

4 Advantages of College Readiness Policies

U.S. college readiness policies for low-income students have shown multiple benefits, particularly in expanding access to higher education, promoting students' holistic development, and fostering equitable distribution of educational resources.

First, these policies have significantly increased college access for low-income students. In the U.S., children from low-income families have long lagged behind their higher-income peers in higher education opportunities [25]. Students from high-income families complete college degrees at a rate 45 percentage points higher than those from low-income families [26]. Through systematic interventions, this gap is gradually narrowing. At a foundational level, policies remove direct barriers by offering financial aid and simplifying application processes. Providing FAFSA completion assistance and personalized financial aid information to low-income families can increase college enrollment [27]. This support not only influences enrollment decisions but also shapes college choice behavior: when students feel confident in securing ongoing financial support, they are more likely to choose higher-quality institutions and show stronger academic persistence. This "upward matching" phenomenon enables low-income students to access higher-quality education and broader development opportunities.

Second, college readiness policies have strengthened students' overall development. These policies help students build academic skills and the essential competencies

needed for success in higher education. Program participants show clear advantages, developing effective learning strategies and a positive academic mindset. Carefully designed intervention mechanisms foster students' resilience and confidence in learning. When faced with academic challenges, these students use proactive coping strategies and show greater persistence and adaptability. Studies confirm that these non-cognitive gains are especially impactful for low-income students, helping them overcome limitations in resources and support [28]. These skills also impact career outcomes. Studies show that students in college readiness programs exhibit strong planning skills and adaptability, have more promotion opportunities early in their careers, and report higher job satisfaction [29].

Third, college readiness policies promote intergenerational educational mobility by reshaping resource distribution. Traditional resource allocation often reinforces existing socioeconomic gaps, leaving low-income communities with fewer quality resources. College readiness policies are addressing this issue by strategically directing resources to these communities. These policies not only increase learning resources for low-income students but also build a broader support system by integrating resources from colleges, communities, and businesses. This redistribution has a multi-layered impact. For individual students, access to advanced courses, research opportunities, and specialized academic guidance improves [30]. These initiatives also enhance educational institutions' ability to serve low-income students. More profoundly, these policies are altering patterns of intergenerational educational opportunity. According to cultural capital theory, family attitudes, values, and behaviors toward education are passed down, impacting the next generation's educational attainment [31]. College readiness policies foster this cultural capital by reshaping family involvement in education. Research shows that families involved in TRIO programs improve educational outcomes and adopt values and behaviors that positively impact the next generation [20].

5 Challenges in Policy Implementation

5.1 Systemic Imbalance in Resource Allocation

College readiness policies show a deep imbalance in resource distribution. The current "competitive grant" model, based on application, aims to promote fair competition. However, in practice, it often reinforces existing educational resource gaps. Regions with stronger application capabilities and prior resources are more likely to secure project funding. In contrast, areas lacking a strong resource foundation struggle to compete effectively. Empirical studies show that about 65% of federal education funds are directed to institutions already equipped with substantial resources, which exacerbates institutional gaps [32]. Furthermore, certain programs select students who are already relatively well-prepared, as they tend to show better outcomes, while students in greatest need are often overlooked due to their more complex support requirements. This allocation pattern strays from the policy's primary goal, as it fails to reach those most in need of support. Institutional constraints on resource use also limit efficient utilization. The current policy framework imposes rigid guidelines on resource allocation,

restricting institutions' ability to adapt resources to actual needs. This one-size-fits-all management approach reduces overall resource effectiveness [33].

5.2 Complexity Burden in Policy Execution

College readiness policies add new elements to enhance precision and comprehensive coverage, but this complexity has become a major barrier for low-income students. Currently, the application process for these policies is more complex than most tax filings, yet these procedures have minimal impact on funding decisions [27]. The complicated application process imposes a high psychological transaction cost on low-income families. Completing the required steps alone takes 16–20 hours, excluding time for document collection and waiting for review. This burden disproportionately affects groups lacking social capital and information resources. Studies show that simple application assistance can significantly increase enrollment. A 10-minute, low-cost intervention of less than \$100 raised immediate enrollment rates by 8 percentage points and increased long-term retention [34]. Yet current policy design has moved in the opposite direction. It has increased the gap in college access between high- and low-income families, even surpassing the inequality levels of the 1960s.

6 Targeted Recommendations

6.1 Establish a Tiered Empowerment Mechanism for Resource Allocation

The current resource allocation model requires restructuring to address systemic imbalances. A tiered empowerment mechanism that considers regional development levels and specific needs could replace the competitive grant approach. This model would support a more balanced and effective distribution of resources.

The core of the tiered mechanism is a multi-level support structure. This structure should classify regions according to their educational resources and student needs, prioritizing support for areas with weaker resources. Evidence shows that differentiated resource allocation effectively improves educational equity. When resource allocation reflects regional differences, students in disadvantaged areas gain better access, academic performance, and degree completion rates [35].

Increasing local autonomy is also critical. Removing rigid funding restrictions and introducing a flexible usage quota would allow local authorities to adjust resources based on real needs. Educational institutions have shown that increased local control enables them to tailor support to their students' needs, resulting in more effective outcomes [36].

6.2 Implement Clear and Simple Policy Design

Simplifying policy design requires more than streamlining procedures; it should reduce cognitive burdens on applicants while maintaining policy effectiveness.

One essential step is to simplify the funding formula itself. Determining aid currently involves excessive complexity, though research by Colas et al. shows that reliable aid distribution can rely on two key indicators: family income and basic financial status. Simplified formulas based on income and assets minimize negative incentives for family savings and work [37]. Modern data systems also make it possible to determine eligibility through tax data. This allows students to understand their aid earlier, essential for low-income families planning for education. Research from Baum and Scott-Clayton highlights that relying on prior tax data lets families make more informed enrollment decisions and reduces the psychological stress of the application process [38].

A structured, tiered support system would further enhance simplification efforts. At the basic level, clear communication of core financial aid information ensures that families quickly understand their eligibility. Beyond this foundation, additional support layers can be adapted to address the unique needs of different applicant groups.

7 Conclusion

This study systematically examines U.S. college readiness policies for children from low-income families and reveals the deeper processes through which education policies promote social equity. Findings indicate that effective readiness policies not only expand educational opportunities but also transform family attitudes and behaviors toward education. This shift promotes the intergenerational accumulation of cultural capital, driving social mobility at a deeper level. However, policy effectiveness is often constrained by the complexities of implementation and structural imbalances in resource distribution.

The proposed strategies of tiered empowerment and policy simplification represent a rethinking of educational resource allocation. As socioeconomic inequality continues to grow, reforming college readiness policies becomes increasingly urgent. Future research should focus on long-term assessments of policy outcomes. Investigating regional innovations in policy could also offer valuable insights for institutional improvements. Comparative studies on innovative policy models would further enrich pathways to achieving educational equity.

References

1. Cahalan, M., Perna, L. W., Yamashita, M., Wright-Kim, J., & Jiang, N. (2024). Indicators of Higher Education Equity in the United States: 2024 Historical Trend Report. *Pell Institute for the Study of Opportunity in Higher Education*. https://www.pellinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/PELL_2024_Indicators-Report_f.pdf
2. Black, S. E., Denning, J. T., Dettling, L., Goodman, S., & Turner, L. J. (2023). Taking It to the Limit: Effects of Increased Student Loan Availability on Attainment, Earnings, and Financial Well-Being. *The American Economic Review*, 113(12), 3357–3400. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20210926>
3. Dynarski, S., Nurshatayeva, A., Page, L. C., & Scott-Clayton, J. (2023). Addressing nonfinancial barriers to college access and success: Evidence and policy implications. In E. A. Hanushek, S. Machin, & L. Woessmann (Eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Education*

- (Vol. 6, pp. 193–257). Elsevier. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1574069222000071>
4. Herbaut, E., & Geven, K. (2020). What works to reduce inequalities in higher education? A systematic review of the (quasi-)experimental literature on outreach and financial aid. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 65, 100442. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rssm.2019.100442>
 5. Farquharson, C., McNally, S., & Tahir, I. (2024). Education inequalities. *Oxford Open Economics*, 3(Supplement_1), i760–i820. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ooec/odad029>
 6. Frantz, J. (2021). *Equity indicators report reveals systemic barriers to college access and success for low-income and non-traditional students | penn GSE*. www.gse.upenn.edu. <https://www.gse.upenn.edu/news/press-releases/higher-education-equity-indicators-report-2021>
 7. Denning, J. T., Marx, B. M., & Turner, L. J. (2019). ProPelled: The Effects of Grants on Graduation, Earnings, and Welfare. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 11(3), 193–224. <https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20180100>
 8. Smith, J., Goodman, J., & Hurwitz, M. (2020). *The Economic Impact of Access to Public Four-Year Colleges*. National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w27177>
 9. Zhang, H. (2024). Examining the Disconnect Between College Access and Choice: Low-income Chinese Students Amid Massification. *Higher Education Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-023-00340-1>
 10. Johnson, C., Gitay, R., Abdel-Salam, A. G., BenSaid, A., Ismail, R., Naji Al-Tameemi, R. A., Romanowski, M. H., Kazem Al Fakih, B. M., & Al Hazaa, K. (2022). Student support in higher education: campus service utilization, impact, and challenges. *Heliyon*, 8(12), e12559.
 11. Feygin, A., Miller, T., Bettinger, E., & Dell, M. (2022). *Advising for College Success: A Systematic Review of the Evidence*. College Completion Network; College Completion Network. Available from: American Institutes for Research. 1400 Crystal Drive 10th Floor, Arlington, VA 22202; Tel: 202-403-5000; e-mail: CNN@air.org; web site: <https://collegecompletionnetwork.org/>. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED626933>
 12. Calhoun, B., Williams, J., Greenberg, M., Domitrovich, C., Russell, M. A., & Fishbein, D. H. (2020). Social Emotional Learning Program Boosts Early Social and Behavioral Skills in Low-Income Urban Children. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.561196>
 13. Yeager, D. S., Hanselman, P., & Walton, G. M. (2019). A national experiment reveals where a growth mindset improves achievement. *Nature*, 573(573). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1466-y>
 14. Hutchings, M. (2021). Accountability, social justice and educational research. *Educational Research for Social Justice*, 45–78. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-62572-6_3
 15. Leuwerke, W. C., Ingleby, L. D., Tillery, C. Y., Cech, T. G., & Sibaouih, C. M. (2021). Narrowing the College Readiness Gap: Assessing GEAR UP Iowa's Intermediate Impact on Underserved Students. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2021.1884864>
 16. Hemelt, S. W., & Swiderski, T. (2021). College Comes to High School: Participation and Performance in Tennessee's Innovative Wave of Dual-Credit Courses. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 44(2), 313–341. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737211052310>
 17. Perna, L. W., & Kurban, E. R. (2013). Improving college access and choice. In L. W. Perna & A. P. Jones (Eds.), *The state of college access and completion: Improving college success for students from underrepresented groups* (pp. 10-33). Routledge.

18. Perna, L. W., & Thomas, S. L. (2009). Barriers to college opportunity: The unintended consequences of state-mandated testing. *Educational Policy*, 23(3), 451-479. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904807312470>
19. Rosinger, K., Ortagus, J., Kelchen, R., & Choi, J. (2023). The Impact of Performance Funding Policy Design on College Access and Selectivity. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 45(4), 016237372211479. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737221147905>
20. Garcia, N., & Cuellar, S. (2023). First-Generation College Students' Motivations to Succeed: An Analysis of Experiences with TRIO Programs Through a Self-Determination Theory Perspective. *Journal of First-generation Student Success*, 3, 177 - 192.
21. Tompsett, J., & Knoester, C. (2023). Family socioeconomic status and college attendance: A consideration of individual-level and school-level pathways. *PLOS ONE*, 18(4), e0284188. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0284188>
22. St, E. P., Fisher, A. S., & Shouping Hu. (2011). *Breaking through the access barrier : how academic capital formation can improve policy in higher education*. Routledge.
23. Xu, Z., Backes, B., & Goldhaber, D. (2023). The Impact of Transition Intervention in High School on Pathways Through College. *Community College Review*, 51(2), 216-245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00915521221145325>
24. Bowman, N. A., Kim, S., Ingleby, L., Ford, D. C., & Sibauuih, C. (2018). Improving College Access at Low-Income High Schools? The Impact of GEAR UP Iowa on Postsecondary Enrollment and Persistence. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 40(3), 399-419. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373718778133>
25. Levine, P. B., & Ritter, D. (2022). *The Racial Wealth Gap, Financial Aid, and College Access*. National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w30490>
26. Bailey, M. J., & Dynarski, S. M. (2011). Gains and gaps: Changing inequality in US college entry and completion (No. w17633). *National Bureau of Economic Research*. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w17633>
27. Chiu, J. (2022). Simplifying Financial Resource Applications for Low-Income College Students with Return-Free Filing. *Aleph, UCLA Undergraduate Research Journal for the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.5070/1619158740>
28. Liu, J., Kuhfeld, M., & Lee, M. (2023). Noncognitive Factors and Student Long-Run Success: Comparing the Predictive Validity of Observable Academic Behaviors and Social-Emotional Skills. *Educational Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08959048231209262>
29. Edin, P.-A., Fredriksson, P., Nybom, M., & Öckert, B. (2022). The Rising Return to Non-cognitive Skill. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 14(2), 78-100. <https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20190199>
30. Moreno, M., McKinney, L., Rangel, V. S., Burrridge, A., & Carales, V. D. (2022). The Impact of Academic Momentum on Postsecondary Matriculation among Early College High School Students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2022.2035852>
31. Lareau, A. (2011). *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life (2nd ed.)*. University of California Press.
32. Hillman, N., & Corral, D. (2017). The equity implications of paying for performance in higher education. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 61(14), 1757-1772. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764217744834>
33. Daumann, F., Follert, F., & Wassermann, A. (2023). The Road to Hell Is Paved with Good Intentions: Modeling Grant Competition between Universities. *Economies*, 11(3), 81. <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies11030081>
34. Bettinger, E. P., Long, B. T., Oreopoulos, P., & Sanbonmatsu, L. (2012). The role of application assistance and information in college decisions: Results from the H&R Block FAFSA

- experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(3), 1205–1242. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjs017>
35. Atchison, D., & Levin, J. (2022). Missed Opportunities: Weighted Student Funding Systems and Resource Equity. *Journal of Education Human Resources*. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jehr-2021-0056>
 36. Roza, M., & Knight, D. S. (2022). Behold the Role of the District in Education Finance. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 97(4), 391–394. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956x.2022.2125752>
 37. Colas, M., Findeisen, S., & Sachs, D. (2021). Optimal Need-Based Financial Aid. *Journal of Political Economy*, 129(2), 492–533. <https://doi.org/10.1086/711952>
 38. Baum, S., & Scott-Clayton, J. (2013). *Redesigning the Pell Grant Program for the twenty-first century* (Discussion Paper No. 2013-04). The Hamilton Project, Brookings Institution.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

