Bipartisan Policy Center

Assessing Alternative Allocation Strategies in Campus-Based Financial Aid

Tristan Stein

DECEMBER 2024

HUMAN CAPITAL PROGRAM

The Bipartisan Policy Center's Human Capital Program is working to ensure that every American, from early childhood through the classroom and career, has the knowledge, skills, and tools they need to access their full potential.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Bipartisan Policy Center thanks the Lumina Foundation and ECMC Foundation for their generous support. The author is grateful to BPC fellow Robert Kelchen for providing the data analysis for this issue brief and for his calculations of the impact of alternative allocation strategies, and thanks BPC colleagues Caitlin Codella Low and Luci Manning for their guidance and helpful feedback. The author also appreciates the dedicated research assistance from former BPC policy analyst Arianna Fano.

DISCLAIMER

The findings expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views or opinions of BPC's founders or its board of directors.

Table of Contents

4 INTRODUCTION

5 CAMPUS-BASED AID PROGRAMS

6 DISPARITIES IN CAMPUS-BASED AID ALLOCATIONS

7 ADDRESSING DISPARITIES

12 CONCLUSION

13 APPENDIX: METHODOLOGICAL SUMMARY FOR ALTERNATIVE ALLOCATION ANALYSES

14 ENDNOTES

Introduction

The federal government allocates about $2 billion annually to colleges and universities through two financial aid programs—Federal Work-Study (FWS) and the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG).[1] These programs are an important source of financial aid for many low-income students. But the allocation formulas, which are heavily influenced by historical funding levels and cost of attendance, are outdated and regressive. As a result, campus-based aid allocations provide a disproportionate share of resources to wealthier and higher-cost institutions and do not effectively direct dollars to institutions serving the largest share of low-income students.

FWS supports part-time employment opportunities for eligible students. It provided aid to approximately 430,000 students in 2021–2022, while SEOG, which helps students with exceptional financial need, served more than 1.8 million students that academic year.

This issue brief highlights the allocation disparities in campus-based aid and the potential effects of alternative allocation strategies.[2] It explains how the funding formulas work, shows how much aid they allocate to public four-year and two-year institutions, as well as to private nonprofit and for-profit institutions. The brief also estimates the impact of alternative strategies on campus-based aid funding to the different postsecondary sectors.[3]

Notably, the most selective 58 private nonprofits received almost 9% of FWS funds while accounting for only about 1% of "Pell completions"—the number of Pell recipients who complete a degree or certificate. Conversely, community colleges received about 18% of FWS dollars and 25% of SEOG and were responsible for 39% of Pell completions. Basing allocations on Pell enrollment or completion would approximately double the share of FWS dollars going to community colleges.

Campus-Based Aid Programs

Unlike most federal financial aid, which is distributed to students based on financial need, FWS and SEOG funds are allocated to institutions, which then determine how much aid to award each eligible student. Although policymakers have modified the allocation methodology several times since their creation in the mid-1960s, the current allocation formulas have changed little since 1986.[4]

Two primary factors determine campus-based aid funding formulas:

1. **Historical Funding Levels:** Institutions receive a substantial portion of their funding based on previous years' amounts.[5] This **base guarantee** ensures that institutions receive at least as much funding as they did in prior years—currently based on allocations from fiscal year 1999—regardless of changes in student enrollment or financial need. Although Congress originally conceived of the base guarantee as a provision that would phase out, it continues to determine the core of institutional allocations.[6]
2. **Fair Share Calculation:** After the base guarantee is determined, remaining FWS and SEOG funds are allocated through a **fair share formula**. The formulas for FWS and SEOG differ, but both programs allocate funding based on each institution's share of total national financial need as determined by the institution's average cost of attendance and the average expected family contribution (EFC) for attending students. The U.S. Department of Education uses income bands that were last updated in 1994 to estimate students' EFC, a measure of how much a student and their family can afford to pay for college.[7]

Both elements of the campus-based aid funding formulas contribute to disparities in allocations. The base guarantee benefits institutions with a long participation history. The fair share formula benefits institutions with higher tuition prices. Newer institutions (which often serve higher percentages of low-income students), those whose enrollments have increased in recent decades, and lower-cost institutions generally receive smaller awards. The resulting allocation disparities mean that FWS and SEOG funds often fail to reach students who could benefit from them the most.[a]

---

[a] Studies suggest that FWS recipients have higher rates of completion than their peers, with the strongest effect for low-income recipients and students at public institutions. See Judith Scott-Clayton and Rachel Yang Zhou, *Does the Federal Work-Study Program Really Work—and for Whom?* Center for Analysis of Postsecondary Education and Employment, March 2017. Available at: https://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/capsee-does-fws-program-really-work.pdf.

Disparities in Campus-Based Aid Allocations

Current campus-based aid allocations do not target institutions serving the largest number of low-income students. Instead, private nonprofit colleges and universities—especially highly selective institutions—receive a disproportionate share of FWS and SEOG dollars. Community colleges receive a considerably smaller share of FWS and SEOG dollars than their share of undergraduate enrollment.

Table 1: Trends in SEOG and FWS awards and enrollment by sector.

Academic Year and Characteristic	4-year public	2-year public	Private nonprofit	For-profit
2001–2002				
SEOG	34.6%	18.4%	41.5%	5.5%
FWS	39.1%	16.6%	42.4%	1.9%
Undergrad enrollment	30.6%	50.6%	14.3%	4.5%
Total enrollment	34.1%	44.1%	17.6%	4.2%
2011–2012				
SEOG	28.2%	22.1%	33.9%	15.8%
FWS	34.4%	18.5%	40.7%	6.4%
Undergrad enrollment	28.4%	47.6%	13.7%	10.3%
Total enrollment	31.2%	41.7%	17.2%	9.9%
2021–2022				
SEOG	32.5%	24.7%	33.4%	9.3%
FWS	36.5%	17.9%	42.0%	3.6%
Undergrad enrollment	33.5%	43.4%	16.0%	7.1%
Total enrollment	36.0%	36.7%	20.0%	7.3%
Number of Pell graduates	33.4%	38.6%	16.1%	11.9%
Number of colleges (2021–2022)	529	1,022	1,314	737

Source: Calculations from BPC Fellow Robert Kelchen using Federal Student Aid and Integrated Postsecondary Education System (IPEDS) data.
Note: All data are at the Federal Student Aid OPEID level.

Table 1 shows the trends in campus-based aid allocations compared with enrollment. Private nonprofit institutions have consistently received the largest share of campus-based aid dollars despite enrolling fewer students than public institutions. In 2021–2022, they received 33.4% of SEOG funds and 42% of FWS funds while accounting for only 16% of total undergraduate enrollment.[b] Conversely, two-year public institutions accounted for 43% of undergraduate enrollment but received only 24.7% of SEOG funds and 17.9% of FWS funds. Four-year public universities have generally received campus-based aid funding that aligns roughly with their share of undergraduate enrollment. In 2021–2022, public four-years received 32.5% of SEOG dollars and 36.5% of FWS dollars, while enrolling 33.5% of undergraduates.

Addressing Disparities

Experts have developed various recommendations for addressing entrenched disparities in campus-based aid allocations. In 2014, the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA) called for eliminating the base guarantee, restructuring the SEOG formula based on Pell funding received by institutions, and updating the income bands used to calculate institutions' share of national financial need.[8] More recently, BPC's Task Force on Higher Education Financing and Student Outcomes recommended revising the allocation formulas to include measures of access and outcomes, as well as limiting FWS allocations to undergraduate students.[9]

Table 2 shows how the distribution of campus-based aid would change by sector under three alternative allocation strategies:

1. eliminating the base guarantee and allocating funds using only the fair share formula;
2. limiting FWS awards to undergraduate students; and
3. allocating funds based on the number of Pell recipients enrolled or the number of Pell recipients who complete a degree or certificate.

[b] Enrollment is based on a 12-month headcount. The enrollment figures in this brief differ from those in BPC's *Addressing Disparities in Campus-Based Aid*, which looked at enrollment among degree/certificate-seeking undergraduates. See Arianna Fano and Tristan Stein, *Addressing Disparities in Campus-Based Aid*, Bipartisan Policy Center, June 24, 2024. Available at: https://bipartisanpolicy.org/explainer/addressing-disparities-in-campus-based-aid/.

Table 2: FWS and SEOG awards under alternative allocations by institutional type.

	Share of Funds by Sector (pct)			
Allocation Method	**4-year public**	**2-year public**	**Private nonprofit**	**For-profit**
Federal Work Study				
Current allocation	36.5%	17.9%	42.0%	3.6%
Fair share				
No cap on tuition	36.3%	6.1%	49.4%	8.2%
75th-percentile cap	42.7%	7.3%	40.6%	9.5%
50th-percentile cap	45.4%	8.0%	37.1%	9.5%
25th-percentile cap	46.8%	8.5%	35.4%	9.3%
Fair share (undergrads only)				
No cap on tuition	34.1%	23.6%	28.7%	13.6%
75th-percentile cap	35.6%	24.6%	26.7%	13.2%
50th-percentile cap	38.9%	26.5%	22.3%	12.3%
25th-percentile cap	41.3%	28.0%	19.1%	11.6%
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant				
Current allocation	32.5%	24.7%	33.4%	9.3%
Fair share				
No cap on tuition	26.7%	17.8%	44.0%	11.6%
75th-percentile cap	33.2%	22.2%	31.4%	13.1%
50th-percentile cap	38.6%	25.2%	23.6%	12.5%
25th-percentile cap	41.7%	27.0%	19.7%	11.7%
Enrollment/completion-based metrics				
Undergraduate enrollment	33.5%	43.4%	16.0%	7.1%
Total enrollment	36.0%	36.7%	20.0%	7.3%
Pell recipients	37.3%	34.4%	16.7%	11.6%
Pell completions	33.4%	38.6%	16.1%	11.9%
Number of colleges	529	1,022	1,314	737

Source: Calculations from BPC Fellow Robert Kelchen using Federal Student Aid and IPEDS data.
Note: All data are at the Federal Student Aid OPEID level, and selectivity is aggregated across branch campuses.

Fair Share Only

Basing campus-based aid allocations on fair share alone would eliminate the base guarantee that ensures institutions receive at least as much funding as they did in prior years. The federal government could also adjust the fair share formula to include tuition cutoffs in which the cost-of-attendance measure would cap tuition at certain percentiles of the overall distribution of tuition prices—thereby limiting the tendency for institutions with higher tuition to receive larger allocations.

Basing allocation on fair share only, without tuition caps, would increase allocations to private nonprofit institutions, with nonprofits' share of FWS funds rising to nearly 50% and their share of SEOG increasing to 44%. Conversely, two-year institutions would see their share of FWS fall to 6.1% and their share of SEOG fall to 17.8%. The share of FWS going to four-year publics would remain unchanged, while their share of SEOG funding would fall from 32.5% to 26.7%. Allocations for for-profits would increase.

Basing allocations on fair share calculations with tuition cutoffs (calculated separately for four-year and two-year institutions) would shift funds toward public four-year institutions, while significantly reducing FWS allocations for community colleges. Private nonprofit institutions would continue to receive campus-based aid awards that are larger than their share of total enrollment, except at the most restrictive (25th percentile) cutoff.

FWS for Undergraduates Only

Approximately 10% of FWS recipients are graduate students. These students tend to receive larger awards, mostly due to the higher price of graduate programs.[c] The inclusion of graduate students in the fair share calculation also contributes to fewer FWS dollars going to community colleges and other institutions without large graduate programs.[10]

Limiting Federal Work-Study to undergraduates tends to increase the proportion of FWS dollars going to public institutions while reducing the share going to nonprofits. Restricting FWS to undergraduates under a fair share only allocation with a 25th-percentile cap increases the share of funding going to two-year and four-year public institutions to 28% and 41.3%, respectively. The share of FWS going to for-profits rises to 11.6%, while the share going to nonprofits falls to 19.1%.

---

[c] The average award for graduate student FWS recipients in 2021–2022 was $2,754, compared with $1,900 for undergraduate FWS recipients. See Federal Student Aid, Campus-Based Program Data Books, 2023 Data Book, Table 49, FWS Awards and Recipients for 2021–2022—U.S. Totals. Available at: https://studentaid.gov/data-center/student/title-iv.

Pell Enrollment/Completions[d]

Adopting a formula based on either the number of Pell recipients enrolled or the number of Pell recipients who complete a degree or certificate would increase the share of funding going to public two-year institutions. Basing allocations on Pell enrollments would result in 34.4% of campus-based aid funds going to community colleges, while basing allocations on Pell completions would lead to them receiving 38.6% of funds—with conferral of certificates helping explain why community colleges would receive a higher share of funds based on Pell completions than Pell enrollment.

In dollar terms, adopting an allocation formula based on Pell enrollment would nearly double the amount of FWS funding flowing to two-year institutions from $205 million to $393 million. Basing awards on Pell completions would lead to their FWS allocations rising to about $440 million.

Basing allocations on Pell enrollment or completions would substantially reduce campus-based aid dollars for nonprofit institutions. It would also substantially increase FWS allocations to for-profit institutions, while having modest effects on overall allocations to four-year public universities.

Alternative Allocations by Selectivity

Under the current formulas, highly selective nonprofit institutions tend to receive significantly more FWS and SEOG funding than public institutions. Table 3 shows that the 58 most selective private nonprofit institutions (those admitting 20% or fewer of applicants) received 8.9% of FWS funds and 5.1% of SEOG dollars in 2021–2022—amounting to nearly $150 million in campus-based aid. These institutions enrolled 1.8% of undergraduates and only 1.1% of Pell recipients.[e] Conversely, the 40 most selective public institutions (admitting half of applicants) received 5.3% of FWS funds and 4% of SEOG funds, while enrolling more than 4% of undergraduates and 4.5% of Pell recipients.

The most selective private nonprofit institutions see the most significant changes under alternative allocation strategies. Nonprofits admitting fewer than 20% of applicants would see their share of FWS and SEOG approximately double under a fair share only formula with no cap on tuition. Conversely, their share of SEOG and FWS falls to about 1% under Pell enrollment/completion formulas, which would result in their combined allocations falling from nearly $150 million to about $20 million.

Less selective private nonprofit institutions see their share of campus-based aid funding decline under most alternative allocations. The changes are less dramatic than they are for more selective institutions but potentially still

---

[d] The analysis here includes both degree and certificate completions. It does not include students who transfer from a community college to a four-year institution without receiving an associate degree.

[e] These are also generally wealthy institutions, with most possessing endowments exceeding $1 billion as of the end of FY 2021–2022.

substantial. Under current formulas, for example, the least selective nonprofits receive 14.7% of FWS and 13% of SEOG. Basing allocations on Pell completions would result in their share of awards declining to 7%.

Among four-year public institutions, alternative allocations have modest effects for the most selective universities. Less selective public universities tend to see gains under allocation strategies that place a cap on tuition prices.

Table 3: FWS and SEOG awards under alternative allocations by institutional selectivity.

	4-year public institutions			4-year nonprofit institutions			
Allocation Method	**0%–50%**	**50%–80%**	**80%–100%**	**0%–20%**	**20%–50%**	**50%–80%**	**80%–100%**
Federal Work Study							
Current allocation	5.3%	13.2%	18.0%	8.9%	3.4%	14.8%	14.7%
Fair share							
No cap on tuition	5.7%	13.2%	17.4%	18.5%	3.1%	12.9%	14.7%
75th-percentile cap	6.6%	15.4%	20.6%	10.0%	2.3%	12.3%	15.7%
50th-percentile cap	7.0%	16.1%	22.3%	8.6%	2.0%	11.2%	15.1%
25th-percentile cap	6.9%	16.3%	23.6%	8.0%	1.9%	10.5%	14.8%
Fair share (undergrads only)							
No cap on tuition	4.1%	12.0%	17.9%	3.1%	1.9%	10.5%	12.2%
75th-percentile cap	4.3%	12.6%	18.7%	2.2%	1.6%	9.8%	13.4%
50th-percentile cap	4.7%	13.8%	20.5%	1.6%	1.3%	7.8%	10.8%
25th-percentile cap	4.9%	14.3%	22.1%	1.3%	1.1%	6.5%	9.5%
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant							
Current allocation	4.0%	11.4%	16.8%	5.1%	2.8%	12.0%	13.0%
Fair share							
No cap on tuition	3.1%	9.4%	14.1%	9.6%	4.2%	15.6%	13.8%
75th-percentile cap	3.9%	11.8%	17.5%	3.1%	2.0%	11.8%	13.6%
50th-percentile cap	4.5%	13.7%	20.4%	1.6%	1.4%	8.3%	11.5%
25th-percentile cap	4.7%	14.4%	22.5%	1.3%	1.1%	6.6%	10.0%
Enrollment/completion-based metrics							
Undergraduate enrollment	4.1%	11.6%	17.8%	1.8%	1.1%	5.5%	7.2%
Total enrollment	4.7%	12.5%	18.8%	3.2%	1.2%	6.5%	8.7%
Pell recipients	4.5%	12.8%	20.0%	1.1%	0.9%	5.5%	8.2%
Pell completions	4.6%	11.2%	17.5%	1.0%	1.1%	5.8%	7.0%
Number of colleges	40	174	315	58	102	482	548

Source: Calculations from BPC Fellow Robert Kelchen using Federal Student Aid and IPEDS data.
Note: All data are at the Federal Student Aid OPEID level, and selectivity is aggregated across branch campuses.

Conclusion

The analyses in this issue brief underscore a core problem with the campus-based financial aid programs: The current allocation formulas are regressive and provide more resources to wealthier institutions and to those enrolling smaller shares of low-income students. Congress can address this issue by updating the allocations formulas to limit Federal Work-Study to undergraduates, eliminate the base guarantee, and consider the number of Pell Grant recipients that institutions enroll and graduate. Reforming allocations would lead to a fairer distribution of campus-based aid dollars and increase federal support for institutions enrolling and effectively serving large numbers of low-income students.

Adjusting the campus-based aid allocation formulation will be tricky. Wealthy, highly selective institutions can probably make up for reductions in campus-based aid by providing students with additional financial aid from their own resources. On the other hand, some less selective nonprofits serving low-income student populations have limited resources to compensate for fewer FWS and SEOG dollars.[11] For these institutions, including private HBCUs, changing the allocation formulas could lead to less financial aid for low-income students. Complexities like this are one of the reasons it has been challenging to forge agreement on how best to reform campus-based aid allocations. Additional analysis could assist by providing more detailed insight into the impact of alternative allocations on nonselective private nonprofits that serve low-income populations well.

Nevertheless, the case remains that the campus-based aid allocation formulas do not effectively target federal resources toward institutions predominantly serving lower-income students but instead direct a significant share of campus-based aid to the wealthiest institutions. Updating campus-based aid allocations could help redirect millions of dollars from institutions with ample resources to institutions serving the largest share of low-income students.

Appendix: Methodological Summary for Alternative Allocation Analyses

The analysis for this issue brief calculates alternative allocations for FWS and SEOG using the 2023-2024 formulas for calculating financial need, which rely on data from the 2021-2022 academic year.

The analysis first calculates both programs' fair share allocation, which represents a given institution's share of the total pool of need among eligible institutions. The formula for calculating student need is the following summarized across students:

Need=0.25(Tuition+fees+14,400)-EFC for FWS; 0.75 (Tuition+fees+14,400)-EFC-Pell for SEOG

Institutions can calculate their need with customized tuition rates (including in-state, out-of-state, and differential tuition), but this analysis uses in-state tuition for the purposes of simplicity. There are also a range of EFC bands based on family income, but this analysis uses the same assumption from Robert Kelchen's 2015 paper on financial aid[f] that undergraduate Pell recipients have zero income (EFC of $563) and non-Pell students have an income of $60,000 or above (EFC of $35,407). Half of graduate students (FWS only) were assumed to be lower income (EFC of $99), and half were assumed to be higher income (EFC of $13,904).

Because disparities in campus-based aid awards over time are in part a function of certain colleges having high tuition, this analysis explores capping tuition and fees at the 75th, 50th, and 25th percentile of the overall distribution (separately for two-year and four-year institutions) to limit the effects of high tuition charges. For the Federal Work-Study program, the analysis created separate estimates excluding graduate students (who are eligible for FWS but ineligible for SEOG).

The analysis also calculates allocations based on four enrollment/completion-based metrics: undergraduate enrollment (based on a 12-month headcount), total enrollment, enrollment of Pell recipients, and Pell completions (based on completing either a degree or certificate).

---

[f] Robert Kelchen, "Campus-Based Financial Aid Programs: Trends and Alternative Allocation Strategies," *Educational Policy*, 31(4), June 2017, first published, September 22, 2015. Available at: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0895904815604213.

Endnotes

1 Federal Student Aid, Campus-Based Program Data Books, 2023 Data Book, Tables 1 and 2. Available at: https://studentaid.gov/data-center/student/title-iv.

2 Several studies have analyzed the extent of these disparities and the potential effect of alternative allocation strategies, including National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, *Estimated Effects of NASFAA's Campus-Based Proposals on Institutional Allocations*, 2014. Available at: https://www.nasfaa.org/uploads/documents/ektron/ba51b208-c203-4afe-9e28-88ee78f8337e/84c19891c281442fb7d0867d9dfe36132.pdf; Robert Kelchen, "Campus-Based Financial Aid Programs: Trends and Alternative Allocation Strategies," *Educational Policy*, 31(4), June 2017, first published, September 22, 2015. Available at: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0895904815604213.

3 Rory O'Sullivan and Reid Setzer, *A Federal Work Study Reform Agenda to Better Serve Low-Income Students*, Young Invincibles, September 2014. Available at: https://younginvincibles.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Federal-Work-Study-Reform-Agenda-Sept-181.pdf; National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, *The Campus-Based Formula*, 2014. Available at: https://www.nasfaa.org/uploads/documents/campus_based_formula.pdf; and G. William Hoagland, Shai Akabas, et al., *A New Course for Higher Education: Strengthening Access, Affordability, and Accountability*, Bipartisan Policy Center, January 2020, 80–82. Available at: https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/new-higher-ed/.

4 Congressional Research Service, *The Campus-Based Financial Aid Programs: Background and Issues*, R45025, updated November 21, 2017. Available at: https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20171121_R45024_56ab704db4879ff0a392f02cf2d4ea3f77f019b1.pdf.

5 National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, *Campus-Based Aid Allocation Formula*, January 2019. Available at: https://www.nasfaa.org/uploads/documents/Issue_Brief_Campus-based_Formula.pdf.

6 Robert Pernell Huff, "The Evolution of the Process of Allocating Federal Campus-based Student Financial Aid to Postsecondary Education Institutions," *Journal of Student Financial Aid*, 34 (2), 2004. Available at: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ965774.pdf.

7 Congressional Research Service, *The Campus-Based Financial Aid Programs: Background and Issues*, R45025, Updated November 21, 2017. Available at: https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20171121_R45024_56ab704db4879ff0a392f02cf2d4ea3f77f019b1.pdf; National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, *Campus-Based Aid Allocation Formula*, January 2019. Available at: https://www.nasfaa.org/uploads/documents/Issue_Brief_Campus-based_Formula.pdf.

8 National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, *The Campus-Based Formula*, 2014. Available at: https://www.nasfaa.org/uploads/documents/campus_based_formula.pdf.

9 G. William Hoagland, Shai Akabas, et al., *A New Course for Higher Education: Strengthening Access, Affordability, and Accountability,* Bipartisan Policy Center, January 2020, 81. Available at: https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/new-higher-ed/.

10 Rory O'Sullivan and Reid Setzer, *A Federal Work Study Reform Agenda to Better Serve Low-Income Students*, Young Invincibles, September 2014, 8. Available at: https://younginvincibles.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Federal-Work-Study-Reform-Agenda-Sept-181.pdf; G. William Hoagland, Shai Akabas, et al., *A New Course for Higher Education: Strengthening Access, Affordability, and Accountability,* Bipartisan Policy Center, January 2020, 81. Available at: https://bipartisanpolicy.org/report/new-higher-ed/.

11 Thurgood Marshall College Fund, "About HBCUs," accessed, October 18, 2024. Available at: https://www.tmcf.org/about-us/member-schools/about-hbcus/.

Bipartisan Policy Center

1225 Eye St NW, Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20005

bipartisanpolicy.org

202 - 204 - 2400

Policy Areas

- Economy
- Energy
- Human Capital
- Health
- Housing
- Democracy

The Bipartisan Policy Center helps policymakers work across party lines to craft bipartisan solutions. By connecting lawmakers across the entire political spectrum, delivering data and context, negotiating policy details, and creating space for bipartisan collaboration, we ensure democracy can function on behalf of all Americans.

@BPC_Bipartisan
facebook.com/BipartisanPolicyCenter
instagram.com/BPC_Bipartisan
linkedin.com/company/bipartisan-policy-center



Bipartisan Policy Center

1225 Eye Street NW, Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20005