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Student loan debt relief has been a central topic in the 2020 presidential election and during discussions about COVID-19 relief. While there has been much debate regarding the nature and scope of broad-based relief for all student loan borrowers, few dispute that borrowers who have been particularly harmed by their school’s misconduct and/or closure should promptly receive the relief that they are entitled to under existing laws and regulations. Indeed, the hundreds of thousands of students who attended large for-profit colleges that closed, and/or who were defrauded by predatory chains such as Corinthian College and ITT Tech, are among those that need debt relief the most. They are disproportionately low-income students and students of color whose dreams were stolen by companies that raked in millions through lies about their programs and subsequently closed, leaving students with worthless (if any) credentials and mountains of debt. To date, the vast majority of these borrowers have not received the relief they are entitled to.

This memorandum focuses on ways that the Department, in the first 100 days, can use its existing “closed school discharge” and “borrower defense” regulations to provide full student loan debt relief to this subset of particularly harmed student loan borrowers.¹

Section I discusses how the Department can promptly provide relief to tens of thousands of borrowers that were harmed by school closures by using its authority to extend closed school discharge eligibility periods and then, for students who attended institutions that closed between November 1, 2013 and July 1, 2020, provide the relief automatically without the borrower needing to apply.² In addition to providing critical relief to borrowers, this would potentially moot tens of thousands of borrower defense claims, thus reducing any backlog of claims, as well as effectively overturning erroneously denied claims.

In Section II, we discuss how the Department should promptly expand its existing borrower defense findings by looking first to its own administrative findings of misrepresentations and other consumer harms that could give rise to borrower defense claims. Remarkably, the Department has gone so far as to end Title IV participation for many institutions based on such consumer harms, but, years later, has not made a single borrower defense finding or granted a single claim from borrowers attending such institutions. The Department should use this evidence—as well as evidence submitted by state attorneys general and others—to develop long-overdue borrower defense findings and provide automatic, full relief to eligible borrowers. The Department should also ensure that, going forward, borrower defense relief is included in the administrative review process from the outset. Finally, the Department should immediately rescind its borrower defense partial relief methodology and provide full relief to all borrowers who fall within its Corinthian and ITT findings,³ including those for whom the Department has granted a claim but provided less than full relief.

Expand Closed School Discharge Relief

Legal Framework

Under the Higher Education Act (“HEA”), the Secretary “shall discharge the borrower’s liability” on a federal Direct Loan if a borrower is “unable to complete the program in which [he or she was] enrolled due to the closure of the institution.” For loans disbursed prior to July 1, 2020, the Department’s regulations provide that a closed school discharge must be granted if a borrower is enrolled at the school at the time it closed or withdrew not more than 120 days prior to the school’s closure, and did not complete the program of study or transfer academic credits to a
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In the first 100 days of a new administration, the Department should conduct a review of school closures to determine where extensions (or further extensions) of the closed school window are warranted.

comparable program at another school. Parent PLUS loan borrowers are eligible for a closed school discharge if the student on whose behalf the loan was taken out qualifies.

By regulation, the 120-day period for loans disbursed before July 1, 2020 may be extended if the Secretary determines that “exceptional circumstances” related to the school’s closing would justify an extension. In a rulemaking finalized on November 1, 2013, the Department sought to “add[] clarity” to this provision by including a non-exhaustive list of the types of exceptional circumstances under which it would extend the 120-day window. The regulations were therefore amended to provide that such circumstances “may include, but are not limited to: the school’s loss of accreditation; the school’s discontinuation of the majority of its academic programs; action by the State to revoke the school’s license to operate or award academic credentials in the State; or a finding by a State or Federal government agency that the school violated State or Federal law.” In the July 29, 2013 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for the November 1, 2013 regulations, the Department was clear that this list is not exhaustive and that the circumstances of each closing must be analyzed on a case-by-case basis.

It is important to note that, although the Secretary would view the cited examples as exceptional circumstances, these examples would not be exclusive or otherwise narrow the scope of exceptional circumstances that the Secretary would consider. The Secretary has the discretion to consider other extenuating circumstances that may warrant a closed school loan discharge for a borrower who withdrew from a school more than 120 days before the school closed. As the Department noted during the negotiated rulemaking session, the Secretary determines whether exceptional circumstances exist on a case-by-case basis and takes into account the facts of the particular situation.

Because all of the schools discussed in Section B below closed on or after November 1, 2013 and have been closed for at least three years, the Department should provide the relief discussed herein automatically, without delay, pursuant to the Automatic CSD Rule. See supra note 2.

Finally, it is important to note that the IRS does not treat discharges pursuant to the Department’s closed school discharge authority as taxable income.

Specific Recommendations

In the first 100 days of a new administration, the Department should conduct a review of school closures to determine where extensions (or further extensions) of the closed school window are warranted. To do this, the Department should compare its school closure list to evidence in its possession from its own findings, including from program reviews and audit determinations. In addition, the Department should review evidence arising from state attorney general submissions, borrower defense claims, and any other channels.

In this section, we recommend extensions to the look-back period for seven institutions, a small selection of the total number of institutions that the Department should review. (Notably, while we do not address the well-known closure of Corinthian College, we believe the next Secretary should closely examine whether additional events justify extending the look-back date even further than the current June 20, 2014 extended date.) Table 1 provides a summary of our recommendations; details are in the text below. Note that for some schools, publicly available information is insufficient to provide a specific recommended look-back date. For these schools, the Department should promptly review its files in order to determine the most appropriate date.
Table 1: Proposed Extensions to Closed School Discharge Look-Back Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Closure Date</th>
<th>Current Look-Back Date</th>
<th>Recommended Look-Back Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte School of Law</td>
<td>8/10/2017</td>
<td>12/31/2016</td>
<td>02/06/2016 or earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream Center/EDMC</td>
<td>12/14/2018 &amp; 3/8/2019 (most campuses)</td>
<td>6/29/2018 (most campuses)</td>
<td>11/16/2015 or earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Corporation of America (ECA)</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>8/9/2018</td>
<td>3/1/2015 or earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT Tech</td>
<td>9/6/2016</td>
<td>5/9/2016</td>
<td>8/19/2014 or earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinello School of Beauty</td>
<td>2/4/2016</td>
<td>10/7/2015</td>
<td>2013 or earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>3/8/2016</td>
<td>11/9/2015</td>
<td>2012 or earlier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charlotte School of Law

The Charlotte School of Law ("CSL") closed on August 10, 2017. On March 9, 2018, the Department announced that it would extend the closed school discharge look-back period, but only to December 31, 2016, 224 days prior to the school’s closure. According to the Department, this decision expanded eligibility for closed school relief to “nearly a dozen additional students.”' This slight extension is not enough.

By letter dated December 19, 2016, the Department denied CSL’s recertification application to participate in Title IV. The recertification denial letter details a long history of CSL’s non-compliance with ABA standards, starting in January 2015 when the ABA Accreditation Committee issued a decision announcing that it had “reason to believe” that CSL had “not demonstrated compliance” with certain ABA standards. As set out in that recertification denial, on February 3, 2016, the ABA Accreditation Committee made twenty factual findings and then concluded that CSL was “not in compliance” with ABA Standards 301(a), 501(a), 501(b), and Interpretation 501-1. Following the February 3, 2016 decision, CSL had numerous opportunities to establish its compliance with the accreditation standards. Ultimately, its non-compliance was deemed both “substantial” and “persistent,” and led to the ABA placing CSL on probation. Shortly thereafter, the Department found that CSL’s failure to “meet the requirements established by the ABA” was of “sufficient severity to merit the denial of recertification.”

Months later, CSL closed. At the time of its closing, CSL had one of the highest debt-to-income ratios of any law school in the country, with its graduates borrowing more than five times their first-year earnings, according to the median figures.

The Department should extend the closed school discharge look-back window to at least February 3, 2016, when the ABA first found CSL to be out of compliance with its standards.
Dream Center/EDMC

Education Management Corporation, or EDMC, was a for-profit education company that operated nationwide under four post-secondary school brands: the Art Institutes, South University, Argosy University, and Brown-Mackie College. In 2015, student enrollment across EDMC brands exceeded 100,000 students.21

On November 16, 2015, the United States, as well as a consortium of 39 state attorneys general and the District of Columbia, reached a global settlement with EDMC. In summary:

EDMC agreed to pay $95.5 million to the U.S. Department of Justice and several states based on the DOJ’s findings that EDMC unlawfully recruited students by running a high-pressure boiler room where admissions personnel were paid based purely on the number of students they enrolled.22

Attorneys General from 39 states and the District of Columbia entered a 69-page global Consent Judgment resolving allegations of fraud and abuse by EDMC, including claims that EDMC: (a) used deceptive solicitations touting educational benefits that were available to few students; (b) engaged in extremely high-pressure recruitment; (c) falsely claimed that programs were accredited by an accreditor necessary to obtain licensure in certain professions; and (d) misrepresented job-placement and graduation rates. The settlement required EDMC to undertake compliance obligations, including disclosures, prohibitions on deceptive recruiting practices, and oversight by an administrator.23

In June 2016, EDMC announced that it would close 22 of its 26 Brown-Mackie campuses, and that the schools would not accept any new students.24 The Department has not extended the closed school look-back date for Brown-Mackie.

On October 17, 2017, EDMC finalized the sale of its Art Institute, Argosy University and South University education systems to a non-profit charity known as the Dream Center Foundation (“Dream Center”). The Dream Center experiment did not last long—by December 14, 2018, it closed 24 Argosy and Art Institute campuses. The schools entered federal receivership on January 18, 2019, and by March 8, 2019, nearly all remaining Dream Center campuses closed.25

On November 8, 2019, for the schools that closed on December 14, 2018, the Department extended the closed school look-back date by approximately six weeks, to June 29, 2018. In February 2020, the Department further extended the date to January 20, 2018, but only for students who attended the Art Institute of Colorado (two Denver, CO locations) and Illinois Institute of Art (Chicago, IL, Schaumburg, IL, and Novi, MI locations), all of which lost accreditation on January 20, 2018 and did not inform students for the next six months.26 The Department has not extended the look-back date for the Dream Center schools that closed in 2019.

Multiple Senators and state Attorneys General have urged the Department to extend the closed school discharge look-back date for all Dream Center schools to October 17, 2017, the date the Dream Center took over.27 We believe, however, that for all closed schools previously owned by EDMC as of November 2015—the Art Institute, Argosy, South University, and Brown-Mackie—the Department should extend the closed school date to at least November 16, 2015, the date of the Consent Judgement that revealed the long history of misconduct that set the schools on a path toward financial instability and closure.

Education Corporation of America (ECA)

On December 5, 2018, ECA announced the immediate closure of more than 70 campuses across 18 states, including the campuses of Brightwood Career Institute, Brightwood College, Ecotech Institute, Golf Academy of America, and Virginia College.28 ECA’s collapse immediately displaced approximately 18,000 students.29 The Department has not extended the closed school look-back window for any ECA campuses.

The troubles for ECA began well-before the current look-back period. In March 2015, amid concerns about its compliance and financial stability, the Department placed many of ECA’s campuses on heightened cash monitoring status, resulting in additional federal oversight of student aid funds.30 The documents supporting this decision do not appear to be publicly available. The Department restricted
the flow of federal funds to more ECA colleges in October 2017 and, based on review of the company’s 2016 financial statements, required additional financial and operating reporting and review requirements in February 2018 and August 2018.\(^{31}\)

When the Department released the first set of gainful employment data in January 2017, ECA’s schools were some of the worst performing, with high debt and low earnings for its graduates. Of approximately 200 ECA programs across 21 campuses, nearly one-third—60 programs—were failing or at risk of failing the gainful employment rule.\(^{32}\)

ECA was also plagued by numerous accreditation issues. In December 2016, after the Department denied the recognition of Virginia College’s accreditor, ACICS, Virginia College had 18 months to find a new accreditor. Virginia College ultimately sought accreditation from ACCET. On May 1, 2018, ACCET denied accreditation to Virginia College due to, among other things, poor graduation rates, poor job placement rates, high faculty turnover rates, and the failure to provide students access to proper supplies.\(^{33}\) On May 8, 2018, relying in part on ACCET’s findings, ACICS placed Virginia College on show cause status.\(^{34}\)

Also in May, multiple Brightwood College and Brightwood Career Institute campuses were required by their accreditor to “show cause” why their accreditation should not be withdrawn.\(^{35}\)

In September 2018, ECA announced it would close and end new enrollment at 26 campuses by 2020, which represented one third of the campuses it owned at the time.\(^{36}\) On December 4, 2018, ACICS withdrew accreditation from Virginia College.\(^{37}\) All ECA campuses closed the next day.

While records relating to ECA’s placement on heightened cash monitoring status in March 2015 are not publicly available, that event appears to have been the first in a chain of events that led to ECA’s closure. Accordingly, we believe the Department should extend ECA’s look-back date to at least March 1, 2015.

**ITT Technical Institute (ITT)**

ITT closed on September 6, 2016 and the Department has not extended the closed school discharge window.\(^{38}\) At the time of its closure, ITT was operating 136 locations across 38 states, serving approximately 35,000 students.\(^{39}\) On September 16, 2016, ITT filed a Voluntary Petition for Chapter 7 Bankruptcy in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Indiana. Multiple senators and state attorneys general have unsuccessfully called upon the Department to use its authority to extend the look-back period for ITT.\(^{40}\)

The Department’s approach to the Corinthian look-back date is instructive here. For Corinthian, the Department extended the date to June 20, 2014, the date upon which the Department placed the institution on heightened cash-monitoring status.\(^{41}\)

We recommend extending the look-back date to at least August 19, 2014, the date upon which the Department sent a letter to ITT citing the school’s failure to submit timely acceptable annual compliance audits and/or audited financial statements. The letter resulted in the institution’s placement on heightened cash-monitoring status as well as the requirement that ITT be provisionally certified for at least five years and post an irrevocable letter of credit for five years.

The August 19, 2014 letter was the first in a series of events that led to ITT’s closure. Between 2014 and 2016, multiple civil lawsuits were filed against ITT by both federal and state law enforcement agencies.\(^{42}\) In addition, as of April 2016 there were civil investigative demands pending from 19 state attorney general offices regarding ITT’s marketing and advertising, recruitment, financial aid, academic advising, career services, admissions practices, programs, licensure exam pass rates, accreditation, student retention, graduation rates, and job placement performance.\(^{43}\)

On April 20, 2016, ITT’s accreditor, ACICS, issued a show-cause directive after finding ITT to be out of compliance with many of its accreditation standards.\(^{44}\) ACICS based its determination on “multiple sources of adverse information since 2014 regarding a variety of financial and regulatory issues confronting the institution[].”\(^{45}\) On June 6, 2016, the Department required ITT to increase its letter of credit from 10% to 20% of the total Title IV funding received in its most recent fiscal year.\(^{46}\) This amounted to an increase of $43,938,303, from $79,707,879 to $123,646,182.\(^{47}\)
On August 25, 2016, the Department again increased ITT’s letter of credit, this time to 40% of the total Title IV funding received during its most recent fiscal year (nearly $250 million) and prohibited ITT from enrolling new students who use federal financial aid.\textsuperscript{44} ITT closed on September 6, 2016. The Department should not penalize students for taking the reasonable step of abandoning ITT’s sinking ship. Accordingly, we believe the Department should extend ITT’s look-back date to at least August 19, 2014, which was the first in this series of events.

\textbf{Marinello School of Beauty}

On February 1, 2016, the Department issued letters to five Marinello Schools of Beauty (“Marinello”), comprised of 23 locations, notifying them that it denied recertification of their eligibility to participate in the federal student aid programs.\textsuperscript{49} Three days later, Marinello closed all 56 of its operating campuses, located in California, Connecticut, Kansas, Nevada, and Utah.\textsuperscript{50}

The Department’s assessment concluded that Marinello “failed to adhere to a fiduciary standard of conduct, failed to comply with critical Title IV program requirements, failed to meet Title IV standards of administrative capability, and made numerous misrepresentations to students.”\textsuperscript{51} Among other things, the Department found that Marinello illegally disbursed Title IV funds by “fabricating high school diplomas” and “misled students regarding key elements of their educational programs and financial charges.”\textsuperscript{52}

Marinello also faced significant legal trouble. On July 22, 2013, six former employees sued the school under the False Claims Act alleging that it had improperly obtained federal student loan funds.\textsuperscript{53} In August 2016, Marinello’s insurer agreed to pay $8.6 million to resolve claims.\textsuperscript{54} In addition, in February 2018 three former Marinello students sued the Department to challenge the denial of their applications for student loan discharges based on misconduct by the school starting in February 2013, when plaintiff Lizette Menendez first inquired about enrolling in Marinello’s cosmetology program.\textsuperscript{55} In April 2018, the Department provided plaintiffs with the full discharges that they sought.\textsuperscript{56}

While the Department’s recertification denial does not provide specific dates for its findings, it appears from the allegations in these lawsuits that the misconduct at issue likely took place prior in or around 2013. However, because the underlying evidence that supported these findings is not public, we do not have sufficient information to propose a precise look-back date, be it in 2013 or earlier. The Department should therefore review the evidence in its possession regarding Marinello in order to determine the appropriate extension date.

\textbf{Medtech College}

Medtech College operated campuses in Virginia, Maryland, and Washington, D.C (“Medtech Virginia”), as well as campuses in Kentucky, and Indiana. It also operated Radians College, which it purchased in 2011, located in Washington, D.C.

On July 26, 2016, the Department denied Medtech Virginia’s application for recertification of eligibility to participate in the federal student aid programs.\textsuperscript{57} The Department’s assessment revealed that:

(1) Medtech significantly overstated the job placement rates it reported to its institutional accreditor in its 2014 Annual Report, (2) Medtech significantly overstated the job placement rates it disclosed to the Department and the public through its Gainful Employment disclosures, (3) Medtech made numerous misrepresentations as to the job placement of individual students, and (4) Medtech contracted with a third-party placement rate verifier and failed to report that contractual arrangement in direct contravention of the Department’s regulations.\textsuperscript{58}

Medtech Virginia closed all campuses on August 10, 2016.\textsuperscript{59} On August 23, Medtech closed its Lexington, Kentucky campus.\textsuperscript{60} On September 16, Medtech closed all of its Indiana campuses (located in Indianapolis, Fort Wayne and Greenwood).\textsuperscript{61} On September 23, Medtech closed Radians College.\textsuperscript{62}

In its recertification denial, the Department found substantial misconduct in 2014, and perhaps earlier. Because the underlying evidence that supported the Department’s findings is not public, we do not have sufficient information to propose a precise look-back date, or to determine if the look-back extension should apply
to Radians College. The Department should review the evidence in its possession to determine the appropriate extension date(s) for all Medtech campuses.

**Westwood College**

Westwood College, owned by Alta Colleges, Inc., closed on March 8, 2016. Despite a long record of troubling conduct that extends back over a decade, the Department has not extended the closed school discharge window for any Westwood campuses.

Examples of Westwood and Alta’s misconduct include: (i) in 2009, Alta agreed to a $7 million settlement with the United States in a false claims case stemming from allegations that the school obtained state licensees by misrepresenting to the state licensing agency that they complied with state job-placement reporting requirements; (ii) in 2011, the VA disqualified three Westwood campuses from the GI Bill after finding erroneous, deceptive, and misleading advertising and enrollment practices; (iii) in 2012, the Colorado Attorney General filed a complaint against Westwood stemming from an investigation into the college’s business and recruiting practices that revealed, among other things that the school misrepresented and inflated its job-placement rates, the average wages of graduates, the transferability of course credits, and the total cost of Westwood degrees. Westwood and the attorney general reached a $4.5 million settlement in March 2012; (iv) on January 18, 2012, the Illinois Attorney General sued Westwood for misleading practices relating to its criminal justice program; Westwood settled the suit for $15 million in 2015 after failing to gain dismissal of the case.

In November 2015, Westwood suspended all new enrollments and, in January 2016, informed students that the school would close in March 2016. On June 5, 2019, the Illinois Attorney General announced that he sent a letter to the Department seeking the discharge of federal student loans for borrowers defrauded by Westwood, based on an application for group relief submitted by his office “over two years ago,” for which the Department had not even “acknowledge[d] receipt.”

Because the underlying evidence that supported these findings and settlements is not public, we do not have sufficient information to propose a precise look-back date, be it in 2012 or earlier. The Department should therefore review the evidence in its possession regarding Westwood to determine the appropriate extension date.

**Borrower Defense**

Under the HEA, 20 U.S.C. § 1087e(h), and its implementing regulations, student loan borrowers who can show that the school they attended engaged in certain wrongful acts or omissions have a defense against repayment of their federal student loan debt through a process known as “borrower defense” to repayment. Borrower defense was little known and rarely used until Corinthian Colleges collapsed in 2014, leading to a flood of borrower defense claims. By the end of the Obama administration, the Department had provided student loan discharges to over 30,000 borrowers, nearly all from Corinthian. In each case, the Department granted a full discharge of the loans and granted refunds of loan payments already made.

In February 2016 the Department announced the creation of a Federal Student Aid Enforcement Unit (“Enforcement Unit”), designed to “respond more quickly and efficiently to allegations of illegal actions by higher education institutions.” The Enforcement Unit was to consist of a newly-created investigations unit to operate alongside, and in close collaboration with, the borrower defense unit. Among other things, the Enforcement Unit was to “collaborate with the Program Compliance Unit regarding evidence which may impact ongoing program compliance reviews” as well as work closely with state and federal agencies to build cases against institutions of higher education, and provide relief to eligible borrowers. The Enforcement Unit was therefore a fundamental redesign of how the Department approached enforcement; with close collaboration between the enforcement/administrative review teams and the borrower defense teams, relief to borrowers was, for the first time, to be a critical component of the larger enforcement process.

This never happened. Under Secretary DeVos, the Department all but dismantled the newly-created Enforcement Unit, effectively isolating borrower defense from the rest of the Department, as well as from state attorneys general and other third parties. Contrary to
the purpose and design of the Enforcement Unit, the Department today does not appear to even consider its own factual findings from program reviews, audit determinations, and other administrative channels in establishing borrower defense findings. For example, the Department has ended many schools’ participation in the federal student loan program based on findings of misrepresentations and other consumer harms that could give rise to borrower defense claims—in 2016 alone, the Department issued recertification denials based on student/consumer harms to: Medtech College, Globe University and the Minnesota School of Business, Charlotte School of Law, Computer Systems Institute (CSI”), and the Marinello School of Beauty. Yet the Department has not made a single borrower defense finding relating to these schools and, despite many claims from students attending these schools, not a single borrower has received relief, and some have been denied.

We therefore recommend that the Department promptly expand its existing borrower defense findings by looking to evidence—in its possession—of misrepresentations, fraud or other misconduct that would give rise to a borrower defense claim. The Department should use this evidence to develop long-overdue findings and provide automatic, full borrower defense relief to eligible borrowers. In addition, going forward the Department should revive the Enforcement Unit and ensure that borrower defense relief is included in the administrative review process from the outset.

In addition to using its own administrative findings, the Department should develop borrower defense findings and provide full borrower defense relief based on:

- Judicial findings, such as those against Globe University/MSB and CollegeAmerica and
- Submissions by State Attorneys General seeking group borrower defense discharges. The Department has reported to Congress that it has received submissions from Attorneys General seeking group borrower defense discharges for students who attended at least the following institutions: (i) Westwood College, (ii) the Illinois Institute of Art and Art Institute of Colorado, (iii) Anthem University, (iv) Lincoln Technical Institute, and (v) Globe University and the Minnesota School of Business; (vi) Corinthian Colleges and (vii) Kaplan University. The Department should review all such evidence and provide group relief where appropriate.

Finally, with respect to existing borrower defense findings, the Department has not publicly made any findings in addition to the Corinthian, very limited ITT (see supra note 3), and American Career Institute (“ACI”) findings that existed at the end of the Obama administration. Under the approach taken by the Obama administration, approved Corinthian, IIT, and ACI borrowers received complete discharges of their federal loans. Secretary DeVos, however, has attempted to implement two tiered “partial relief” methodologies for Corinthian and ITT borrowers that (i) provide approved borrowers with little to no financial relief and (ii) are both the subject of ongoing litigation. The Department should promptly rescind these “partial relief” methodologies and, consistent with its prior practices, provide full relief to all borrowers who fall within existing Corinthian and ITT findings, including those for whom the Department has granted a claim but provided less than full relief.
Receive a discharge after three-years, as long as the National School closure information, including closure dates, is available through school-specific FSA fact sheets, available at: https://studentaid.gov/sites/default/files/charlotte-law.pdf.

1 To be clear, this is not an omnibus debt relief memorandum—it does not address existing proposals for regulatory change and broad-based debt relief, and should not be read to suggest that the institutions discussed herein are the only institutions to which these principles should apply. Rather, the goal here is to provide concrete examples of specific, long- overdue relief that the Department can immediately provide, using existing regulations, to discrete categories of borrowers, irrespective of and in addition to any other forms or sources of debt relief.

2 In 2016, as part of the Borrower Defense rulemaking, the Department created the Automatic Closed School Discharge Rule (“Automatic CSD Rule”), which provided that a student who was attending a school (or campus) at or within 120-days of the time of closure would automatically receive a discharge after three-years, as long as the Department did not have evidence that the student took out loans to continue the program at a different institution (or campus). See 81 Fed. Reg. 75,926, 76,078-82 (Nov. 1, 2016) (codified at 34 C.F.R. §§ 674.33(g)(3), 682.402(d)(8), 685.214(c)(2)). This rule applied to all schools (or campuses) that closed on or after November 1, 2013. Id. The 2019 Borrower Defense Rule repealed the Automatic CSD Rule as of July 1, 2020, but that repeal is not retroactive. Accordingly, the Department must continue to grant automatic closed school relief for borrowers whose schools closed on or after November 1, 2013 and before July 1, 2020. See 84 Fed. Reg. 49,788, 49,889 (Sept. 23, 2019). In a separate memorandum, we discuss how the Department should commence a rulemaking in order to reinstate and improve upon the Automatic CSD Rule.

3 The Department’s ITT findings should promptly be expanded. At the end of the Obama administration, the ITT findings applied only to California borrowers, and the Department has not publicly expanded those findings. See, e.g., Cory Turner, Betsy DeVos Overruled Education Dept. Findings On Defrauded Student Borrowers, National Public Radio (Dec. 11, 2019), available at: https://www.npr.org/2019/12/11/786367598/betsy-devos-overruled-education-dept-findings-on-defrauded-student-borrowers.


5 34 C.F.R. § 685.214(c)(1)(i). For loans first disbursed on or after July 1, 2020, the 2019 Borrower Defense Rule extends the closed school discharge window from 120 to 180 days. See 84 Fed. Reg. 49,848 (Sept. 23, 2019).


7 34 C.F.R. §§ 682.402(d)(1)(i) (FFEL), 685.214(c)(1)(i)(b) (Direct Loan).


9 34 C.F.R. § 685.214(c)(1)(i)(b). For loans disbursed on or after July 1, 2020, the 2019 Borrower Defense Rule revised the non-exclusive list of exceptional circumstances in § 685.214(c)(1)(i)(b) (redesignated § 685.214(c)(2)(i)(b)) to include: “the revocation or withdrawal by an accrediting agency of the school’s institutional accreditation; the revocation or withdrawal by the State authorization or licensing authority of the school’s authorization or license to operate or to award academic credentials in the State; the termination by the Department of the school’s participation in a title IV, HEA program; or the teach-out of the student’s educational program exceeds the 180-day look-back period for a closed school loan discharge.” 84 Fed. Reg. 49850 (Sept. 23, 2019).


11 See HEA §§ 437(c)(4), 464(q)(4), and 455(a)(1) (providing that closed school discharge relief for borrowers of FFELs, Direct Loans, and Perkins Loans is not taxable); IRS Rev. Proc. 2020-11, 2020-6 I.R.B. 406 (2020) (providing that the IRS will not treat loans discharged through the “Closed School discharge process” as taxable revenue).

12 School closure information, including closure dates, is available through school-specific FSA fact sheets, available at: https://studentaid.gov/announcements/events/closedschool?utm_content =&utm_medium=email&utm_name=&utm_source=govdelivery&utm_term=.


17 Id. at 3.

18 Id. at 8.

19 Id.


22 Id.


24 See Ashley A. Smith, Decreases in Enrollment Lead to Brown Mackie Closing, Inside Higher Ed (June 15, 2016), available at: https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/06/15/decreases-enrollment-lead -brown-mackie-closing. The majority of the remaining campuses were sold to Ross Medical Education Center in 2017. See Ross Education Website, About Us, available at: https://www.rosededucation.edu/our -school/.
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