

SENIOR DEMOCRATIC WHIP

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE
AND TECHNOLOGY
RANKING MEMBER

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION
AND INFRASTRUCTURE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER
RESOURCES & ENVIRONMENT
SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HIGHWAYS AND TRANSIT

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS
CHAIR, 107TH CONGRESS



Eddie Bernice Johnson

Congress of the United States

30th District, Texas

PLEASE RESPOND TO:

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
2468 RAYBURN BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-4330
(202) 225-8885

DALLAS OFFICE:
1825 MARKET CENTER BOULEVARD
SUITE 440
DALLAS, TX 75207
(214) 922-8885

WWW.HOUSE.GOV/EBJOHNSON/
REP.E.B.JOHNSON@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV
TWITTER.COM/REPEBJ
FACEBOOK.COM/CONGRESSWOMANEBJTX30
YOUTUBE.COM/REPEBJ
FLICKR.COM/REPEBJ

September 6, 2018

The Honorable Betsy DeVos
Secretary of Education
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Re: Docket ID ED-2018-OPE-0042

Dear Secretary DeVos:

I write this comment in strong opposition to the proposed rescission of the “Gainful Employment” (GE) rule Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) published in the Federal Register on August 14, 2018. Finalized in 2014, the GE rule has a simple premise: to ensure that career programs keep tuition and fees in line with the earnings students could reasonably expect to make because of the program. It provides disclosures to alert students when programs are not meeting debt-to-earnings (D/E) metrics and consumer protection safeguards that eliminate access to federal student aid if a program fails such metrics for multiple years.

This crucial regulation sets the compliance standard for a longstanding mandate in the Higher Education Act of 1965 that requires career programs to provide “training to prepare students for gainful employment in a recognized occupation,” or lose access to federal student aid.¹ Without a compliance standard set through rulemaking, this statutory requirement has gone unfulfilled, leaving students and taxpayers to suffer at the hands of predatory programs pedaling high-cost, low-quality degrees and credentials that ultimately fail to enable students to gain employment in their particular area of study/fail at assisting students to gain employment in their particular area of study.

The Department of Education’s (Department’s) given rationales for rescinding the GE rule are unsubstantiated. Of note are the following specious arguments:

The NPRM misuses research findings to purposefully mislead taxpayers. The Department claims that new research challenges the validity and accuracy of using certain D/E calculations in the rule. This is not the case. Sandy Baum, one of the researchers cited in the NPRM has publicly stated that the Department’s interpretation draws the opposite conclusion her research made, amounting to a

¹ 20 U.S.C. 1001(b)(1).



“misrepresentation.”² Baum is on record stating “[t]he [2014] GE rules are, if anything, [are] too permissive.”³ This selective use of sources reflects the relative weakness of the arguments to rescind the GE rule.

The NPRM wrongly assumes that cost alone provides an accurate measure of program quality without taking results into account. The NPRM suggests that “high quality programs” have greater chances to fail GE “simply because it costs more to deliver the highest quality program and as a result the debt level is higher.”⁴ This is first of many places where the Department decides to focus on only one half of the D/E calculation to make its point. Defining a high-quality program as one that necessarily has *high costs* neglects a key part of assessing quality – whether a program has *better results* (i.e. higher earnings for completers) when compared to other programs. The Department’s suggestion that a program is high quality simply because it costs more reflects what is regarded in the higher education community as a rampant fallacy – one that is, at least in part, responsible for elevated higher education costs.⁵ A program that has low costs but results in higher earnings to students obviously has higher “quality” than one that has high costs and low earnings. Such a program would have no problems passing the GE rule.

The NPRM feigns concern with institutional burden. Claiming the GE rule imposes undue institutional burden while simultaneously proposing to expand just the disclosure requirements to all Title IV eligible programs is contradictory in nature. If institutional burden is a deeply held concern by this Department, it would consider keeping the disclosures narrowly focused on certain programs.

The NPRM falsely asserts that the GE rule limits postsecondary access based on geographic, racial, and gender considerations. Analysis of GE data shows that, in many instances, there are two career programs at different institutions located close to each other that have dramatically different D/E outcomes.⁶ Many career programs at for-profit schools have an established track record of deliberately attempting to enroll racial and ethnic minorities, lower-income individuals, and single mothers, convincing these communities that their programs are the key to a better life.⁷ In short, career programs at-risk of failing GE serve such students not because there is a lack of accessible options, but because the program disproportionately targets low-income and low-information consumers for enrollment. For

² See Andrew Kreighbaum, “Questioning the Evidence”, INSIDE HIGHER EDUCATION, Aug. 23, 2018, *available at* <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/08/23/researcher-says-devos-misrepresented-her-work-justify-repeal-student-loan-rule>.

³ *Id* (emphasis added).

⁴ 83 FR 40171.

⁵ See e.g., Robert Ronstadt, “High Tuition Doesn’t Equal Quality”, FORBES, Mar. 10, 2009 (“a similar price/quality disconnect exists between community colleges and “for profit” schools, with the latter charging inflated prices for similar, if not the same programs while enticing students to finance their educations with expensive loans.”) *available at* <https://www.forbes.com/2009/03/10/college-debt-smart-shoppers-personal-finance-retirement-ronstadt.html#68c34082127b>.

⁶ Examples of Nearby Career Education Programs with Very Different Outcomes, THE INSTITUTE FOR COLLEGE ACCESS AND SUCCESS, June 12, 2017, *available at* https://ticas.org/sites/default/files/u159/ge_comparisons_factsheet.pdf.

⁷ See e.g., Melinda Anderson, When For-Profit Colleges Prey on Unsuspecting Students, THE ATLANTIC, Oct. 24, 2016, *available at* <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/10/when-for-profit-colleges-prey-on-unsuspecting-students/505034/>; Julie Anderson, et al., Single Mothers Overrepresented at For-Profit Colleges, INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN’S POLICY RESEARCH, Sept. 6, 2017 *available at* <https://iwpr.org/publications/single-mothers-overrepresented-profit-colleges/>; Lynn Jennings, “Gainful Rule Is Exactly What Students of Color Need”, EDUCATION TRUST, April 10, 2014, *available at* <https://edtrust.org/the-equity-line/gainful-rule-is-exactly-what-students-of-color-need/>.

the Department to claim that GE programs have high levels of minority and female students and as such we should rescind the rule lest we limit access is frankly insulting.

The NPRM advances a baseless claim the GE rule inhibits workforce readiness. To the contrary, evidence shows that career schools are using GE as a tool to rethink which programs provide students with a greater chance of success in the workforce.⁸ In fact, even for-profit representatives have agreed that the rule is working as it should.⁹ Additionally, there are a host of pressing issues facing American workers, such as wage stagnation, the erosion of power to organize, unpredictable schedules, lack of access to paid sick leave, and other benefits that continue to be ignored by the Trump Administration.¹⁰

All of the NPRM's baseless arguments are founded on a deeply disturbing premise: there are justifiable reasons to provide low-quality programs access to students and their federal student aid dollars. Rescinding the rule suggests there is no need to intervene when a school charges more than \$30,000 for a degree that results in earnings of less than \$15,000 per year.¹¹ Eliminating the rule when data show that, in many cases, students would have comparable earnings if they had never even attended some career programs is baffling.¹² To rescind GE and place no check on the ability to access higher education opportunities that saddle students with a lifetime of unsurmountable debt is unconscionable.

Furthermore, by choosing to rescind the rule in its entirety, the Department is abdicating its duty to regulate in the best interests of students and taxpayers – an abdication fully aligned to the desires of low-quality programs and institutions that, as directed by federal statute, are subject to the GE requirement and accompanying regulation. This proposed action does not exist in a vacuum – we have one year of GE data that clearly shows what is at stake with this rule. In the first round of GE data released January of 2017, Nine out of ten colleges with career programs had no failing programs.¹³ While eight out of ten for-profit schools also had no failing programs, 98% of the over 800 programs that failed the rule were offered by for-profit colleges.¹⁴

⁸ Kevin Carey, “DeVos Is Discarding College Policies That New Evidence Shows Are Effective”, N.Y. Times, June 30, 2017 (“a close analysis of the more than 500 failing programs ... reveals something interesting: A substantial majority of them, 300 or so, have already been shut down — even though colleges are not yet required to do so. The gainful employment test turns out to be an accurate way of identifying programs that for-profit colleges themselves don’t think are worth saving...”), available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/30/upshot/new-evidence-shows-devos-is-discarding-college-policies-that-are-effective.html>.

⁹ Green, Erica., August 10, 2018, “DeVos Ends Obama-Era Safeguards Aimed at Abuses by For-Profit Colleges,” The New York Times (“Even for-profit leaders concede the gainful employment rule has had its intended effect. Mr. Gunderson said that for-profit institutions had to adjust programming to be more affordable and responsive to the job markets.”), available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/10/us/politics/betsy-devos-for-profit-colleges.html>.

¹⁰ Paul Waldman, Donald Trump’s war on workers, Washington Post, September 3, 2018, available at <https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2018/09/03/donald-trumps-war-on-workers>.

¹¹ Pauline Abernathy, *What Does a Failing Program Look Like*, The Institute for College Access and Success, Mar. 7, 2017, available at <https://ticas.org/blog/what-does-failing-program-look>.

¹² Stephanie Riegg Cellini and Nicholas Turner, Gainfully Employed? Assessing the Employment and Earnings of For-Profit College Students Using Administrative Data, National Bureau of Economic Research, May 2016, rev’d Jan. 2018, available at <http://www.nber.org/papers/w22287> (“Taken together, our results suggest that relative to no college, for-profit certificate programs modestly increase the likelihood of employment, but appear to do little to raise earnings.”)

¹³ Press Release, U.S. Dep’t of Educ., Education Department Releases Final Debt-to-Earnings Rates for Gainful Employment Programs (Jan. 9, 2017) available at <https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/education-department-releases-final-debt-earnings-rates-gainful-employment-programs>.

¹⁴ *Id.*

Since taking office, the Trump administration has extended deadlines for schools to comply with the rule, effectively suspending implementation of a rule that has been in effect since 2015;¹⁵ declined to renew contracts with vendors who compile GE data for the Department, signaling intent not to implement the regulation;¹⁶ supported House Majority efforts to strike the operative language from the Higher Education Act that allows the Department to regulate on GE;¹⁷ and been sued by multiple State Attorneys General for failure to uphold the current rule.¹⁸ Based on this track record, the decision by the Department to rescind the rule seems less a logical endpoint to a thoughtful process and more an ideological goal established long ago that is finally being realized. A goal that by its own estimates will result in over \$5 billion in additional federal student aid flowing to programs that would not have had access under the GE rule. Even considering the Department's flawed arguments in their most favorable light, the logical course of action would be to amend the rule to reflect the Department's concerns, not to rescind it in its entirety.

Lastly, along with rescinding the GE rule, this NPRM, seeks comment on the proposal to provide program-level data for all Title IV programs. This proposal is, in no way, a substitute for ensuring that career programs (at-for profit and proprietary schools) are providing their students with educations that lead to gainful employment in a recognized profession, the legal requirement of HEA. Compliance with this legal requirement must be the focus of the Department's regulatory process. Full rescission of the GE rule will leave taxpayers, policymakers, and students unable to determine whether career programs provide their students gainful employment in a recognized profession.

In the laws establishing and organizing the Department, the mission statement of the Department includes promoting "preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence."¹⁹ The GE rule ensured that workers who choose to enhance their skills in career programs can do so with faith that the program will provide a real chance at a better job and a better future.

I urge you to abandon the proposed rescission and restore the GE rule.

Sincerely,


Eddie Bernice Johnson
Member of Congress

¹⁵ Andrew Kreighbaum, DeVos Allows Career Programs to Delay Disclosure to Students, Inside Higher Education, (July 3, 2017), available at <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/07/03/education-department-announces-new-delays-gainful-employment>.

¹⁶ Letter from Sen. Patty Murray and Rep. Rosa DeLauro to Betsy DeVos, Sec'y, U.S. Dept. of Educ. (Sept. 17, 2017).

¹⁷ See Erica L. Green, *New Higher Education Bill Rolls Back Obama-Era Safeguards*, N.Y. Times, Dec. 13, 2017 at A14.

¹⁸ Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, *Maryland v. U.S. Dep't of Educ.*, 1:17-cv-02139 (D.D.C. Oct. 17, 2017) available at http://www.illinoisattorneygeneral.gov/pressroom/2017_10/Complaint_Gainful_Employment-stamped-101717.pdf.

¹⁹ Department of Education Organization Act, P.L. 96-88, 1980.