AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 2018

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met at 10:15 a.m. in room SD–124, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Roy Blunt (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Blunt, Alexander, Capito, Lankford, Kennedy, Rubio, Hyde-Smith, Murray, Durbin, Reed, Shaheen, Merkley, Baldwin, Murphy, Manchin, and Leahy.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

STATEMENT OF HON. BETSY DeVOS, SECRETARY

ACCOMPANIED BY BILL CORDES, ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL ANALYSIS DIVISION DIRECTOR, BUDGET SERVICE

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROY BLUNT

Senator BLUNT. The Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies will come to order.

We are pleased, Secretary DeVos, that you are here with us today. Thank you for appearing to talk about your budget and to answer our questions.

The 2019 budget request from the Department is 11 percent less than the money that the Congress appropriated for fiscal year 2018 in March. To the Department's credit, you propose eliminating and consolidating programs that may not be working effectively, and we will want to look at those very carefully with you.

The budget also includes a $1 billion new competitive grant program for States and school districts to expand their choice programs.

Certainly I appreciate the perspective, the new look, you have brought to the Department. I agree that we should look at programs that are either inefficient or ineffective and prioritize programs that work the best for students.

We have a shared priority—your Department and the committee certainly—on STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathe-

matics) education. I am interested in hearing more about how you think the Department can support STEM education, including computer science education, and what we can do in schools around the country. And I think you will find we will be particularly interested in rural schools that may not be where we would like them to be in that competitive environment.

The omnibus included $50 million in dedicated funding for evidence-based STEM education programs. I want to certainly work with you, as our committee does, and the Department to see how we can support and expand that effort.

I am also interested in working together to make post-secondary education more accessible and affordable for all students. Two years ago, we were able to reinstate in our appropriating bill, with the cooperation of our authorizers, year-round Pell Grants. I just spent some time in Missouri at the end of the last college year talking about this being really the first summer where schools could plan and students could plan for year-round Pell. We think there are about 20,000 more students on campus this summer in Missouri and about a million students nationwide because they have the potential to continue to make the pattern that is working continue to work. You know, if you are paying your way through college, working your way through college, maybe the first person in your family that is either attending or trying to graduate from college, having a pattern that works makes a big difference.

When I went to college, the first person in my family to graduate from college, frankly as several people on this committee also are—and I went in 3 years and three summers. As I recall, it took 124 hours of credit to graduate. I had 124 hours of credit, not one extra credit or one extra day. The best way, of course, to keep college cost down is to get done, and I think a lot of schools have responded to year-round Pell by being sure that they have bachelor degree programs that can realistically be completed, if that is what a student wants to do, in a shorter period of time.

We look at what happened with year-round Pell. Now, we increased the Pell Grant through our committee last year by 3 percent to $6,095. Your budget is still predicated on a top two-semester Pell of $5,920. I think we will, obviously, continue the other number and look for the authorizing committee, the Chairman and Ranking Member of which are on either side of me, to see their forward view on Pell Grants and other assistance programs.

Many of the proposals in the budget eliminate programs. I think some of that can be done. I hope we can look at it carefully with you. But I think it is likely that the committee will look at the work we just completed, and the large formula grant programs are not likely to be eliminated. We are not likely to support the elimination of Impact Aid for Federal property, though this administration would not be the first one to suggest that Impact Aid could be looked at in another way.

There are some small targeted programs eliminated like Special Olympics and Arts and Education. Again, while the size maybe looks like they do not make a lot of impact, it would make a lot of impact if you eliminated them. And I think our committee would want to think long and hard before we did that.

Finally, Secretary DeVos, I want to acknowledge your efforts to realign the Department of Education's role in the education system. I believe, as many Members of the Senate and House do, that decisions should, whenever they can, be made closer to students and their family and local school districts. That is where those decisions should be made. It is hard enough to make a decision in a State capital that impacts an entire State as opposed to decisions in Washington, DC that impact the entire country. And your efforts to try to look for ways that more of those decisions can be made closer to where kids and their families are and where adult students are going to school is a wonderful thing for us to be talking about.

I look forward to your testimony today and the discussion that will follow that.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROY BLUNT

Good morning. Thank you, Secretary DeVos, for appearing before the Subcommittee today to discuss the Department of Education's fiscal year 2019 budget request.

The fiscal year 2019 budget request for the Department of Education is $63.2 billion, $7.7 billion, or 11 percent, less than the fiscal year 2018 Omnibus passed in March.

Like last year's request, this budget proposal includes significant changes to the scope of the Federal Government's investments in education. It eliminates or consolidates over 30 programs and significantly reduces funding for several others. It also includes $1 billion for a new competitive grant program for States and school districts to expand school choice programs.

I appreciate the fresh perspective you bring to the Department. This request makes difficult decisions and prioritizes funding for programs while working under tight budget constraints. I agree we should look for programs that are ineffective or inefficient, and prioritize that funding to programs that work best for students. I am confident we can work together throughout this year's budget process on that goal.

We have a shared priority in STEM education. I am interested in hearing more about your ideas on how the Department can support STEM education, including computer science education, in schools across the country, particularly rural schools. The Omnibus included $50 million in dedicated funding for evidence-based STEM education programs and I want to work with you on how the Department can support and expand that effort as well as build upon the innovative work States and school districts are already doing in STEM education.

I am also interested in working together to make post-secondary education more accessible and affordable for all students. Two years ago, the Labor/HHS bill reinstated Year Round Pell Grants. Year-round Pell is expected to help approximately one million students nationwide each year, and 20,000 in my home State of Missouri, where one-third of students receive a Pell Grant. When I was in Missouri last month visiting community colleges and universities, I heard from students about the benefits of being able to take classes continuously. And this is the first summer most students are able to benefit.

Additionally, in the fiscal year 2018 Omnibus, we were able to build upon the success of Year-round Pell by funding several significant initiatives focused on college affordability and completion, including increasing the Pell Grant maximum award, increasing funding for campus-based aid programs like Federal Work Study, and focusing funding on TRIO programs to help students get into and complete college. As the first person in my family to graduate college, I understand the importance of finding a system that works. Staying continuously enrolled in school, having support from programs like TRIO, and access to financial aid through Pell and campus-based aid programs will help more students stay on track for graduation, enter or re-enter the workforce sooner, and graduate with less debt.

We share a lot of common ground with regard to the role of the Federal Government in our education system. However, there are places we disagree. I continue to believe that certain elements of the Department's proposal on student loan servicing are misguided. The Omnibus bill prevents the Department from moving for-

ward with a new system that does not include certain safeguards to promote accountability and transparency, and incentivize high-quality service for borrowers. I hope that we can work together this year to improve the Federal student loan servicing process for borrowers, while making sure these safeguards are in place.

Further, many of the proposals in the budget request to eliminate programs were considered by our Subcommittee last year, and rejected. This Subcommittee will not pass a bill eliminating large formula grant programs supporting afterschool programs and teacher professional development. As we have done since the last Administration, our Labor/HHS bill will not support the elimination of the Impact Aid Payments for Federal Property program, which represents a core aspect of the Federal Government's commitment to the parts of the country impacted by the presence of federally-owned land. Similarly, while some small targeted grant programs, like Special Olympics or Arts in Education, may simply because of their size not have widespread impacts, they can help leverage significant private funding and build the evidence-base for what works to improve student outcomes. As we look to produce our third consecutive bipartisan Labor/HHS bill at the end of this month, I expect these proposals will face the same result this year.

Finally, Madame Secretary, I want to acknowledge your efforts to realign the Department of Education's role in our education system. I believe education decisions should be made as close to the student and family as possible. It is hard enough to make decisions for a student in Springfield, Missouri from Jefferson City, let alone Washington, D.C. We need to empower schools, students, and families to make the best decisions for individual students to help them succeed. I believe you are taking important steps to do that and limit the role of the Federal Government in both our elementary and secondary school system and at institutions of higher education. I will continue to support you in those efforts.

My goal is for us to continue to work together to identify priorities and find common ground while responsibly allocating taxpayers' resources. Madame Secretary, I look forward to hearing your testimony today and appreciate your dialogue with us about these important issues.

Thank you.

Senator BLUNT. And I am pleased now to recognize my good friend, Senator Murray.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PATTY MURRAY

Senator MURRAY. Thank you, Chairman Blunt.

Thank you, Secretary DeVos, for joining us today.

It is now 16 months since you were confirmed by an unprecedented tie-breaking vote as Secretary of Education, and you were confirmed despite millions of students and parents and teachers around the country who spoke up in opposition to your extreme ideological commitment to privatizing public education and who were concerned about your lack of experience in educating or in advocating for our public schools.

Unfortunately, instead of taking those concerns to heart, you have doubled down on your harmful agenda and filled your Department with for-profit college executives and lobbyists looking out for their former employers and clients. And that could not be clearer when looking at your actions over the past year and the budget that you are here to defend today.

Secretary DeVos, since you were confirmed, we have seen a barrage of actions out of the Department that hurt both students and taxpayers. You continue to prioritize your extreme privatization agenda, which would siphon taxpayer dollars away from public schools. You are ignoring the parts of our Nation's K–12 law, the Every Student Succeeds Act, that helps ensure equity in our schools. You have made it easier for predatory for-profit colleges and student loan companies to take advantage of our students by rolling back a number of consumer protections and effectively dismantling the unit that actually investigates claims of fraud and

abuse. And you have taken a number of extremely concerning steps to undermine civil rights protections for our students, including attempting to scale back the Office for Civil Rights, rescinding guidance protecting transgender students, making it easier for schools to once again sweep sexual assault under the rug, saying it is a local decision to call ICE (Immigration and Customs Enforcement) on undocumented students, and so much more.

SIMILARITIES TO PRIOR YEAR BUDGET REQUEST

So let me turn to the budget you are proposing for next year. And I am really disappointed how similar this budget looks to what you proposed last year and which this committee soundly rejected.

After years of budgets for education not keeping up with our needs, we are now seeing teachers and parents around the country organizing and standing up for public education because our kids should not be forced to learn in crumbling classrooms with shabby textbooks, and our teachers should be paid fairly for the important work they do. And yet, with this budget, once again you are ignoring what millions of parents and teachers and students are asking for, and you have instead proposed more than $4 billion in cuts to elementary and secondary education.

I do not have time to name them all, but your budget would eliminate programs that help teachers grow and improve their teaching skills, grants that support before and after school programs, and investments that support low-income undergraduates.

SCHOOL VIOLENCE

And this budget is another example of an empty promise made by this administration to address the senseless gun violence devastating our families and our schools and our communities around the country. President Trump has continued to give in to the demands of the NRA (National Rifle Association). Your Gun Safety Commission has yet to take any real action steps, and now your budget would eliminate grants that are used to improve students' safety for the second year in a row. After the tragic Parkland shooting, you said Congress should hold hearings on gun and school safety. So in a show of good faith, I urge you to commit to testify in front of the HELP Committee on what meaningful gun safety reform we can enact to help end the scourge of violence in our schools.

SCHOOL CHOICE

Finally, while your discretionary budget cuts $7.7 billion in Federal investments in education, you are proposing $1 billion for programs that align with your personal agenda but are not authorized by the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act. A little more than 2 months ago, Congress rejected virtually the same proposals in the bipartisan spending bill.

So, Secretary DeVos, I have many questions for you this morning on why you once again put forth a budget that will hurt our students and families, and I look forward to your responses this morning. Thank you.

Senator BLUNT. So we have votes at 11:00, but we will continue the hearing through those two votes. We have a hard stop today at noon because of commercial travel. But Senator Leahy said that he would give up his time in return for us getting to questions quicker. So glad to do that.

And Secretary, if you want to go ahead and make your opening statement, we would be pleased to hear that.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF HON. BETSY DEVOS

Secretary DEVOS. Thank you, Chairman Blunt.

Chairman Blunt, Ranking Member Murray, and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify on the President's fiscal year 2019 budget request for the Department of Education.

This budget sharpens and hones the focus of our mission: serving students by meeting their needs. When the Department was created, it was charged to prohibit Federal control of education. I take that charge seriously. Accordingly, President Trump is committed to limited government, fiscal discipline, and reducing the Federal footprint in education.

The President's fiscal year 2019 budget would reduce overall funding for Department programs by $3.7 billion, or 5.6 percent from fiscal year 2017 enacted levels, and $7.6 billion, or 10.8 percent, below the fiscal year 2018 enacted level.

This budget was prepared prior to the 2-year cap deal and the Omnibus, for that matter. So the Administration submitted an addendum that restores valuable investments in students, including Impact Act Basic Support Payments, TRIO, school choice, Federal Work-Study, and Pell.

For programs that we level funded in this budget request, our intent was to maintain levels appropriated by Congress. We used the numbers in place at the time, and our intent remains the same for newly appropriated funds.

This Department's budget focuses on improving educational opportunities and outcomes for all students, while also returning power to the people closest to students.

PROMOTING SAFE AND HEALTHY SCHOOLS

First, we must promote a safe and healthy culture in our schools. The tragedies at Noblesville West Middle School in Indiana and Santa Fe High School in Texas were only the most recent devastating reminders that our Nation must come together to address the underlying issues that create a culture of violence. I have directed my Department to do everything within the law to encourage States and districts to take advantage of flexibilities so newly appropriated funds, about $1.1 billion, under Title IV are most useful.

OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

Second, our request would provide significant new resources dedicated to helping achieve the President's goal of giving every student the freedom to attend a school that best meets his or her unique needs. The budget provides funding for this program

through a new Opportunity Grants program that would expand the number of students who have the opportunity to attend a school of their choice. Under this new program, States could apply for funding to provide scholarships to students from low-income families that could be used to transfer to a different school. Local educational agencies participating in the Department's student-centered funding pilot could request funds to build on the flexibility provided by establishing or expanding open enrollment systems. This way funds follow children based on their needs, not buildings or systems.

In addition, the budget requests support for Charter Schools by providing an increase of $100 million, for a total of $500 million, and continues support for Magnet Schools. We are also proposing to expand use of direct student services to allow States to reserve up to 5 percent of their Title I allocations to further expand educational freedom, including helping students transfer to a school that better meets individual needs.

SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Third, the Administration's request includes support for students with disabilities. Our request for essential K–12 formula grant programs supports the Nation's neediest students, especially all programs authorized under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

PATHWAYS TO CAREERS

Fourth, our request creates more pathways to prepare workers to fill existing and newly created jobs, as well as jobs of the future. Expanding apprenticeships and reforming ineffective education and workforce development programs will help more Americans obtain relevant skills and enter high paying jobs.

Students should be able to pursue a variety of pathways to successful careers. To that end, the budget expands the use of Pell Grants for high quality, short-term summer and certificate programs. It invests in career and technical education and streamlines student loan repayment.

These proposals also support congressional efforts to reauthorize the Higher Education Act to address student debt and higher education costs while reducing the complexity of student financial aid.

STEM EDUCATION

Fifth, our request supports STEM education to help better equip students with skills employers need. Consistent with the President's Memorandum on STEM Education, our request includes $200 million in new funding to support STEM education while continuing to fund almost $330 million in discretionary grants.

REFORM AND REORGANIZATION

Finally, our request reflects a number of reform proposals aimed at streamlining the Department's internal organization and improving the Department's services to States, districts, postsecondary institutions, and the public. We recommend, for instance, a number of consolidations, including proposals for the Federal TRIO

programs and the HEA Title III and V programs supporting Minority-Serving Institutions, making them formula grants so that States may use the funds more effectively. The budget eliminates, streamlines, or reduces funding for many discretionary programs that do not address national needs, that duplicate other programs, are ineffective, or are more appropriately supported with State, local, or private funds.

The budget reflects our commitment to spending taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently. The Federal Government does not and cannot know the unique needs of each individual student in America. Parents and teachers know their students best and know how their needs should be addressed.

With this budget, we can continue to return power to those who walk side by side with students every day because that is who budgets are for, not for special interests, not legislators, not the system. This budget is about students. It is easy to get lost in the numbers and forget about the faces of students whom we have all pledged to serve. Education can truly change the trajectory of a child's life. All they need is the chance to attain it. More students need the freedom to seek an education that unlocks their potential and allows them to pursue their passions. That is the focus of this Administration and the focus of this budget.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to your questions.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. BETSY DEVOS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on the President's Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Request for the Department of Education.

This Department's Budget focuses on improving educational opportunities and outcomes for all students while also returning power to those closest to them.

Ultimately, this Budget sharpens and hones the focus of our mission: serving students by meeting their needs. When this Department was created, it was charged with prohibiting Federal control of education.[1] I take that charge seriously. Accordingly, President Trump is committed to reducing the Federal footprint in education, and that is reflected in this Budget.

I won't miss an opportunity to point out that past Federal education reform efforts have not worked as hoped. Too many of our children are still unprepared to lead successful careers and fulfilling lives, despite billions of dollars injected into the system with the goal of improving the outcome.

The United States spends more per pupil than nearly every other developed country, many of which perform better than our Nation on the international stage. Yet there are many who, despite the evidence to the contrary, continue to push "more funding" as the answer to every challenge. Student success should be measured by the outcomes—by what they achieve. It should not be measured by the number of inputs. That's why this Budget refocuses taxpayer dollars more effectively to benefit students.

The President's Fiscal Year 2019 Budget would reduce overall funding for Department programs by $3.7 billion or 5.6 percent from fiscal year 2017 enacted levels.

The Budget was initially prepared prior to enactment of a 2-year cap deal, which raises the fiscal year 2019 caps significantly above the previous cap levels. To account for the resulting higher non-defense spending levels in the most fiscally responsible manner, the Administration submitted an addendum to its 2019 Budget that includes nearly $3 billion in additional funding for a limited set of Administration priorities under the new, higher cap levels. The fiscal year 2019 Budget request is $7.6 billion or 10.8 percent below the fiscal year 2018 enacted appropriation.

[1] Department of Education Organization Act, Section 103(b); https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/STATUTE-93/pdf/STATUTE-93-Pg668.pdf.

This addendum restores valuable investments in students, including Impact Aid Basic Support Payments, TRIO, school choice, and Federal Work-Study, while eliminating a proposed rescission of Pell Grant balances.

This Budget seeks to support and empower families and expand postsecondary pathways, helping ensure students lead successful careers and fulfilling lives.

First, our request would provide significant new resources dedicated to helping achieve the President's goal of giving every student the freedom to attend a school that best meets his or her unique needs.

The Budget provides funding for this purpose through a new Opportunity Grants program that would expand the number of students who have the opportunity to attend a school of their choice. Under this new program, States could apply for funding to provide scholarships to students from low-income families that could be used to transfer to a different school, and local educational agencies participating in the Department's weighted student-centered funding pilot could request funds to build on the flexibility provided by establishing or expanding open enrollment programs.

In addition, the Budget requests support for charter schools by providing an increase of $100 million—for a total of $500 million—and continues support for magnet schools. We also are proposing to expand the Direct Student Services reservation in section 1003A of the ESEA to allow States to reserve up to 5 percent of their Title I allocations to further expand educational choice, including helping disadvantaged students attending a school identified for improvement to transfer to a higher-performing school.

Second, the Administration's request recognizes the importance of maintaining strong support for students with disabilities. Our request intended to maintain funding for programs authorized under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), including essential preschool and K–12 formula grant programs that provide basic support to schools and programs that support research, demonstrations, technical assistance and dissemination, and personnel preparation and development.

Third, our request creates more pathways to prepare workers to fill existing and newly created jobs, as well as jobs of the future. It includes proposals that would promote multiple pathways to successful careers while minimizing costs to students and families. The Administration believes students need to have a full host of options, including technical schools, community colleges, and apprenticeships.

Students should be able to pursue a variety of pathways to successful careers. To that end, funding should follow the student, as they do in the Pell Grant program. The Budget requests expansion of the use of Pell Grants for high-quality, short-term programs. In addition, it invests in career and technical education, and streamlines student loan repayment.

These proposals also support congressional efforts to reauthorize the Higher Education Act to address student debt and higher education costs while reducing the complexity of student financial aid.

Fourth, our request supports STEM education to help better equip America's young people with the relevant knowledge and skills that will enable them to secure high-paying, stable jobs throughout their careers. Consistent with the Presidential Memorandum on STEM education, our request includes $200 million in new funding to support STEM education while continuing to fund almost $330 million in discretionary grants for STEM projects.

Fifth, we look forward to working with Congress on promoting a safe and healthy culture in our schools. Our commitment to every student's success is one we must renew every day, but first we must ensure our children are safe at school. The tragedy at Santa Fe High School in Texas was only the most recent, devastating reminder that our Nation must come together to address the underlying issues that create a culture of violence.

This Administration is committed to keeping our Nation's students and teachers safe at school. I've directed my Department to do everything within the law to encourage States and districts to take advantage of flexibilities in spending the $1.1 billion in new funding available beginning July 1 under the flexible Title IV–A grant program. Naturally, the primary responsibility for the physical security of schools rests with States and local communities. Schools must have the resources they need to improve safety infrastructure, hire more counselors, and host more programs and activities aimed at violence prevention. We owe the victims of school violence nothing less.

Our request also supports a new round of School Climate Transformation Grants that will help States support effective implementation of school-based opioid abuse prevention strategies by addressing mental health and other needs of students affected by the epidemic. This funding would also support technical assistance centers

that develop and provide opioid abuse prevention resources that would be publicly available to all schools and postsecondary institutions.

Finally, our request reflects a number of reform proposals aimed at streamlining the Department's internal organization and improving the Department's services to States, districts, postsecondary institutions, and the public. We recommend, for instance, a number of consolidations, including proposals for the Federal TRIO programs and the HEA Title III and Title V programs supporting Minority-Serving Institutions, making them formula grants so that States may use the funds more effectively. The Budget eliminates, streamlines, or reduces funding for many discretionary programs that do not address national needs, duplicate other programs, are ineffective, or are more appropriately supported with State, local, or private funds—reducing taxpayer costs by $7.6 billion.

The Budget reflects our commitment to spending taxpayer dollars wisely and efficiently. The Federal Government does not—and cannot—know the unique needs of every individual student. Parents and teachers know their students best and know how their needs should be addressed.

With this Budget we can continue to return power to those who walk side-by-side with students every day.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify. I will be happy to respond to any questions you may have.

SCHOOL SAFETY FUNDING AND FLEXIBILITY

Senator BLUNT. Well, thank you, Secretary DeVos. Glad to have you and Mr. Cordes from the budget office there with you.

Let us talk about student safety to start with. Clearly the idea that people go to elementary school and high school and any school anywhere with some sense that bad things have happened in other schools and can happen in their school—what are we doing to try to minimize that likelihood? There was a $22 million increase in the spending bill that you just got at the end of March for school safety. What are you doing with that? And what ideas do you have of other programs that we might allow more flexibility to use those programs like Title II and Title IV, as an example, for school safety? With the situation we are in now, every parent, every grandparent, every citizen sees that as unacceptable. What can we do to encourage school districts getting to the right place on the safety of kids at school?

Secretary DEVOS. Thanks, Chairman, for that question.

I know we all share concern for students as they attend school each day and feel for the parents who fear for their own children's safety. It is a focus of this Administration. I know it is the focus of this body as well.

And I would just broaden the question and the issue around the issue of the Commission that the President has commenced and that I am chairing to look at practices that are happening in States and in some communities. We have been charged with about 27 different items to look at and study and to raise up best practices on to share more broadly. I think one of the most important things we can do is help others learn about what has been effective in a local community or in a State and encourage them to adopt some of these measures in their own communities or in their own States.

I know many State legislatures are debating this very topic and issue right now and are formulating plans and policies that are unique to their situations. We know there is no one-size-fits-all approach. We know that our geographies and our people are very dispersed. And so we have to make sure that there are ample menu options to choose from for communities to consider, ensuring that

their school buildings—that their students are safe at school each day.

APPLICATION OF $22 MILLION INCREASE IN SCHOOL SAFETY FUNDING

Senator BLUNT. And are there things we can do with $22 million that you did not have in the past for this purpose or other programs to encourage those menu options to be looked at and funded when chosen?

Secretary DEVOS. Yes, indeed, and also the Title IV funds for which there is great flexibility. Those all will be part of the forward-looking focus of this Commission and the recommendations that will follow. And as States and communities develop their plans and programs, these funds will be available for proven solutions, ones that have been enacted in certain places that have proven effective. And we are there. We want to support those activities and ensure that each community is able to answer and address this situation unique to their circumstances.

PELL GRANTS

Senator BLUNT. I am sure others will come back to that, so let me move on quickly in the minute and 30 seconds I have left.

On Pell Grants, you are talking about allowing Pell Grants to be used for certification programs and other programs that in the short-time programs in the past we have not allowed Pell Grants to be used. I am supportive of that, but I would like to hear a little bit more about your thought as to how those shorter-term certification programs would be defined and how Pell Grant eligibility would help prepare that workforce.

Secretary DEVOS. Well, thank you.

We know that fewer and fewer students today are traditional students, going from high school into a 4-year college or university. And we know that there are many opportunities for students to pursue a shorter-term program, a certification, a credentialing that will get them into the workforce into a meaningful path and track for whatever their interests might be. Our proposal is to develop high quality, short-term programs and do so in conjunction with Congress to put the appropriate guardrails around that, but acknowledging that students are very different today than they were 20 or 30 years ago, and to meet their needs and to meet the needs of our economy today, we can do so by recognizing and allowing for those kinds of flexibilities and innovations.

Senator BLUNT. Well, I think in the interest of everybody being sure they get their questions in on the panel, I am going to enforce the time limit pretty carefully. So I will enforce it on myself. My time is up and now to Senator Murray.

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS RESOURCES AND STAFFING

Senator MURRAY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary DeVos, let me start with you. You claim the Office for Civil Rights is more efficient under your new policies. One new policy that you have allows the Office for Civil Rights to dismiss complaints if it places an unreasonable burden on OCR (Office for Civil Rights) resources. If you feel there is a strain on OCR resources,

you should be asking Congress for more funding to make sure that every student is protected.

Last year, you reduced the number of staff at OCR through voluntary buy-outs. Does that not result in fewer staff to handle the workload?

Secretary DEVOS. Thanks for that question, Senator.

And before I answer that one, I just want to make reference to your opening——

Senator MURRAY. Well, I have a very short amount of time.

Secretary DEVOS. I know that.

Senator MURRAY. So if you could just answer me yes or no on that question, and we will get a chance to hear on your others later. But I want to know.

Secretary DEVOS. The Office for Civil Rights is very much focused on the work that it has before it. They have been able to do so with effectiveness and efficiency. I am very proud of the work that they have done, and they continue to address all complaints appropriately and will continue to do so.

IMPACT OF REQUESTED FUNDING ON OCR CLAIMS DISMISSAL

Senator MURRAY. Well, you are requesting even fewer resources for OCR. Does that mean OCR will dismiss even more complaints because of the burden it places on their efforts?

Secretary DEVOS. We are committed to ensuring that the rights of every student are protected, and the Office is very much committed to continuing that work.

Senator MURRAY. Well, I think it is very clear with fewer resources, fewer staff, and that we are going to take fewer claims and protect fewer students. That really is not how OCR is supposed to operate. Congress has taken very clear steps to address that issue with our budget. In the spending bill that we passed last year, Republicans and Democrats actually rejected your proposed cuts to OCR and instead directed OCR to increase staff in order to effectively and timely investigate the complaints. Your staff would not provide specific information to our bipartisan, bicameral appropriations staff during a briefing on your hiring plans. Will you commit here and now to get back to our staffs with specifics on that, please?

Secretary DEVOS. We will be happy to get back with you on that. We are in the process of following the orders and the intent of Congress. We remain very committed to protecting students' rights.

Senator MURRAY. Okay. Your staff refused to give us answers. So we would like that and would appreciate getting back to us.

Secretary DEVOS. Of course.

TEACHER STRIKES

Senator MURRAY. During your April meeting with State Teachers of the Year, you claimed that the teacher strikes occurring around the country were coming, quote, "at the expense of children". Those teachers out there are fighting for new school supplies for their students, classrooms that are not falling apart, and the ability to support their families on their salaries. Do you think children benefit when they have to use outdated and worn books or when their teachers have to work multiple jobs just to make ends meet?

Secretary DEVOS. I think students, when they are not able to go to school because they do not have anyone to go to school to teach them—that hurts them. And so my point has been that I hope that adults will have their disagreements and debates outside of the time that it impacts and affects students. We need to ensure that students are kept in the center of the equation on this whole question.

Senator MURRAY. Well, it takes money to pay teachers more. And you keep trying to cut Federal investments, as I talked about in my opening statement. Do you think children benefit from your proposals to cut billions from public elementary and secondary schools, including funding to train teachers, underfunding grants for students' safety, well-rounded education and other issues, an after-school program for almost 2 million students? Do you think children benefit from that?

Secretary DEVOS. Our budget is focused on helping students that need the most help. And we are keeping in mind the fact that the Federal Government is only 10 percent of the equation of funding for schools. We need to stay focused on what actually benefits students the most, and we believe our budget stays very focused on those students——

REFUGEE STUDENTS AND TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Senator MURRAY. I can tell you as a former school board member, I can tell you every dollar counts.

Finally, you may have seen the student letters that Mandy Manning—she is the National Teacher of the Year from my home State of Washington. The National Teacher of the Year. She delivered it personally to President Trump. And she teaches English actually to refugees and immigrants. And one of her students wrote to President Trump. And I want to read it to you.

When you say you don't want refugees, students in the hall at school tell me that they don't want me here because I am a refugee. You can change this by saying good things about people like me.

That is what a student said from the Teacher of the Year.

Do you think it would be good for all children if the President would say good things about students like those of our National Teacher of the Year?

Secretary DEVOS. I had the pleasure of meeting Mandy, and I think she is an awesome teacher. I think that the work that she does is so important, and I think that we need to continue to support her and all of our counterparts.

Senator MURRAY. Do you think adults should be careful with their language because of the impact it has on students like that?

Secretary DEVOS. I think we all have an opportunity to be careful with what we say.

Senator MURRAY. Including the President?

Secretary DEVOS. All of us have the opportunity to be careful.

Senator MURRAY. Thank you.

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, Senator Murray.

Senator Lankford.

PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE WITHIN A DISTRICT

Senator LANKFORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, it is good to see you again. Thanks for all the work that you are doing for our kids and our teachers around the country. I appreciate the ongoing work.

I want to ask you about a proposal that you have dealing with students having and parents having options within a district to be able to choose a different school within a district. Now, this is a very different kind of discussion about school choice.

I happened to grow up in a district that had four high schools in it, and I was allowed, even at the time that I went to high school, to be able to pick whichever high school that I wanted to be able to attend. I was in the band. I liked the band program in one of the high schools that was across town better than the one that was closer to me. So I had the opportunity to be able to choose to drive across town and to be able to get there. Now, that was a burden for my family and all those things to be able to work on transportation issues, but it gave me the option to be able to choose that.

I think that is what I am hearing from you when you are talking about somewhat about school choice within districts. You are talking about having that opportunity. What is the incentive? How would that work for the school that was not chosen? How does that work for parents? And what do you envision there?

Secretary DEVOS. Thanks, Senator, for that question.

I would just say at the beginning you were very fortunate because your school district must have been a real leader in its time in allowing for open choice within the district.

There are few districts—there are some that offer that today, and we encourage districts to look seriously at opening up their district-wide choice to meet students' needs better. Part of our proposal through the Opportunity Grant proposal and also through the student-weighted funding pilot program through ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) provides a couple of different ways that local districts could look at opening up options to a wider range of schools within the district. We very much encourage States and school districts to look at doing so because it does help continue to give students the kinds of options and choices that they need.

FLEXIBILITIES REQUIRED TO EXPAND CHOICE WITHIN DISTRICTS

Senator LANKFORD. So mechanically how would that work? You have got a parent that does not have any kind of wealth, that transportation is going to be a challenge for them, that want their kids to be able to go to another school on the other side of the district and say they may have better opportunities there, they may have better test scores, whatever it may be. The finances and the flexibility—could they use that for transportation and be able to help? How would that impact the first school there, that now has smaller class sizes because they have fewer students? But how does that help them as well?

Secretary DEVOS. Well, we have seen this implemented on a smaller scale in a number of States. It really does depend on what the needs of that district are. Transportation costs could be factored in and a variety of different accommodations to ensure that the students' needs are met and that the disruption is minimized in the district. The idea of the proposal is to remain flexible

so that States and local districts can adopt the kind of approach and the kind of supports that will work for them.

Senator LANKFORD. I met last week with a group of African American pastors and floated this concept to them. They happened to be in an urban district in my State. And I asked them, how would this work for you, how would this work for your parents. The gentleman to my left immediately said I would be glad to take any opportunity that we had to be able to do that, for my parents to be able to choose whichever school in the district they want to be able to go to as long as the school close to me is not forgotten because some parents will not have that opportunity.

Do you envision that there is still that focus from the district to say we are not leaving any one school behind, but we are also giving parents that option?

Secretary DEVOS. Well, again, I think in the districts that have implemented this well that has been a high sensitivity for them. I think about Indianapolis that has done a really innovative job of addressing this and have created innovation schools alongside some of the traditional schools within the district. They have, again as a district, been quite sensitive to what the needs of the whole district are. So that opportunity is very much there, and the proposal remains very flexible so that districts can address these issues according to the local need.

IMPORTANCE OF INTERDEPARTMENTAL COLLABORATION

Senator LANKFORD. Terrific.

Let me bring up one caveat as well. I know that the Department of Education and the Department of Labor are trying to be able to work together because ultimately we are preparing people for careers. So that cooperation should be there. In fact, in most other countries, education and labor are one entity within government rather than two. So I appreciate the cooperation.

I would like to encourage continued cooperation as well between Interior and Education because our Indian education continues to suffer around the country. There are some assets that you could bring to bear that would help the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Indian Education to be able to have that cooperation together. So as you are cooperating with Labor, I would encourage continued cooperation with Interior as well.

Secretary DEVOS. Indeed. Thanks, Senator.

Senator LANKFORD. Thank you.

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, Senator Lankford.

Senator Leahy.

SCHOOL SAFETY COMMISSION

Senator LEAHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary DeVos, welcome back to the subcommittee.

Secretary DEVOS. Thank you.

Senator LEAHY. I regret that we are discussing a budget proposal that does not support all students seeking to learn in our education system. And I will not repeat what Senator Murray said, but I totally agree with her statement.

Let me go into another area. You are the chair of the President's School Safety Commission that was formed after the school shoot-

ing in Florida that left 17 students and educators dead. Our country is now averaging a school shooting each week. In fact, 1 day after the Commission met last month, another 10 students and teachers were killed in Santa Fe, Texas.

I understand your commission intends to release its recommendations by the end of the year. Will your Commission look at the role of firearms as it relates to gun violence in our schools?

Secretary DEVOS. Thanks, Senator, for that question.

It is an honor to serve and to lead this Commission.

We are focused on the 20-some different provisions that the——

Senator LEAHY. I understand there is a lot. But I am also thinking the chairman has difficulties. So I tried to give you a question that could be answered yes or no. Will your Commission look at the role of firearms as it relates to gun violence in our schools?

Secretary DEVOS. That is not part of the Commission's charge per se.

ROLE OF GUNS IN SCHOOL VIOLENCE

Senator LEAHY. I see. So you are studying gun violence but not considering the role of guns?

Secretary DEVOS. We are actually studying school safety and how we can ensure our students are safe at school.

Senator LEAHY. Well, you are studying things like how much time they spend on video games and all that, but you can go to a lot of other countries where they spend just as much time but have only a tiny fraction of the shootings that we do.

The gun of choice for mass shooters is an AR–15. Do you believe an 18-year-old high school student should be able to walk into a store, and minutes later come out with an AR–15 style rifle and hundreds of rounds of ammunition?

Secretary DEVOS. Well, sir, I know that this body and your counterparts on the other side of the Capitol have addressed a number of these issues, and I know that you are going to continue to debate them and discuss them.

Senator LEAHY. I am trying to give you questions that could be answered yes or no. So let me repeat it in case I was not clear.

Secretary DEVOS. Thank you.

Senator LEAHY. Do you believe an 18-year-old high school student should be able to walk into a store and minutes later come out with an AR–15 style assault weapon and hundreds of rounds of ammunition?

Secretary DEVOS. I believe that is very much a matter for debate. And I know that has been debated within this body and will continue to be.

Our focus is on raising up successful, proven techniques and approaches to ensuring schools are safe for students to attend.

Senator LEAHY. Are you looking at those other countries where the students spend just as much time on social media and video games and everything else but have much lower gun violence in their schools?

Secretary DEVOS. We had a very important meeting last week in Maryland at a school within a district that has employed an approach called PBIS (Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports) for 16 or 18 years that deals with——

Senator LEAHY. I am sorry. Maybe I did not make my question clear. Are you looking at some of those countries where the students do just as much time on video games, just as much time on social media as we do, but do not have gun violence? Are you looking at those at all? That is a yes or no.

Secretary DEVOS. Not per se.

AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS AND SUPPORTING STUDENTS AFFECTED BY OPIOID CRISIS

Senator LEAHY. Thank you.

So we will look at gun violence in schools but not look at guns. It is an interesting concept.

Now, I have learned from after-school programs across my own State of Vermont. Many of the families who participate are struggling with opioid addiction. I think the same could be said probably of every single State represented by Republicans or Democrats in this body. Are you concerned that by pulling $1 billion in after-school funding the Department of Education would be complicating recovery for many families who depend on safe and educational care for their children in order to hold down a job or focus on addiction treatment?

Secretary DEVOS. We are very much focused on this program—I mean, on this problem and have, in fact, in the budget included $43 million to identify and encourage replication of effective prevention programs. We also know that there is a lot of flexibility——

Senator LEAHY. That is not included in the 11 percent that you have cut from key programs that do support our students.

Secretary DEVOS. The focus is on flexible funding to be used as needed by the districts and the States in which these problems are more prevalent, and we encourage States to take that flexibility and to apply it in ways that it is going to be particularly effective and meaningful for their communities.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you. My time is up, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, Senator.

Senator Alexander.

ESSA STATE PLAN APPROVALS

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, welcome.

Under our new Every Student Succeeds Act, replacing No Child Left Behind, every State submits a plan to you for approval in order to receive about $18 billion of Federal funding for Titles I, II, and IV. I have some questions on that because it has been suggested by some—not me—that you are not following the law in approving those plans.

How many State plans have been approved so far?

Secretary DEVOS. 46 State plans.

Senator ALEXANDER. Do you believe it is a requirement of the law that States collect, report, and use data on the performance of all students and each subgroup of students?

Secretary DEVOS. Yes, indeed.

Senator ALEXANDER. Do all the State plans that you have approved thus far propose to look at data from, "all students and each subgroup of students"?

Secretary DEVOS. They do, yes.

Senator ALEXANDER. Do you believe it is a requirement of the law that States identify schools with, "consistently under-performing subgroups"?

Secretary DEVOS. Yes.

Senator ALEXANDER. Do all of the State plans that you have approved thus far propose to identify schools with, "consistently under-performing subgroups"?

Secretary DEVOS. Yes, indeed.

Senator ALEXANDER. After the Passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act, Secretary Duncan reportedly said, "Candidly, our lawyers at the Department of Education are much smarter than many of the folks who are working on this bill." Are any of those smart lawyers still at your Department?

Secretary DEVOS. Indeed, they are, probably most of them.

Senator ALEXANDER. Do those smart lawyers at the Department agree that the plans that you have approved meet all of the requirements of the law?

Secretary DEVOS. They do.

SIMPLIFYING FINANCIAL AID APPLICATION PROCESS

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Now, let me ask you this. We have had a lot of discussion in our authorizing committee about trying to make it simpler for students to apply for and pay back where they need to their Federal student aid, $100 billion in loans each year, $30 billion or so in Pell Grants.

It seems to me that applying for Federal aid for college should be as simple as buying a plane ticket on your phone or buying a book with one click. This has been invented and we use it for all sorts of things.

Now, you have asked for $50 million in the budget in order to modernize the system by which students apply for and pay back their Federal financial aid. What can you tell us about that? How do you plan to spend the money? And why do you think you will be successful doing this when we were so unsuccessful in technology when we dealt with the Obamacare exchanges, which turned into a big mess?

Secretary DEVOS. Thanks, Senator, for that question.

I am really excited about the effort to modernize Federal student aid, both the process and the experience. We believe that students should have a world-class experience when applying for and then subsequently paying down their student loans. The framework and infrastructure for this has not been modernized and has not been—it has been sort of patched over the last 20-some years. So our approach is to completely restructure and make that experience one that will be seamless for students, one that we can complete the Federal student aid application on your smart phone, and again have the world-class experience that we have come to expect in every other area of life.

The confidence I have in being able to do that is that we have the right leadership in place to be able to ensure that——

Senator ALEXANDER. Who is that? Why do you think that?

Secretary DEVOS. Well, we have Dr. Wayne Johnson who comes from the financial services field with much experience and lots of entrepreneurial activity in that field. In fact——

Senator ALEXANDER. Has he ever done anything like this before?

Secretary DEVOS. He has, indeed. Some of you may recall years ago when you got new credit cards in the mail, they would come without an activation code because that was just how it was done. Strangely enough, many of those cards disappeared in the process of getting from the origination point to your mailbox. Well, he developed the 1–800 number that now we just go online to activate. But the 800 number was his invention, and it became ubiquitous across the financial services industry. So very forward-thinking and a very deep knowledge of that field and that process and that experience.

We are committed to having the first steps completed for a pilot test in July of this year, and we will be able to in the fall—hopefully by October 1st—have the full thing being able to roll out so that student aid applications for the next school year will be able to be completed online in one sitting.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, Senator Alexander.

Senator Shaheen.

SCHOOL VIOLENCE FROM INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for being here, Secretary DeVos.

I want to go back to an issue that was raised by Senator Leahy because we got an email from a high school student from Dover, New Hampshire in our office, and she writes—and I am quoting—"it should be known that I am a student and that February 14th, 2018, which was the date of the Parkland shooting, was not the first time in my life that I have stayed up at night thinking extensively about how I would react in a situation such as a school shooting. I at 16 years old should not have an intimate relationship with the idea of mass shootings. But I do. And so does every one of my friends. So do my parents. So does my 9-year-old brother, and so does the rest of the country."

I think that outlines very dramatically a problem that is unique to the United States, sadly. School shootings in the U.S. occur at a scale far beyond any other major industrialized nation. Since 2009, the U.S. has had 57 times more school shootings than the rest of the G–7 countries combined. That is 288 school shootings in the U.S. compared with 2 each in Canada and France, 1 in Germany, and none in Japan, Italy, or the United Kingdom.

So the question that I have for you is, are you going to be looking at this? What are these other countries doing to protect their students from school shootings? Do they have fewer mentally ill people? Are they arming their teachers? Or do they have more sensible gun laws?

Secretary DEVOS. Senator, thank you for that question. These are, of course, very important questions in the whole context of talking about keeping schools safe and making sure students are safe in school.

The Commission that has begun its work is very much focused on the range of issues that we have been asked to address and to focus on. It does get down to looking at what is this culture of violence, where does it come from. It really is the issue of violence, and violence can manifest in several different ways.

Senator SHAHEEN. Excuse me for interrupting, but we do have limited time.

But given that, it does seem to me that you should think about reworking the mission of the Commission so that it is also taking a look at guns and the role that guns play in school violence. So I would urge you to do that.

AFFORDABILITY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

I would like to move on to another topic because you said in your opening remarks that education can change the trajectory of a child's life, and I very much believe that. I believe that going to good schools and having an opportunity for a higher education provides opportunities that young people can get in no other way.

And so that is why I am so puzzled about why your budget proposes cutting so many of the programs that help our students in New Hampshire, the after-school programs, the help for college students, particularly first generation college students. We heard from some students at the University of New Hampshire, one pre-med student who says coming to college can be very overwhelming. Personally I did not have family members that could guide me to college, tell me what to expect or what to do. And being part of TRIO, they were that family.

So we also have the second highest student loan debt in the country, and yet your budget proposes cuts that will force students to take out even more loans to pay for school. You eliminate work-study programs. You eliminate subsidized loans for undergraduates. How should we tell students in New Hampshire that they are going to be able to afford college and that they are going to be able to go to good schools?

Secretary DEVOS. Senator, we are very much focused on ensuring that students that have the greatest need have also the greatest opportunity. This budget was predicated on making decisions around the parameters that we were given and is really focused on programs that do meet students that are in the greatest need directly. Some of the programs that you referred to are ones that have not been proven to be effective or have been spread too thinly or——

EVIDENCE OF INEFFECTIVE PROGRAMS

Senator SHAHEEN. And do you have reports that show that they have not been effective? Can you share that with the committee why the 21st Learning Grants you believe are not effective?

Secretary DEVOS. Yes, indeed. There is data that demonstrates ineffectiveness in that program and we would be happy to share that.

Senator SHAHEEN. I think we would very much appreciate seeing that information.

[The information follows:]

PERFORMANCE AND EVALUATION DATA FOR 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS PROGRAM

While limited evaluation and survey data from certain States and individual centers demonstrate benefits from participation, such as improved behavior and classroom grades, overall program performance data show that the 21st CCLC program is not achieving its goal of helping students, particularly those who attend low-performing schools, meet challenging State academic standards. For example, in 2016, only 26 percent of elementary school program participants improved from not proficient to proficient or above on State assessments in reading and only 19 percent of middle and high school program participants improved from not proficient to proficient or above on State assessments in mathematics. Furthermore, student improvement in academic grades was limited, with States reporting higher math and English grades for less than half of "regular program participants," defined as students who attended programs for 30 days or more during a school year. Additionally, the last rigorous national evaluation of the program, conducted in 2005, found the program had limited academic impact (see https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/other/cclcfinalreport/cclcfinal.pdf).

The program's longstanding failure to contribute meaningfully to improved academic outcomes may be partly explained by the fact that less than half of all participants (728,000 out of 1.9 million, or 44 percent) attended programs for 30 days or more during the 2015–2016 school year. These data suggest that low participation rates and limited or infrequent access to federally funded activities are significant obstacles to program effectiveness.

A 2010 report prepared by the Department's Policy and Program Studies Service, "21st Century Community Learning Centers: Descriptive Study of Program Practices," analyzed data from a nationally representative sample of 21st CCLC programs to evaluate State and local program implementation (see http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/opepd/ppss/reports.html#after-school). The evaluation focused on how, and to what extent, funds support high quality programs that emphasize academic content, as well as staffing patterns and other features of after-school program implementation that may have an impact on the quality of the programming offered. Centers reported that about half of their students attended roughly 2 days a week or more. In addition, three-quarters of the centers reported that a typical student participated in reading activities (75 percent) and mathematics activities (81 percent) for less than 4 hours per week. About half of centers reported offering professional development opportunities to staff through training courses or conferences.

A 2005 program evaluation conducted by the Department's Institute of Education Sciences found that there were no differences between treatment group students and control group students on most academic outcomes; treatment group students scored no better on reading tests than control group students and had similar grades in English, mathematics, science, and social studies. This study identified a potentially contributing factor to the lack of academic gains resulting from the program: only 53 percent of the treatment group students who continued to have access to a 21st CCLC program in year 2 of the evaluation continued to attend a center (see https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/other/cclcfinalreport/cclcfinal.pdf).

PROPOSED CUTS TO FEDERAL WORK-STUDY

Senator SHAHEEN. And on higher education, you think the Work-Study program has not helped students with——

Secretary DEVOS. The Work-Study program we have continued to propose funding for. The piece that you are referring to is the graduate piece of that program and again, making difficult decisions around where to focus the resources. By the time a student gets into a graduate program, there are other opportunities. We are focused on trying to get the greatest number of students the opportunity to pursue higher education whatever that looks like for them. That is why we have suggested a short-term Pell program as well because we cannot make the assumption that a 4-year college or university is the right answer or the right pathway for every single student.

Senator SHAHEEN. My time is up. Thank you.

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, Senator Shaheen.

Senator Capito.

ADDRESSING REJECTED TRIO APPLICATIONS

Senator CAPITO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Secretary DeVos, for coming this morning and thank you for your service.

I wanted to follow up. You came by the office a few weeks ago and we talked about the TRIO programs. And I wanted you to share with the committee your plan for reviewing these applications that were discarded due to either formatting or budget issues. This Committee, thanks to Chairman Blunt and others, wants to make sure that institutions like WVU and West Virginia State are not penalized for the minor errors in their applications.

Secretary DEVOS. Thanks, Senator, for that question.

We did have that conversation. And as you know, the formatting issue was dealt with I think later last year. But there were some other applications that had some issues with the budgetary formatting and/or some of the numbers, frankly. Per the direction of Congress, we have gone back and have opened a process to reexamine those—I think it is—40-some applicants that fall into that category.

Senator CAPITO. Do we have a timeline on that?

Secretary DEVOS. I do not have the specific timeline, but I would be happy to get that to you.

Senator CAPITO. Thank you.

In your remarks, you mentioned that a number of consolidations are occurring, including proposals for the Federal TRIO, HEA, Title III and Title V supporting Minority-Serving Institutions, making them formula grants so that the States may use the funds more effectively.

Could we talk about that a little bit? Does that mean it is formula grants down to the State to make that decision? Is that how you envision that? And why is that more efficient and a better way to deliver the funding than what we presently have?

Secretary DEVOS. So let me just go back to your previous question because I just—we are on track to have the process for the 40-some schools we just talked about done by the summer so that it is in advance of the next school year.

Senator CAPITO. The fall. Great.

PROPOSAL TO SHIFT COMPETITIVE TO FORMULA GRANTS

Secretary DEVOS. With respect to your question about some of the programs that we have proposed for consolidation, all of these programs—about 90 percent of the funding continually goes to the same entities. And yet, we have a large process within the Department of Education that goes through all of these grant programs repetitively time after time and ends up granting them out to the same places.

So our proposal is to make that more efficient and recognize what it essentially is, which is more of a block granted program, and do so to the States. The States, we believe, are closer to the institutions and have a better handle on whether there are some new entrants into the market that might be considered and also how the existing ones are doing. And so that is our proposal to

streamline that and make that process more effective and recognize what it basically is.

Senator CAPITO. I mean, I agree with the premise of giving the States the flexibility. I think that goes along with the Every Student Succeeds Act that we passed and others.

My questions is—and I think Senator Shaheen will—her ears will perk up on this one as well—whenever I hear the formula funding, it always sounds like it is going to be population-based, and for smaller States, sometimes and a lot of times that can be detrimental to maybe previous years. So I would just put that on your radar screen.

Secretary DEVOS. The proposal would be for the States to get the same level of funding that they had previously.

APPRENTICESHIPS

Senator CAPITO. Okay. That makes me feel better.

On the apprenticeships, you and I talked about skills gaps. We hear this all the time. You basically cannot have an economic development conversation with any businesses who are a problem finding the right skill sets for the jobs of tomorrow and even the jobs right today. This is a big concern for all of us I think. So I am interested in your expansion of the apprenticeship, and I know that obviously you all have that.

What steps are you taking to—are you working with the Secretary of Labor on this to expand this? Are you working with the unions to expand this? If you could just talk about that aspect of it, please.

Secretary DEVOS. Sure. The Task Force on Apprenticeships that President Trump had——

Senator CAPITO. Right. Put together.

Secretary DEVOS [continuing]. Put together just completed its report last month and submitted I think about three dozen different recommendations on how to expand this important opportunity and pathway. It is one area of import. Actually I am going to be in Switzerland later this week where I am attending an international forum on apprenticeships, and I think this is an area where America can learn a lot from their model there. Almost 70 percent of the students in Switzerland go into apprenticeships of some sort. When we think of apprenticeships, I think we think of a pretty narrow definition for them here. And yet, in Switzerland it goes into every sector. So I think these are areas that we have to get a lot more serious about.

Referencing back to the work of the Apprenticeship Task Force, the group that really discussed the recommendations and brought them forward was a very robust combination of business leadership, labor leadership, and higher ed leadership, all really coming together in a very unanimous and supportive fashion to say these are programs and these are areas that we have to become much more intentional about supporting business to form these new consortiums and apprenticeship opportunities and then having the theoretical and instructional pieces come alongside and do so in a way that is going to be relevant and current for students and able to be flexible to change as the needs change.

Senator CAPITO. Thank you.

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, Senator Capito.

Senator Durbin.

PROPRIETARY SCHOOLS AND LOAN DEFAULTS

Senator DURBIN. Welcome, Madam Secretary.

I think we both would agree that when students default on their student loans, there are many losers: the student, the student's family, America's taxpayers, and you might say other students who are counting on that money coming back into the Treasury for their generation to have a chance at higher education.

So I want to ask you a question, and I am going to give you multiple choice answers. Here is the question. Which group of colleges and universities enroll 9 percent of all postsecondary students—9 percent of high school grads—but account for 33 percent of Federal student loan defaults? Here are your choices: (A) public colleges and universities, (B) private not-for-profit colleges and universities, and (C) for-profit colleges and universities. Which one would you choose?

Secretary DEVOS. C.

Senator DURBIN. Exactly right.

So could you explain to me why for-profit colleges and universities, which enroll just 9 percent of high school graduates, account for 33 percent of all Federal student loan defaults?

Secretary DEVOS. It is a very serious issue, Senator, and it is one that we have—I think collectively we have to get much more serious about looking at both the opportunities for students and acknowledge—I think this is a much broader question than just what you are trying to get at because——

Senator DURBIN. Well, let me just say——

Secretary DEVOS [continuing]. Students today need to know early on before they even get into high school a number of different options that they have to pursue beyond high school.

Senator DURBIN. It just seems to me that one class with fewer than 10 percent of the students and 33 percent of the student loan defaults really has a problem that the other types of universities and colleges do not, at least to some extent.

So here is what is comes down to as far as I am concerned. They are charging too much and they are providing too little. They are misleading these students into debt and enrollment and then casting them off.

Now, how can I say something as extreme as that? Because here is what the statistics show. Two out of three graduates from for-profit colleges and universities make less money than their high school graduate counterparts who never attend a university. So they are not making much money. And it also turns out that three out of four students from these types of for-profit colleges and universities are not able to pay $1 on their Federal student debt within 3 years of entering repayment. So a lot is going on here.

And luckily for us, you have been in charge of a Department which has an investigative unit that is going to keep an eye on these for-profit colleges and universities because they are being investigated by everybody. In fact, some of them are failing because of the abusive approaches they have used and their misleading marketing: Corinthian, Westwood, ITT Tech and so forth and so on.

APPOINTEES FROM FOR-PROFIT COLLEGE SECTOR

But here is the thing that troubles me and what I want to ask you a question about. Were you aware—I am sure you are not aware of this, but you should be. Were you aware of the fact that the people you have appointed to the enforcement unit to keep an eye on for-profit colleges and universities that are ripping off students and their families and taxpayers—I am sure you are not aware of this. But it turns out that the head of the unit, Julian Schmoke, was a former dean at DeVry, one of the largest for-profit colleges and universities in my home State of Illinois. And it also turns out that Robert Eitel in that same unit you appointed and Diane Auer Jones and Carlos Muniz were former employees at Bridgepoint and Career Education Corporation, for-profit colleges and universities, themselves. So were you aware of the fact that you were appointing people to the enforcement and investigative unit who had a conflict of interest because of their own private careers before they joined you?

Secretary DEVOS. Well, Senator, the enforcement unit, part of Federal Student Aid, is very robust and functioning very well. And most of those individuals you just referred to are not part of the enforcement unit. So that is erroneous information.

STUDENT AID ENFORCEMENT UNIT

Senator DURBIN. So tell me what happened at the enforcement unit?

Secretary DEVOS. Let me just say we are very focused on ensuring that colleges and universities have a—the opportunities that students have are quality. We have to focus——

Senator DURBIN. You have reduced the number.

Secretary DEVOS [continuing]. On the opportunities and the outcomes for students——

Senator DURBIN. Well, if you focused on the outcomes and 33 percent are defaulting on their student loans and only 10 percent of the students and you took a dozen attorneys in the enforcement unit and cut it down to three and then you riddled the unit with people with conflicts of interest, it is no wonder that little or nothing is being done by way of investigation.

Secretary DEVOS. Well, I am sorry, but your information is just erroneous.

Senator DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the article from the "New York Times," which catalogues this in detail—and I am sure you have seen it—be made a part of the record after my question.

Senator ALEXANDER [presiding]. So ordered. Thank you, Senator Durbin.

[The article follows:]

New York Times
Education Department Unwinds Unit Investigating Fraud at For-Profits
By Danielle Ivory, Erica L. Green and Steve Eder
May 13, 2018

Members of a special team at the Education Department that had been investigating widespread abuses by for-profit colleges have been marginalized, reassigned or instructed to focus on other matters, according to current and former employees.

The unwinding of the team has effectively killed investigations into possibly fraudulent activities at several large for-profit colleges where top hires of Betsy DeVos, the education secretary, had previously worked.

During the final months of the Obama administration, the team had expanded to include a dozen or so lawyers and investigators who were looking into advertising, recruitment practices and job placement claims at several institutions, including DeVry Education Group.

The investigation into DeVry ground to a halt early last year. Later, in the summer, Ms. DeVos named Julian Schmoke, a former dean at DeVry, as the team's new supervisor.

Now only three employees work on the team, and their mission has been scaled back to focus on processing student loan forgiveness applications and looking at smaller compliance cases, said the current and former employees, including former members of the team, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because they feared retaliation from the department.

In addition to DeVry, now known as Adtalem Global Education, investigations into Bridgepoint Education and Career Education Corporation, which also operate large for-profit colleges, went dark.

Former employees of those institutions now work for Ms. DeVos as well, including Robert S. Eitel, her senior counselor, and Diane Auer Jones, a senior adviser on postsecondary education. Last month, Congress confirmed the appointment of a lawyer who provided consulting services to Career Education, Carlos G. Muñiz, as the department's general counsel.

The investigative team had been created in 2016 after the collapse of the for-profit Corinthian Colleges, which set off a wave of complaints from students about predatory activities at for-profit schools. The institutions had been accused of widespread fraud that involved misrepresenting enrollment benefits, job placement rates and program offerings, which could leave students with huge debts and no degrees.

Elizabeth Hill, a spokeswoman for the Education Department, attributed the reduction of the group to attrition and said that "conducting investigations is but one way the investigations team contributes to the department's broad effort to provide oversight." She said that none of the new employees who had previously worked in the for-profit education industry had influenced the unit's work.

She also said the team's deployment on student loan forgiveness applications was an "operational decision" that "neither points to a curtailment of our school oversight efforts nor indicates a conscious effort to ignore 'large-scale' investigations."

Aaron Ament, a former chief of staff to the office of the department's general counsel who helped create the team under President Barack Obama, said it had been intended to protect students from fraudulent for-profit colleges. "Unfortunately, Secretary DeVos seems to think the colleges need protection from their students," said Mr. Ament, who is now president of the National Student Legal Defense Network.

Senator Elizabeth Warren, a Democrat from Massachusetts, also criticized the team's new direction. Ms. DeVos has taken a number of actions to roll back or delay regulations that sought to rein in abuses and predatory practices among for-profit colleges—actions that Ms. Warren and other Democrats have said put the industry's interests ahead of those of students.

"Secretary DeVos has filled the department with for-profit college hacks who only care about making sham schools rich and shutting down investigations into fraud," Ms. Warren said.

DeVry did not respond to requests for comment, and Mr. Schmoke declined to be interviewed. Mr. Schmoke recused himself from matters involving DeVry, according to the department.

DeVry agreed to pay $100 million in 2016 to settle a separate Federal Trade Commission lawsuit alleging that it misled prospective students with ads about employment and salaries after graduation.

The Education Department announced a limited settlement with DeVry the same year after finding that the school could not substantiate claims that 90 percent of its alumni since 1975 were employed in their field of study within 6 months of graduating. But the investigative team continued to look into the institution's job placement claims and other recruiting practices.

The former and current employees disputed Ms. Hill's account, and said the group and its work had become an issue of contention during meetings with the Trump transition team. Several of the employees said that there had been a staff push to continue the investigation as recently as this year, with no result.

The group had also been looking into similar issues of recruiting and advertising at Bridgepoint and Career Education during the latter part of 2016, the employees said.

Ms. Hill declined to comment on those cases. "To preserve the integrity of investigations, program reviews and other enforcement activities," she said, "the department's practice is to neither confirm nor deny current or potential investigations."

In a statement, Bridgepoint said the company was aware of a review beginning in 2015, but had "not been made aware of any investigation or involvement by the enforcement unit." Career Education did not respond to requests for comment.

Bridgepoint has a high-profile connection in the Trump administration beyond the Education Department: It is a former client of Mercedes Schlapp, who is now the director of strategic communications at the White House.

Ms. Schlapp was a consultant for Bridgepoint at Cove Strategies, a lobbying and consulting firm she founded with her husband, Matt Schlapp. Bridgepoint said that it remained a Cove client.

The White House did not say whether Ms. Schlapp had recused herself from issues involving Bridgepoint and did not respond to a request to interview her. Mr. Schlapp said in an email that "Bridgepoint and other online institutions were persecuted by President Obama's administration because they dared to bring innovation to the education market."

He added, "I believe educational innovation and disruption are a fight worth having and it matches the President's agenda of rolling back the excess of the Obama regulatory stranglehold."

Mr. Eitel, the senior adviser to Ms. DeVos, last year recused himself from issues involving both Bridgepoint and Career Education, where he was previously a top lawyer.

Ms. Jones, the senior adviser on postsecondary education, has not recused herself from matters involving Career Education, where she previously worked, according to a list of recusals the department provided. The department did not say whether Mr. Muñiz had recused himself from issues involving the company.

Ms. Jones worked for about 5 years as a senior vice president at Career Education Corporation after serving as assistant secretary for postsecondary education for President George W. Bush. She joined the Trump administration early this year.

In a letter to Ms. DeVos last week, Ms. Warren and nine other Democratic senators called on the department to reveal the extent of Ms. Jones's ties to the industry, suggesting she had a history of working "on behalf of bad actors."

The department issued an extensive statement defending Ms. Jones, calling her background an "asset" that would advance the department's goals. Ms. Jones has had "vast higher-ed experience in community colleges, research universities and for-profit colleges," it said in the statement, adding that she had spent only a fraction of her career in the for-profit industry.

The investigative team emerged in the wake of Corinthian Colleges' shutdown as the Obama administration faced criticism for providing loans to students attending other for-profit schools that had also been accused of illegal activity, substandard practices or predatory behavior. While not created expressly to focus on for-profit schools, the group directed its attention to those institutions because of their recruiting practices and the large amount of students they serve.

Separately, another group, the borrower defense unit, focused on forgiving loans for students at Corinthian and other schools where fraud had been identified. That group's work all but came to a stop last year, but has recently gotten going again.

After Mr. Trump's victory, some employees openly worried about the fate of the investigative unit, and policies quickly changed with the new administration, according to the current and former employees.

Communication with outside groups now required special approval, including with state attorneys general, who had been partners in identifying cases, and Federal agencies like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which had been aggressively monitoring a number of for-profit colleges. Without permission, team members could not contact schools or other parties to request documents, an essential part of making a case, which effectively halted investigative work.

Ms. Hill, the Education Department spokeswoman, said the department was "focused on weeding out bad actors" across higher education, "not capriciously targeting schools based on their tax status."

In recent months, the three remaining team members have been looking at small cases and examining student requests for loan forgiveness, like one filed by Josue Perez.

Mr. Perez, 30, said he was persuaded by an admissions officer at Corinthian Colleges' Everest Institute in the Boston area to take out a $5,000 loan to attend the school for massage therapy.

The officer told him, according to Mr. Perez, that the college would help him find a job when he graduated. But Mr. Perez never received the help, he said, and he still has not worked in the field. The loan has since tripled to more than $15,000, he said.

He has been waiting for more than a year for the Education Department's decision on his claim to forgive the $15,000, he said. In the meantime, he worries about the department's new direction.

"They're basically removing the police force that keeps these colleges in check," he said.

Senator ALEXANDER. Senator Hyde-Smith.

ISSUES FACING RURAL SCHOOLS

Senator HYDE-SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary DeVos, first of all, I am thrilled that you are here. I enjoyed getting to meet you over the phone, and thank you for talking with me.

Rural schools, like many in my State, face unique challenges from recruiting and retaining teachers to the lack of access to broadband. I believe it is imperative that the Department support research to address the specific needs for rural schools and students.

It is my understanding that the Department will recompete a grant to establish a Research and Development Center dedicated to rural education.

My question is, what does the Department consider the most pressing issues facing rural schools, and how will you help tackle these needs, including the severe teacher shortage?

Secretary DEVOS. Senator, thanks for that question.

I know that the needs of rural communities are very unique and they differ from community to community. We very much support the flexibility for rural communities to address their issues and their needs specifically.

When we think about opportunities and making sure that students have a broad range of opportunity, I think one of the most important things is that the schools and the communities have ac-

cess to broadband in a very robust way. I know that that is continuing to improve. That is not part of the Department of Education's purview but we certainly advocate for the widespread adoption of and availability of broadband. That is I think one tool that communities can use to ensure that students are introduced to a broader subject range through courses that they may not be able to provide at their school. But we again acknowledge that every rural community is different as well. So we support the communities' approaches to address the needs that they have for their students and are focused on trying to do so in a way that recognizes the varying geographies and the varying needs.

GEOGRAPHY AND REGIONAL DIVERSITY IN FUNDING DECISIONS

Senator HYDE-SMITH. And another question is, how does the Department consider the geographic distribution and disparities of research projects and fundings?

Secretary DEVOS. The research projects and fundings—those are programs that are generally looked at competitively and as a whole. And if you have a specific one that you are interested in, I would certainly look forward to hearing about that and for the Department to look at that program seriously—or that request, I should say.

Senator HYDE-SMITH. Thank you for that.

The Department recently awarded Striving Reader Literacy Grants to 11 States, and I understand that this funding is used to help States create a comprehensive program to advance literacy skills for students from birth through grade 12. Would you please share with the committee what the Department is doing to ensure these grants benefit a wide variety of States, especially rural areas with underserved populations like Mississippi?

Secretary DEVOS. Well, we are certainly taking into account the very diverse populations that we have in our country and are hoping to ensure that a wide range of communities and students are able to take advantage of that program. Again, if you have a specific interest in that one, I would be glad offline to talk with you about that and try to ensure that we are looking very objectively at the requests from your State.

Senator HYDE-SMITH. Great. Thank you very, very much.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you, Senator Hyde-Smith.

Senator Manchin.

CUTS TO FLEXIBLE FUNDS APPLICABLE TO ADDRESSING OPIOIDS

Senator MANCHIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Secretary, for being here.

I know the vote is going on. I got to hurry.

I want to thank Secretary DeVos for being here.

While the fiscal year 2019 budget proposal does not cut as much funding from the Department of Education as last year, I am very concerned about the significant cuts that have been proposed and appreciate you are here to answer our questions.

I am particularly concerned about the $3.6 billion in cuts that come primarily by eliminating the 21st Century Community Learning Centers and the Title II teacher grant funds. Both of these pro-

grams are critical for West Virginia communities but particularly so in all of our rural communities and rural States.

As you know, the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act includes a program called Title IV Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants Program. The block grant is designed to provide States and school districts the flexibility to provide a wide range of services that support a well-rounded education. Congress authorized more than $1.6 billion in funding. Then we appropriated $1.1 billion in funding. And the President's budget, however, eliminates all the funding entirely.

The problem is we are using that for opioid concerns that we have with students coming from addicted households and maybe even addiction themselves. It puts us in a critical situation, Madam Secretary, and I did not know how you all plan to work with this or navigate this since there is no money.

Secretary DEVOS. Well, Senator, thanks for the questions.

The budget in total was produced in the context of the restrictions and the parameters that we had. We had to make choices around programs that were duplicative or spread thinly or shown not to be effective. I would say that the funding that Congress did restore in the Omnibus to Title IV is an area that I think we look at differently given the circumstances today versus when the budget was originally generated.

Senator MANCHIN. You have gone from like $400 million up to $1.1 billion, which I am very much appreciative, but then it goes right back to nothing. Opioid addiction in my State, as you know, and a lot of States—the flexibility that we had with those grants, those titles—we were able to use that to intervene, to identify, to replace children that were coming from addicted homes. And it is going to be imperative we have some way of doing that.

Secretary DEVOS. Absolutely. Well, the funding that remains in the proposed budget is very flexible and can be used in——

Senator MANCHIN. So you are intending to basically use with the base budgets you have in education because there is 3.6 percent cut overall.

Secretary DEVOS. But as I said, the budget was put forward prior to the enactment of the 2018 Omnibus. Given the time frame and the elapsed time since then and the focus both on school safety issues, as well as the opioid crisis, we look anew at the Title IV——

Senator MANCHIN. If your staff can get with us and show us how you intend for us to be able to still address the problems we are having because our educators are concerned next year everything stops. We got a program moving right now identifying children that are coming from addicted homes, placing them, getting them out of risk. And it is just imperative that we have some——

Secretary DEVOS. I know the opioid issue is a very horrible one.

PLAUSIBILITY OF SCHOOL CHOICE IN RURAL AREAS

Senator MANCHIN. The other thing is I am concerned—and you and I have spoken about this before—is choice and school charters. In small rural States, the only choice we have is either improving the education we have or doing without. There is not an option in some of the rural areas. So I am concerned about the $3.6 billion that are being cut while at the same time shifting $1.5 billion from

critical education programs to school choice. That is going to be very, very hard.

So would your choice program not simply leave holes in West Virginia? I mean, the way it is right now in our West Virginia school budgets created by these proposed cuts, it is just going to leave a hole that we cannot fill.

Secretary DEVOS. Well, sir, the proposal around choice really does offer rural districts opportunities to think differently and to meet students' needs differently as well. And that is really sort of the big picture——

Senator MANCHIN. In West Virginia, we just cannot afford to start another education system. We do not have the market where the private market is moving into that. All we are doing is taking funds away from—hopefully enhancing a system, making it better than what we have right now.

Secretary DEVOS. But sometimes you can think of choice differently, and I think we often think in terms of infrastructure and buildings. In rural areas, I understand that maybe the biggest challenge is a school that is not able to offer some AP courses because they simply do not have enough students. So offering course choice via a virtual classroom is an opportunity to——

Senator MANCHIN. That would be great except I do not even have Internet connect in most of the rural areas and even cell service. So sometimes——

Senator ALEXANDER. Senator Blunt will be upset with me if I do not enforce the rule.

Senator MANCHIN. I know. With that, we would like to invite you to West Virginia to come into some of these real rural communities without connectivity to see firsthand. Okay?

Secretary DEVOS. Yes, thanks. I mean, I know that is a huge issue.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you, Senator Manchin.

Senator Murphy.

FEDERAL AUTHORITY ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Senator MURPHY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Madam Secretary, for being here today.

I think you have heard some concern from many of us about the changes in procedures for civil rights investigations and dismissal of claims. And so let me just try to square some of your opening comments with some of the changes that you have been asked about.

You have made it very clear that you do not think that there should be a one-size-fits-all approach to education in the country, you should not think as much authority for making decisions about kids' education should be in the hands of local educators. And there are certainly lots of members of this committee who agree.

But on the issue of civil rights, should there be a one-size-fits-all for civil rights protections, or should that decision be in the hands of local communities? Or should your office consider different community standards regarding issues like civil rights when making decisions?

Secretary DEVOS. The role of the Department is an important one in enforcing students' civil rights and protecting them. And it

is one that I am committed to and it is one that the Office for Civil Rights is committed to.

Senator MURPHY. So I understand that. But there should be a one-size-fits-all standard for civil rights protections. Right? We should have a Federal civil rights law. All students should be protected by that under the same standard.

Secretary DEVOS. Indeed.

RIGHTS OF UNDOCUMENTED STUDENTS

Senator MURPHY. Let me ask you a question that you were presented with in a House hearing around the question of whether teachers should refer undocumented students to ICE for immigration enforcement. In the hearing, I think you stated that that should be up to each individual State or school district, and then you released a follow-up statement in which you said that our Nation has both a legal and moral obligation to educate every child and it is well established under the Supreme Court's ruling in Plyler and has been consistent in my position since day one.

So I am worried that that statement is still not clear on this sort of very important question of whether or not a teacher or a principal is allowed to call ICE to report an undocumented student under Federal law. Can a teacher or principal call ICE to report an undocumented student under current Federal law?

Secretary DEVOS. I will refer back again to the settled case in *Plyler v. Doe* in 1982 which says students that are not documented have the right to an education. I think it is incumbent on us to ensure that those students have a safe and secure environment to attend school, to learn, and I maintain that.

Senator MURPHY. So let me ask the question again. Is it okay—you are the Secretary of Education. There are a lot of schools that want guidance and want to understand what the law is. Is it okay for a teacher or principal to call ICE to report an undocumented student?

Secretary DEVOS. I think a school is a sacrosanct place for students to be able to learn, and they should be protected there.

Senator MURPHY. You seem to be very purposely not giving a yes or no answer, and I think there are a lot of educators that want to know whether this is permissible.

Secretary DEVOS. I think educators know in their hearts that they need to ensure that students have a safe place to learn.

Senator MURPHY. Why are you not answering the question?

Secretary DEVOS. I think I am answering the question.

Senator MURPHY. Well, the question is yes or no. Can a principal call ICE on a student? Is that allowed under Federal law? You are the Secretary of Education.

Secretary DEVOS. In a school setting, a student has the right to be there and the right to learn. And so everything surrounding that should protect that and enhance that student's opportunity and that student's environment.

Senator MURPHY. So they cannot call ICE.

Secretary DEVOS. I do not think they can.

Senator MURPHY. Thank you.

SCHOOL SAFETY AND CONSISTENT STANDARDS

Lastly, on your School Safety Commission, I guess I am just trying to square again this belief about not having one-size-fits-all with the goal of the Commission to establish best practices. So how do you do both? Because if you just give a menu to schools, that might not be terribly helpful. What would be helpful is to look at evidence, what works, what does not. Obviously, you know my interest in making sure that teachers are not armed. I would argue that if you look at the evidence, it will not point you in the direction of arming teachers.

I am out of time here. But just how do you balance telling schools what works based on the evidence versus not having a one-size-fits-all presentation on the issue of school safety?

Secretary DEVOS. Well, I do not think it is a role of the Federal Department of Education to tell schools what they can and should do or cannot and should not do. It is the role for States and local communities to decide what is going to be best to protect their students. And we know that there are countless legislatures at the State level debating how they are going to address these issues now. The role of the safety commission is to ensure that we raise up these practices and encourage States to look at them and encourage communities to look at them.

One of the first things that we did was to go back to the reports following Sandy Hook, following Columbine and Virginia Tech and to look at what actually has been adopted in places and that is being assessed now. But evidence-based approaches that have been demonstrated to work—we need to urge and encourage more of those to be broadly adopted.

Senator MURPHY. Great. Thank you.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you, Senator Murphy.

Senator Reed.

SCHOOL FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Senator REED. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Madam Secretary, during the campaign, President Trump strongly advocated for fixing schools up as part of an infrastructure plan, and the schools certainly need it. The American Society of Civil Engineers gives our school facilities a D-plus rating, about a $38 billion gap between necessary repairs to bring them up to standard. And that is certainly a level that cannot be supported by States and localities alone.

One of the ironies is that we are spending money programmatically in schools that, because of the disrepair, are not functional. The kids are not being well educated not because they do not have good teachers. It is just that the windows are broken and the computers are damaged by rain and all those things.

So just what are you doing to address this issue of improving school facilities at the Department of Education or getting the President to get it into his infrastructure plan?

Secretary DEVOS. Well, thanks, Senator, for that question.

As you know, the specifics around school infrastructure were not part of the infrastructure proposal, and that really does not fall under the purview of the Department of Education. These issues

are left to the States and local communities to deal with, and I think that is where those are best addressed.

Senator REED. The issue of addressing them locally goes to just like highways and roads and bridges, yes, but without Federal support, they will not be effectively addressed. And we are spending a lot of time here talking about educational reform, programmatic reform, enhancing the teachers' skills, et cetera when kids are sitting in rooms where the ceilings are falling in, the windows are broken. Should you not be advocating that the President incorporate it in his infrastructure plan, that this is absolutely critical to education success?

Secretary DEVOS. Well, I obviously think that learning environments are important to students, but I also think that we can have an opportunity to think a little more broadly as well. I visited a school last week that is a public middle school located in a public museum, and the whole city is their classroom. These are the kinds of approaches that I think more schools can be thinking about and utilizing. And I would encourage that because the world has changed.

Senator REED. Well, Madam Secretary that is a novel and perhaps unique experience. Most schools—in fact, too many schools—I will not say most, but I will say too many schools are just without basic maintenance and funds for rehabilitation. And it is an issue that is an educational issue. You do not see the connection between a suitable school facility with adequate heat and windows and an education? That is disconnected?

Secretary DEVOS. I do think it is an important part of an educational experience.

Senator REED. So you will advocate from the Department of Education based on educational issues that we do something for school infrastructure?

Secretary DEVOS. Infrastructure is a State and local issue. It is a matter for those entities to address and deal with to ensure their students have the kind of environment that is conducive to their learning.

Senator REED. So you are saying no, that the Federal Government should not be involved in providing support to schools for reconstruction, for rehabilitation, and for physical improvements.

Secretary DEVOS. Well, it is not part of the President's plan and it is not part of the Administration's proposal.

Senator REED. But it is a big part of education from the perspective of most people that I know, students, teachers, and other people.

COORDINATING WITH DEFENSE ON LOAN FORGIVENESS

Your student loan program proposals. The request would make student loans more expensive. You are eliminating the in-school interest subsidies for needy students, ending public service loan forgiveness. This particular issue I think is problematic because we have heard comments from the Department of Defense that they use this loan forgiveness as a means to begin recruiting personnel into the military. Have you coordinated with DOD (Department of Defense) about the effect of rescinding the loan forgiveness?

Secretary DEVOS. We have been in conversation with DOD about serving our military and our veterans well, including the students of those military families——

Senator REED. I am talking about prospective recruits which would rely upon or could benefit from the loan forgiveness, but if it is taken away, they might decide that going into the service is not their best option.

Secretary DEVOS. Well, I hope that we will be supportive and continue to be supportive of veterans in their careers and beyond.

TEACH GRANT SERVICING

Senator REED. Finally, the TEACH Grant program has had tremendous servicing issues. People have discovered after they thought they spent years in a program that would allow them to have their loan forgiven that because of poor servicing, bad advice, they have failed. They do not get the relief they thought they would have.

What are you doing to fix that servicing problem?

Secretary DEVOS. I will look into that specific question and issue and get back with you on that.

[The information follows:]

REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT PLANS FOR SERVICING OF TEACH GRANTS

The Department reaffirms its commitment to improve its administration of the Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) Grant Program. Taking note of past servicing issues, the Department is studying all aspects of the program to determine necessary modifications so as to align servicing of the TEACH Grants with Congressional intent. This will ensure that students who agree to teach for 4 years at an elementary school, secondary school, or educational service agency that serves students from low-income families have the resources and support that they need.

In the interim, the Department will continue to perform oversight and review of TEACH Grant-related disputes and escalated issues resulting from interactions with recipients. Moreover, the Department will continue to perform periodic on-site and off-site monitoring to ensure adherence to existing TEACH Grant regulations, requirements, and other issues.

Senator REED. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you, Senator Reed.

HIGHER EDUCATION REGULATORY REFORM

Other Senators are coming back, Madam Secretary, but in the meantime let me ask you this.

A distinguished group of higher education officials headed by the chancellor of Vanderbilt and the chancellor of Maryland at the request of a bipartisan group of Senators on this Committee gave us a group of 59 recommendations to cut through what they described as the, "jungle of red tape interfering with their administration of higher education." 12 of those are items that the Department of Education can deal with without legislative action.

Are those on your priority list, and where do we stand with that?

Secretary DEVOS. They are, Senator. And I will get back with you with the specifics on each of the ones that are administratively able to be done. They are in varying degrees of process forward.

[The information follows:]

HIGHER EDUCATION REGULATORY REFORM

Consistent with President Trump's Executive Order 13771, Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs, the Department of Education fully shares the goals of the Task Force on Federal Regulation of Higher Education (Task Force). In particular, we agree with the Task Force that "oversight of higher education by the Department of Education has expanded and evolved in ways that undermine the ability of colleges and universities to serve students and accomplish their missions." The Department is currently undertaking a comprehensive regulatory reform effort pursuant to Executive Order 13771, focusing on rescinding and modifying all outdated, unnecessary, or ineffective regulations, guidance, and information collection requests. As part of this effort, the Department published on June 22, 2017, a Federal Register notice soliciting public input to inform its evaluation of existing regulations and guidance. The Department has reviewed these comments, which it will continue to consider as part of our overall regulatory reform initiative.

With regard to the specific regulatory actions identified by the Task Force, the Department has already taken action, including negotiated rulemaking in the areas of borrower defense to repayment, financial responsibility requirements for institutions, false certification discharges, closed school discharges, and gainful employment. In addition, the Department intends to conduct negotiated rulemaking on a variety of issues identified by the Task Force, including accreditation, State authorization distance education and related disclosures, "regular and substantive interaction" requirements for distance education, "credit hour" requirements, and direct assessment programs and competency-based education.

DEPARTMENT VS CONGRESSIONALLY INITIATED REFORM

Senator ALEXANDER. Well, I just want to make sure that those 12 items are things that you can do while we are still debating when to move ahead with our Higher Education Act, and I would hope that you could do that because they have broad support within our higher education system. There are, of course, 6,000-plus institutions. And one of the most common complaints we hear from administrators is, for example, the University of Maryland wants to offer online programs in this country. It has to get approval from every single State.

Secretary DEVOS. Yes.

Senator ALEXANDER. And they recommended a change in that. That is something that maybe we have to do, but there are some things you can do.

TITLE IX

Another area where you are moving ahead is in the area of Title IX. Since 1999 when the Supreme Court decided the word "sex" includes sexual harassment, we, the Congress, have not passed a law defining what we mean by sexual harassment, and the Department has not done any regulations in that area. All we have had are a series of letters of guidances, and that is very confusing to the more than 6,000 higher education institutions and 50,000 public schools who are governed by Title IX.

I mean, as a former university president, it would be helpful for me to know, if I were in that business, exactly what is the definition of sexual harassment? When am I required to act under the Federal law? What about off-campus incidents? What is a fair and impartial process?

Now, I would assume that since you have said and testified in the House you are in a regulatory process that you cannot talk about that very much because of the way our laws are written. But what can you say to us, if anything, about the Department's effort to regulate under Title IX?

And let me say to begin with I support what you are doing. It should have been done some time ago. This is a very important area for the students and faculty members and administrators all over the country. They have a right to know what the Federal law expects, and if Congress itself does not define these issues, then the only other proper way to do something of this importance is to do it through Federal regulation where interested people have a chance to make comments and you have a chance to consider them. And a Federal regulation has the rule of law. These guidances and letters, which have been popping out of the Department of Education on a variety of matters every other day it seems like, are not supposed to have the force of law, but it is very confusing to institutions.

So what can you say to the college and university presidents and the high school principals about what the Department is doing on Title IX, and what should they expect?

Secretary DEVOS. Thanks, Senator, for that question.

You and I have talked about this at some length. The guidance letter that the last Administration put out with respect to this issue was one that has been very confusing for institutions, and it is also one that has in many cases not really respected the due process rights of both parties involved in a complaint. So we are focused on making sure, first of all, that we do this in the proper way through a formal regulatory process, and we are in the midst of that process now. In the coming months, we will have a draft for comment. We are focused and intent on ensuring that institutions will have clarity around their responsibilities in this area and that the rights and due process rights are respected for all parties involved in such complaints.

Senator ALEXANDER. Where does the regulatory process stand right now in terms of what you are doing?

Secretary DEVOS. We are close to being able to release a draft for comment.

ESSA STATE PLANS

Senator ALEXANDER. Let me switch back to another area.

You have now reviewed, I think you said, 46 State plans.

Secretary DEVOS. ESSA (Every Student Succeeds Act) plans. We have approved 46.

Senator ALEXANDER. Approved 46 State plans, Titles I, II, and IV. That is about $18 billion in a year that goes out to State and local governments. Have you been encouraged by the plans?

I mean, the idea of Congress was to give—what we were able to agree on in this committee, pretty remarkably, was that we wanted to continue the 17 Federal tests, and some other requirements and the disaggregation of those tests. We wanted the public to know what our 50 million students in 100,000 public schools—how they were doing and how the schools are doing. And we continued that. That is quite a bit of Federal involvement. We wanted local governments to then have the responsibility for what to do about the results of the tests.

Have you seen many States that have taken advantage of this new flexibility in a good way?

Secretary DEVOS. A number of the States are actually approaching this question with some level of creativity and intentionality to ensure that this information is widely shared and that it is very accessible to students and parents. I think the rubber will meet the road in the next year or so when they actually have it fully implemented. I know that we have continued to encourage States to seize all the opportunity they have for flexibility in those areas, and we will continue to do so. And I think as States implement them, it is going to become obvious variation of approaches and hopefully States will learn from one another.

Senator ALEXANDER. Well, I am going to turn this back over to the chairman.

But it would be fair to say, would it not, that we are not likely to get a fair and complete picture of how the States' plans operate until we see them actually operate? And then perhaps some of the questions that Senators have about whether States are doing what Senators and Congressmen intended them to do will be clearer.

Secretary DEVOS. Exactly, yes.

Senator BLUNT [presiding]. Senator Baldwin.

PROPOSED CUTS TO STEM-RELATED PROGRAMS

Senator BALDWIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary DeVos, you and I have agreed on the importance of career and technical education, or CTE, both in private meetings and at previous hearings before this and the HELP Committee. Yet once again, your proposed budget fails to significantly invest in these programs.

Now, I am pleased that, unlike your fiscal year 2018 budget proposal, there are no cuts to programs under the Perkins Career and Technical Education Act. However, I am disappointed that the budget simply requests fiscal year 2017 level funding for the Perkins Basic State Grant program and that, once again, it seeks to cut two K through 12 programs that can support career and technical education in STEM, namely the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grant and the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Grant.

You have talked about the need to strengthen investments in high quality career and technical education programs and STEM education, but the budget proposal does not back that up.

So why does flat funding and even cutting funding for these programs support your commitment to career and technical education and STEM if they are, indeed, priorities for you?

Secretary DEVOS. Well, thank you, Senator for that question.

To put the budget a little more in context, when this budget was proposed, it was within the parameters of the broader Administration budget proposals, and so decisions had to be made around programs that were most effective in reaching students and the needs that they have. That resulted in the proposed elimination of a couple of the programs that you have referred to because they are spread thinly and they have been demonstrated to not be particularly effective.

That said, any line item that has been basically flat funded—proposed to be flat funded from 2017 is considered a high priority by

us, by the Administration. And so career and technical education investments continue to receive that kind of support.

We have also made a proposal for short-term Pell Grants recognizing that there are not as many traditional students today and that high quality, short-term certification programs through Pell would provide students a lot of other opportunities to pursue some of these career and technical programs that they may not be able to otherwise.

Senator BALDWIN. On that last point, I appreciate that. That is a policy change that I have been seeking to make for some time, recognizing the need for sometimes shorter-term programs and things that lead to a credential that would otherwise be unaidable.

However, when you say that flat funding is what you are doing for your most high priority programs that is disappointing.

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY

Let me move to college affordability. In your testimony, you suggest that your budget hones the focus of the Department's mission, "serving students by meeting their needs." But just as it did last year, your budget proposal would make college less affordable for students in my State, Wisconsin, and across the country. It again targets three campus-based programs: Perkins Loans, Federal Work-Study and Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, all of which allow campuses to target financial aid to the students they know to be in need. It slashes them all, eliminating SEOG (Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant), cutting work-study in half or almost half, and supporting an end to the Perkins program.

This would eliminate in the State of Wisconsin roughly $461 million in aid for Wisconsin students. It also cuts billions from other programs that make college more affordable, including by eliminating Federal subsidized loans and the Public Service Loan Forgiveness program. As you know, college costs continue to rise and push the promise of higher education out of reach to more and more, young people.

How do these massive cuts to Federal financial aid programs further your Department's mission to, quote again "serve students by meeting their needs?"

Secretary DEVOS. Thank, Senator, for that question.

And just in reference to a couple of the programs that you cited, the Perkins program has been continually phased out by Congress. So I guess the budget reflects a continuation of that.

The Work-Study program. We continue to propose funding Work-Study but really focused on the students that are in the baccalaureate programs versus the graduate programs. The elimination is really for graduate level work-study.

The bigger question about how can we make sure that students have opportunity to pursue higher education refers back to again supporting a multitude of pathways and then also for students that take on debt in order to do so really streamlining that experience and then their repayment. We have made proposals for an income-driven repayment program that is much more robust for them, can be counted on for the students that elect that option. We think that will help students that heretofore have not been able to pursue

higher ed in a longer-term, meaningful way to be able to do so. We are focused on finding ways to make sure that students that are most in need of these opportunities are able to access them and then have good options for the back end in repaying.

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, Senator.

We have two more members. We are going to try to finish up right at noon. And Senator Kennedy, you are first, followed by Senator Rubio.

COMPARING SPENDING AND RESULTS VERSUS INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Senator KENNEDY. Madam Secretary, welcome.

If you add up all State, local, and Federal dollars that we spend on pre-K to 12, my understanding is we spend on average in the United States about $13,000 per public school student. Does that sound about right?

Secretary DEVOS. That does.

Senator KENNEDY. I also understand we rank about the same as Slovakia, which spends about half the money. Is that right?

Secretary DEVOS. I think that would be about right.

Senator KENNEDY. Name me the one single thing that Congress could do in your considered judgment to improve elementary and secondary education on the public side in America.

Secretary DEVOS. The one single thing that Congress can do——

Senator KENNEDY. The most important.

Secretary DEVOS [continuing]. Would be to empower parents, especially low-income parents, to find and choose the right education setting for their child on the one hand and to really embrace and support individual local public schools to be creative and innovative with how they meet their students' needs so that we do not see the kind of one-size-fits-all approaches that are prevalent in many States across the country.

VOLUNTEERING TO SUBSTITUTE TEACH

Senator KENNEDY. This is just one person's opinion, Madam Secretary. And I think you are doing a wonderful job, by the way. I think a lot of our policymakers do not understand what our public schools are like today. They do not. That is true at the State and local level. I think it is also true at the Federal level. We cannot control what our colleagues at the State and local level do, but we can control what we at the Federal level do.

And I am going to make a general suggestion to you. Start with the upper echelon folks at the Department of Education. How you define that will be up to you. Eventually I would like you to consider extending this to every policymaker in the Department of Education. Ask them to volunteer to substitute teach at least once in a public school, not a private school, in an inner city public school. And I do not mean going in and talking to the civics class about how a bill becomes a law. I mean signing up as a substitute. All you need is a B.A. degree or a B.S. college degree, and you go to an orientation. And then you are a substitute teacher. And you start at a quarter to 7:00 and you go to 2:45, and you do either bus duty or lunchroom duty and it is you and 25 or 20 or 30 kids. And you are going to learn some stuff.

Would you consider doing that?

Secretary DEVOS. I think it is a great idea, and in fact, I think we have an example that I am looking at right now. As I understand you do this two or three times a year in Louisiana.

Senator KENNEDY. Yes.

I mean, what you see is how hard it is to be a teacher. Teachers—they do not just have to teach. They have to be mamas or daddies and social workers and psychologists. And it is so much harder being a kid today. These young people are seeing things in the 6th grade that I did not even know about until I was in college. And I just think a lot of our policymakers have lost sight of that. It is easy to tell teachers, well, just maintain discipline in the classroom. But in a lot of our schools, violence is common and learning is rare. And it just seems to me that is an appropriate place to start.

COST VS VALUE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Here is my final question. The cost of a college education has gone up since 1985, more than the cost of healthcare, which is breathtaking. Do you believe that the value of a college education has gone up commensurate with its cost?

Secretary DEVOS. I think that is a very good question, and I think that varies from place to place and from institution to institution. And I think we can be helpful in helping students and parents evaluate these questions and issues by providing more information.

Senator KENNEDY. How could we lower the cost? What is the one thing we can do to lower the cost?

Secretary DEVOS. I do not know that there is one thing to lower the cost. I think that allowing for a lot more innovation in higher education is one area that has to be explored, and it has to be allowed to happen because again the world has changed in every other area except primarily the world of education.

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, Secretary.

Senator Rubio.

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SCHOOL VIOLENCE AND DISCIPLINE

Senator RUBIO. Thank you for being here. I guess I get to bat cleanup it sounds like.

One of the things that struck me in the aftermath of Parkland was even before the authorities had released the name of the shooter, all the students knew who it was. Everybody knew who it was without even seeing it.

We now know, for example, that this student—this killer had been suspended 67 days in a single year for things like bringing bullets to campus claiming that he sold knives at school, drawing swastikas and hate speech on his book bag, a series of other offenses, a number of which, including off campus, would have had him formally reported to law enforcement and in turn, added to the NICS (National Instant Criminal Background Check System) system that would have prevented him from purchasing a firearm.

As your Department has reviewed the school discipline policies nationally and in particular in Broward County, what do we know

to this point about the school discipline policy in Broward or nationally.

Secretary DEVOS. Thanks for the question, Senator.

As you know, this policy is part of the menu of items that the School Safety Commission is charged with considering. We are looking at and evaluating the policy. Clearly the goal of the policy, to ensure that no student is discriminated against in a discipline situation, is a valid and noble goal and we certainly embrace that. The question is, is the policy doing some harm in some way? And we are in the middle of reviewing that and considering that, and it will be part of the work of this Commission to come out with a result and recommendation.

Senator RUBIO. And indeed, the goal is to prevent school discipline policies from having an unfair impact, for example, on minority students. I agree with that. No one wants to see minority students disproportionately or unfairly impacted.

Do we know that as a direct result of the guidance, has the Department found any schools or school districts to have discipline policies that violate civil rights?

Secretary DEVOS. We are in the process of reviewing that, and I do not have anything to add at this moment about it but will soon.

Senator RUBIO. Do we know how many have been investigated for potential violations leading up to your time at the Department?

Secretary DEVOS. I do not have that specific number now, but I can get that to your office.

Senator RUBIO. I guess my last question is clearly the intent of the school discipline guidance that was issued under the previous administration could not have been meant to prevent teachers from reporting a student to law enforcement when the student commits an act that may result in them being prohibited from legally purchasing a firearm. Clearly that should not be the intent of the policy. You would agree.

Secretary DEVOS. I would agree.

Senator RUBIO. And the reason why I bring that up—and I hope to encourage you to be supportive of it. It is an issue of first impression. I am not even sure we have shared it—we might have shared it with your office already. But it is legislation that I have introduced called ABCs in School Discipline Act, and it would make it clear. It would provide clear guidance on this that the discipline policy of our school districts should in no way prevent teachers from reporting a student to law enforcement when the student commits an act that may result in them being prohibited from legally purchasing a firearm later on for obvious reasons. And so I hope that is something that we can get put in place so that something like this may never ever happen again.

I think I am fine. Just in the interest of time, thank you for being here today.

Secretary DEVOS. Thanks, Senator.

Senator BLUNT. Well, thank you, Senator Rubio.

Thank you, Secretary DeVos, for being here with us today.

The record will stay open for 1 week for additional questions, and the subcommittee——

ESSA GOALS AND ADMINISTRATION BRIEFINGS

Senator MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, if I could just make one statement simply because ESSA has been raised a number of times here.

Secretary DeVos, you know I disagree with much of what you said. When we wrote the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act, we agreed that the performance of students who have historically struggled must be factored in when States measure overall school performance. The "Wall Street Journal" has reported that a State may award an A letter grade to a school even if only 40 percent of African American students can read at grade level. That is exactly why we put in those provisions. I do not think you would give an A to a student who got 40 percent of the answers right. I do not think it is fair for families of African American families to be told their students are going to an A-rated school even if only 40 percent of African American students are reading at grade level.

So I disagree with the conversation very clearly that has occurred here today. And I just want to reiterate my staff has requested multiple times that your Department begin to provide bipartisan staff briefings on this so we can examine it. And I reiterate that request to you today.

Secretary DEVOS. Thank you, Senator.

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, Senator. I am sorry I did not ask if you had anything to add before we started to finish up there.

I would say on the topic of just being responsive to the committee, that is really important. It needs to happen. Everybody could be better at it. But I think it is a priority and it gets you a long way by just providing the information when it is asked for as quickly as it is asked for, and frankly, if you are working on things that you know are going to be a problem with the committee, to step forward with that as well.

Secretary DEVOS. Senator, if I could just say we have asked and invited Senator Murray on multiple occasions to talk about the specific issues that she has had questions on. So we will continue to do so and welcome that opportunity.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Senator BLUNT. And again, thank you for being here today.

The record will stay open for 1 week for additional questions.

[The following questions were not asked at the hearing, but were submitted to the Department for response subsequent to the hearing:]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ROY BLUNT

NEXT GENERATION FINANCIAL SERVICES ENVIRONMENT AND COMPLIANCE WITH OMNIBUS SERVICING REQUIREMENTS

Question. The fiscal year 2018 Omnibus includes bill language to promote accountability, transparency, and competition in the Federal student loan servicing, and specifically requires the Department to ensure that any future Federal student loan servicing environment include: (1) the participation of multiple student loan servicers that contract with the Department to manage a unique portfolio of borrower accounts; (2) that each servicer manage the full life-cycle of borrower accounts from disbursement to pay off with certain limited exceptions; and (3) that new borrower accounts are assigned to servicers based on performance. Given this language, how specifically does the Department plan to move forward with its Next Genera-

tion Financial Services Environment proposal so that it is consistent with current law and congressional intent?

Answer. The Department is committed to enhancing the borrower experience, improving and simplifying loan servicing, and optimizing outcomes, and it will ensure compliance with all statutory requirements. We will continue to work closely with Congress on an ongoing basis to communicate more detailed information as it becomes available.

ROLE OF ENHANCED SERVICERS IN NEXT GENERATION FINANCIAL SERVICES ENVIRONMENT PROPOSAL

Question. The Department has indicated that it plans to include "enhanced servicers" as part of the Next Generation Financial Servicers Environment for borrowers who are more than 90 days delinquent on their loan. How does this fit in with the Departments larger Next Generation Financial Services Environment proposal?

Answer. One of the key goals of the Next Generation Financial Services Environment (NextGen) is to drive better borrower outcomes by creating a simpler, more consistent, and more customer-friendly environment throughout the student aid lifecycle. With regard to "enhanced servicing," FSA will increase outreach to borrowers as soon as they miss three payments, which is much earlier than the 270 day default trigger. Earlier outreach will help borrowers get into an appropriate repayment program long before they are in default. NextGen will leverage world-class mobile and other digital engagement and self-service technologies while also deploying real-time, customer-driven analytics to inform our outreach efforts. The final structure of NextGen will be determined through the ongoing active procurement. We will continue to work closely with congressional staff on an ongoing basis to communicate more detailed information as it becomes available.

CURRENT PORTFOLIO OF STEM-RELATED FUNDING

Question. In your testimony, you say that the budget request includes $200 million in new funding for STEM education while continuing to funding almost $330 million in discretionary grants for STEM projects. What specific programs and grants are included in that existing $330 million?

Answer. Most existing STEM investments are in our higher education programs, including the HSI STEM and Articulation program, Upward Bound Math and Science, the McNair Postbaccalaureate program, Student Support Services, Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need, the Minority Science and Engineering program, and Teacher Quality Partnerships. Other key programs supporting STEM projects include Magnet Schools Assistance, Javits Gifted and Talented, IDEA Stepping Up Technology Implementation, and research grants administered by the Institute of Education Sciences. We have also posted a Notice Inviting Applications for STEM apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship programs through the National Programs authority under the Perkins Career and Technical Education Act.

STEM PRIORITIES AT REQUESTED FUNDING LEVEL

Question. How does the Department plan to prioritize STEM education projects as part of the $200 million in new funding within EIR and Career and Technical Education?

Answer. The $180 million request for Education Innovation and Research includes proposed bill language that would allow the Department to award all fiscal year 2019 EIR funds under one or more STEM priorities. The Department would use existing National Programs authority under the Perkins Career and Technical Education Act to use the $20 million requested in fiscal year 2019 solely for projects that promote innovative CTE programs in STEM fields, including computer science.

FUNDS SUPPORTING STEM FOR FISCAL YEARS 2018 AND 2019

Question. What other discretionary grant programs will the Department include STEM priorities in for fiscal year 2018 or 2019, and does the Department have an estimate of how much funding will be used for STEM education as part of those other programs?

Answer. In fiscal year 2018 we are using STEM priorities in the following programs: Teacher Quality Partnerships, Supporting Effective Education Development, GEAR UP, and Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need. The STEM Priority is also being used in Education Innovation and Research, Special Programs for Indian Children, the Training Program under Federal TRIO Programs, Center on STEM Learning for Young Children with Disabilities, Innovative Approaches to Lit-

eracy, Pathways, Upward Bound and Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education's Pilot Program for Cybersecurity Education Technology Upgrades for Community. The actual investment in STEM projects under these programs depends on the number and quality of applications meeting the STEM priorities. The Department has not yet completed its fiscal year 2019 spending plan, which will include determining the specific programs using STEM priorities for 2019 competitions.

PLANNED CHANGES FOR DEFAULTED FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN BORROWERS

Question. The Department has indicated that it will make significant changes to the way it manages borrowers who have defaulted on their Federal student loans. What specific changes does the Department plan to make in this area?

Answer. The Department is in the process of reviewing and refining our approach to delinquency prevention and default collection, with the twin goals of improving outcomes for borrowers and enhancing our stewardship of the over $1.4 trillion Federal investment in student loans and related administrative costs. This process has been, and will continue to be, informed by past experience, the results of pilots and other analyses, market research activities, and input from a broad range of sources within and outside of government. Details of the Department's plans have not been finalized, but the Department will share with Congress after they are completed. Although the general outline of the planned changes have been approved and shared with the public, the Department continues to develop the details. Those details will be shared with Congress as they are completed.

DETERMINING CAPACITY TO SERVE DEFAULTED BORROWERS

Question. Under the current process, and until the Department could transition to a new one, how did the Department determine that it has sufficient capacity in its current contract to properly serve students in default, and what factors or performance measures did the Department consider as part of that process?

Answer. The Department's determination regarding the current flow of new accounts being handled by the current 13 PCAs was based on a review of monthly account placements over the last 14 months. The average number of placements during this period was 120,000 accounts per month (in December 2017 an eight month backlog of accounts was assigned due to the Court's prior injunction of all account placement activity). The Department also based its determination on its ongoing assessment of PCA capacity. Based on that review, the Department determined that small businesses would have a "going forward" monthly capacity of about 750,000 new accounts. The two 2017 award term extension (ATE) would contribute an additional 210,000 account capacity to that monthly total. The available capacity far exceeds the recent monthly average for account assignments.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR MARCO RUBIO

APPLICATION OF OBAMA ADMINISTRATION SCHOOL DISCIPLINE GUIDANCE IN JUDGMENT OF CIVIL RIGHTS ACT VIOLATIONS

Question. Mrs. Secretary, during your testimony I asked for specifics regarding the Obama Administration's Dear Colleague Letter on the Nondiscriminatory Administration of School Discipline and you noted that you would provide this information later.

As a direct result of the Obama Administration's guidance, has the Department of Education concluded that any schools or school districts have discipline policies that violate the Civil Rights Act?

Answer. As a result of the Obama Administration's guidance, OCR found that one school district had a discipline policy that violated Title VI of the Civil Rights Act.

INVESTIGATIONS UNDER OBAMA ADMINISTRATION SCHOOL DISCIPLINE GUIDANCE

Question. Do you know how many schools, or school districts, have been investigated for potential violations?

Answer. The prior administration opened 439 cases for investigation.

AVAILABILITY OF RACIAL DATA ON THOSE VICTIMIZED BY DISCIPLINED STUDENTS

Question. It is my understanding that the Department keeps some records about the race of students subject to disciplinary actions. Does the Department have similar statistics about the race of the student(s) victimized when a school-based punishment occurs? Would you consider including that question in your agencies reviews?

Answer. Although OCR collects racial data for school discipline numbers through its Civil Rights Data Collection, OCR is not able to definitively say how many schools have declined to appropriately discipline a student due to their racial minority status. Such a practice would be impermissible conduct under Title VI, because it would treat non-minority students more harshly based on their race, and if such a complaint were brought to OCR, the office would evaluate the allegation for investigation.

That being said, with respect to racial discipline cases more broadly, we can offer the following information.

The total number of racial discipline cases received since January 2014 and opened for investigation: 503 (473 elementary and secondary and 30 postsecondary).

The total number of racial discipline cases received since January 2014 that has found violations: 1.

—Still under investigation: 329
—Early Complaint Resolution: 10
—302 resolution agreement (pre-OCR determination): 22
—Resolved w/OCR involvement, no agreement: 3
—Insufficient evidence: 90
—Administrative closure: 48

The total number of racial discipline cases involving non-minority white students received since January 2014 and opened for investigation: 15 (14 elementary and secondary, 1 postsecondary).

The total number of racial discipline cases involving non-minority white students received since January 2014 that has found a violation: 0.

—Still under investigation: 6
—Early Complaint Resolution: 1
—302 resolution agreement: 1
—Resolved w/OCR involvement, no agreement: 1
—Insufficient evidence: 6

ENSURING ACCURATE REPORTING OF STUDENT DISCIPLINARY DATA

Question. Multiple Broward county media outlets have reported that Broward County failed to report numerous discipline actions, including alleged acts of trespassing, bullying, theft, battery, and bringing weapons to schools. The Broward County League of Cities' School and Community Public Safety Task Force's initial report stated, "[w]hile there is certainly a defined process for discipline, it was reported that some individual participants in BCPS system may have a real or perceived incentive to underreport or not impose consequences. The Task Force was unanimous that such incentives need to be eliminated and audits need to be performed to make sure the discipline process is being followed with fidelity."

What can your Department do to ensure that school districts are accurately reporting these incidents to the States?

Answer. OCR coordinates with local educational agencies (LEAs) or school districts, in most cases, and with State educational agencies (SEAs), such as in Florida's case, for the Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC). OCR and responding school districts and SEAs work together to ensure CRDC data are an accurate and comprehensive depiction of student access to educational opportunities in school districts. The submission system includes a series of embedded edit checks to ensure significant data errors are corrected during the data submission process. OCR also ensures that data quality-checks of submitted data occur and excludes outlier data when appropriate. Additionally, each district or the submitting SEA, such as Florida, is required to certify the accuracy of its submission. Only a district superintendent or designee, or the SEA designee in Florida, may certify the CRDC submission. Ultimately, the quality of the CRDC data depends on accurate collection and reporting by the participating districts and SEAs. Additionally, with each survey cycle, OCR engages in continuous improvement of the data quality processes. New data quality checks and technical assistance materials are developed, particularly when new data elements are introduced.

ANONYMOUS FEEDBACK ON SCHOOL DISCIPLINE GUIDANCE

Question. Has the Department considered asking school districts or teachers for anonymous feedback as to whether the Federal school discipline guidelines, or local pressures, have discouraged them from reporting school disciplinary actions?

Answer. Although the Department has not solicited anonymous feedback, OCR has held several listening sessions with organizations representing school districts and educators concerning the impact of the Federal school discipline guidelines.

Those sessions included discussions on the issue of whether educators have felt pressure to avoid reporting school disciplinary actions.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR CINDY HYDE-SMITH

APPLYING AND ALLOCATING FUNDS TO SERVE RURAL SCHOOLS AND STUDENTS

Question. Secretary DeVos, rural schools, like many in my State, face unique challenges from recruiting and retaining teachers to the lack of access to broadband. I believe it is imperative that the Department support educational research to address the specific needs of rural schools and students. I understand the Department will re-compete a grant to establish an Institute of Education Sciences National Research and Development Center dedicated to rural education. How will this specific Research Center help tackle needs of rural schools, including severe teacher shortages? How does the Department consider the geographic distribution and disparities of research projects and funding?

Answer. The Notice Inviting Applications for an Education Research and Development Center on Improving Rural Education was published in the Federal Register on May 21, 2018; applications are due August 9, 2018; and the Department anticipates making an award in fiscal year 2019. The Center will examine how to build the capacity of rural schools and postsecondary institutions to use high-quality, scientific research to improve student educational outcomes. The goals of the Rural Center are (1) to conduct research on a major problem or issue in rural education that involves local stakeholders and addresses their needs and (2) to develop and test a tool or method to support the conduct of education research in rural settings. The Department does not mandate specific areas of research but, instead, encourages applicants to identify the problem or issue they will address, based on locally-identified needs. Applicants must explain why the area they selected is significant to education policy and practice and how the proposed research will help rural schools and institutions of higher education improve student education outcomes. The applications will be reviewed by non-Federal peer reviewers who are knowledgeable about the issues to be addressed by the center.

Other research opportunities also are available to address the unique needs of rural areas. Under the IES Education Research Grants competition for fiscal year 2019 awards, IES noted that it was particularly interested in understanding how technology may be used to expand educational opportunities in underserved areas, such as low-income and rural communities. The notice also identified areas where it felt there are critical research gaps, including issues related to providing educational services in rural communities.

DETERMINING NEED AND REACHING RURAL STUDENTS IN AWARDING LITERACY GRANTS

Question. Madam Secretary, the Department recently awarded Striving Reader literacy grants to 11 States to help States create a comprehensive program to advance literacy skills for students from birth through grade 12. Please share with the Committee what the Department is doing to ensure these literacy grants benefit a wide variety of States, especially rural areas with underserved populations, like Mississippi. What metrics does the Department use in determining States with the greatest need are awarded these grants, including States with reading scores significantly below the national average?

Answer. Of the 11 grantees in the 2017 Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy (SRCL) cohort, five explicitly discussed in their funded applications the unique issues that students in rural communities face. These five applicants received 48 percent of the funds available for new awards in 2017. The Department asked States to submit, as part of their applications, State- and local-level literacy plans that were informed by a comprehensive needs assessment. The local literacy plans were required to include evidence-based literacy interventions tailored to local needs and a strategy for tracking student outcomes over time. External peer reviewers then reviewed and scored each application by reviewing the contents of the proposed literacy plans and determining the extent to which such plans were relevant to the stated needs of students that would be served. Finally, the 2017 notice inviting applications for new SRCL awards explicitly stated that when awarding subgrants States must prioritize districts that would serve greater numbers or percentages of disadvantaged children, including children who are performing below grade level.

CONTENT CENTER PRIORITIES, TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SERVE RURAL COMMUNITIES

Question. Madam Secretary, in fiscal year 2017 and fiscal year 2018 budget requests, the Department indicated funding for Comprehensive Centers would "support a new cohort of Content Centers to be selected through a competitive process to reflect the changing priorities and new demands resulting from the reauthorization of ESEA." To date, the Department has not indicated when new Content Centers would be selected or which priorities within ESEA would be addressed. Should Congress provide funding for Comprehensive Centers in fiscal year 2019, when does the Department plan to release details on which issues Content Centers will address? Since ESSA provides greater flexibility to State and local schools, how does the Department plan to use Comprehensive Centers to provide training and technical assistance (TTA) to build capacity within low-performing schools? Please explain how the Department plans to establish a Content Center focused on assisting rural schools with TTA, as emphasized in the fiscal year 2017 and fiscal year 2018 Senate Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Committee Reports.

Answer. The Department is developing plans for a competition for new Comprehensive Center awards in fiscal year 2019, should Congress choose to fund the program, and anticipates publishing a notice of proposed priorities in the fall of 2018. The Department will take the special needs of rural areas into consideration when designing the competition and making awards.

TIMELINE AND ACTIONS ON PROMISE NEIGHBORHOOD EXTENSION GRANTS

Question. Secretary DeVos, you and I have previously discussed how proud I am of Mississippi's two Promise Neighborhood programs in the Delta region. In the fiscal year 2018 Consolidated Appropriations Act, Congress provided detailed guidance to the Department regarding the 2-year extension of Promise Neighborhood grantees from the fiscal year 2011 and fiscal year 2012 cohorts. Extended support would allow grantees additional time to formalize relationships for long-term sustainability. I appreciate the attentiveness the Department has given to this issue. Please provide the Committee with an update on the timeline and actions the Department have taken on awarding extensions grants.

Answer. The Department awarded three extension grants on July 2 to South Bay Community Services (CA), Mission Economic Development Agency (CA), and Delta Health Alliance (MS). Each grantee was awarded $6 million to be spent over 2 years.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR PATTY MURRAY

PREEMPTION OF STATE AUTHORITY IN STUDENT LOAN SERVICING OVERSIGHT

Question. Does the Department believe it would have benefited from input from affected State and local officials in developing the Notice of Interpretation entitled "Federal Preemption and State Regulation of the Department of Education's Federal Student Loan Programs and Federal Student Loan Servicers," published in the Federal Register on March 12, 2018, even if it does not assert that it was legally required to obtain such consultation?

Answer. The Notice of Interpretation ("Notice") reflects the Department's legal position regarding State regulation of Federal student loan servicing. The Department is open to receiving input from State and local officials on important issues related to the Department's responsibilities, including its loan servicing practices; however, as with litigation or other legal proceedings, the Department does not solicit opinions from outside the Federal Government when determining its own legal position. The Notice is also consistent with the Department's approach in previous statements where it asserted Federal preemption over State laws regulating Federal student loan servicing and the administration of Federal student loan programs. For example, in 1990, the Department did not seek public comment when it published a Notice of Interpretation that Federal law preempted State law regulating the conduct of certain loan collection activities by guaranty agencies. See 55 FR 40120. During the prior Administration, the Department did not seek public comment when it intervened in litigation and successfully asserted that Federal law preempted State law that was being used to regulate Federal Family Education Loan Program (FFELP) Loan servicing. See Chae v. SLM Corporation, 593 F.3d 936 (9th Cir. 2010).

DISAGGREGATED PRIVATE COLLECTION AGENCY VOLUME AND PERFORMANCE

Question. The explanatory statement accompanying the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115–141) asks the Department to provide the performance metrics, total loan volume, and number of accounts broken out by servicer and for each private collection agency. The Department has provided total loan volume and number of accounts for some private collection agencies, but no performance metrics. Please indicate which performance metrics have been used to evaluate private collection agency volume and specify the performance on those metrics, disaggregated by each private collection agency currently holding Federal loan volume.

Answer. FSA does not think that it is possible to draw a meaningful comparison between performances of our 11 small business private collection agencies (PCAs) to the PCAs with unrestricted contracts because the two contracts have operated during different periods of performance and with different contractual incentives. Historically, when FSA has compared the performance of its PCAs, we have compared the performance on groups of accounts assigned to those PCAs contemporaneously. This is not possible to do between two different contracts because FSA stopped transferring accounts to the unrestricted contractors at roughly the same time that we began transferring accounts to the small business contractors. Because it takes a minimum of 10 months for a borrower to rehabilitate his or her defaulted loan, the age of a PCA's portfolio is a critical factor in comparing performance; we would expect very different performance statistics for a cohort of borrowers a PCA has held for a year rather than for just 6 months.

The Small Businesses have been effective in resolving defaulted accounts. Since November 2015, these PCAs collected more than $585 billion (Voluntary payments and AWG) and to date have rehabilitated more than 137,000 defaulted borrowers' accounts, excluding additional borrowers who are working to complete rehabilitation but have not yet completed.

FSA does monitor prime performance in a number of ways., First, Quality Control (QC) is performed monthly on both complaints filed and calls handled by the PCAs and focuses on regulatory compliance and customer service. The results are shared regularly with PCAs. Secondly, Quality Audit Reports (QAR) is performed periodically and focuses primarily on the extent of a vendor's adherence to contractual requirements, along with applicable policies and procedures documented in the vendor's Quality Control Plan. Finally, Contractor Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation (CPME) was developed as a tool by which to measure success in default collections, adherence to regulatory and customer experience via QC of calls, and volume of complaints. The intent of CPME is to eventually utilize it as a tool to determine monthly allocation volume to all vendors based on these competitive results. Until CPME is utilized, monthly allocations are distributed solely on capacity provided by the vendors. Unfortunately, litigation has prevented us from previously implementing CPME.

SERVICER PAYMENT REDUCTIONS FOR BORROWER BENEFIT NONCOMPLIANCE

Question. In response to written questions submitted in March 2018 by Representative Rosa L. DeLauro, you indicated that "FSA reduced payments to Great Lakes Higher Education Corporation, Granite State Management & Resources, and Oklahoma Student Loan Authority in 2017 as a result of noncompliance in the application of a borrower benefit." Which borrower benefit were these servicers found to be out of compliance with administering, and what was the total amount of the reduced payment for each servicer?

Answer. FSA reduced payments to Great Lakes Higher Education Corporation, Granite State Management & Resources, and Oklahoma Student Loan Authority in 2017 as a result of noncompliance in the application of the 0.80 percent interest rate reductions. From October 1, 2000—September 30, 2001, the Department offered an up-front, permanent interest rate reduction of 0.80 percent to borrowers who consolidated their loans and made 12 consecutive on-time payments. This was a one-time reduction and could not be regained if the 12 consecutive on-time payments were not made. FSA found that some borrowers were provided with either a double interest rate incentive (0.80 percent X 2 = 1.6 percent) or originally lost the 0.80 percent interest rate incentive but regained the incentive once the new servicer received 12 monthly on-time payments.

Servicers are not entitled to payment for borrowers who are not being serviced in compliance with requirements. Therefore, FSA reduced payments to Great Lakes, Granite State, and OSLA by the amount previously paid by FSA for the improper servicing of affected student loan borrowers.

In April 2017, FSA worked with Great Lakes, Granite State, and OSLA to determine how much FSA paid each servicer for the affected borrowers for the entire period of noncompliance. The period of noncompliance is from the time of the improper deduction until January 26, 2016 (for borrowers who received a double deduction) or until May 5, 2016 (for borrowers who were improperly granted the deduction). The calculated amounts were as follows: Great Lakes—$1,260.14; Granite State—$37,437.57; and OSLA—$42,549.57.

In May 2017, FSA requested that these amounts be credited, and the amounts were credited on the servicers' next invoices.

LIST OF ROUTINE AND TARGETED SERVICER AUDITS

Question. Please provide a list of all routine or targeted audits of Direct Loan servicers conducted by FSA in the last 5 years, including the name of each servicer for which the audit was conducted and the applicable dates of the audit.

Answer. Please refer to the three tables that follow.

ROUTINE AND TARGETED SERVICER AUDITS

Servicer(s)	Name of Review	Report Type	Topic	FY	Report Date
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA	SCRA5*	Monitoring Off Site	Military	18	est. 9 2018
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA	Teacher Loan Forgiveness*	Monitoring Off Site	Discharge	18	est. 7 2018
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA	Disaster Forbearances*	Monitoring Off Site	Entitlement	18	est. 7 2018
FedLoan Servicing	TEACH*	Monitoring Off Site	TEACH	18	est. 7 2018
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA	IDR Denials*	Monitoring Off Site	Income Driven	18	est. 7 2018
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA	Military and HEROES**	Monitoring Off Site	Military	18	18-Jun
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA	Closed School Discharges**	Monitoring Off Site	Discharge	18	18-Jun
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA	Death Claims**	Monitoring Off Site	Discharge	18	18-Jun
ECSI	2018-02-07 - ECSI Perkins Servicer Version Revised 3-13-2018	Monitoring On Site	Perkins	18	2/7/2018
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA	2017-12-21-NFPSandTIVAS-SCRA Round 4	Monitoring Off Site	Military,SCRA, Servicemember	18	12/21/2017
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA	2017-12-08-NFPSandTIVAS-Credit Report Disputes	Monitoring Off Site	Credit Reporting	18	12/8/2017
Nelnet	2017-12-07-NNI-TPD-Death Discharge and Rejected Applications	Monitoring Off Site	Discharge,TPD	18	12/7/2017

Call Monitoring Monthly for all servicer -Aspire, Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	Montly call monitoring for all TIVAS/NFPA	Monitoring Off Site	Phone Monitoring	18	Every month (12)
FedLoan Servicing	2017-10-11-FedLoanServicing-Call Center	Monitoring On Site	Call Center	17	10/11/2017
FedLoan Servicing	2017-07-27-FedLoanServicing-PSLF	Monitoring On Site	PSLF	17	7/27/2017
FedLoan Servicing, Great Lakes, Navient, Nelnet	2017-06-22-TIVAS-Consolidation	Monitoring Off Site	Consolidation	17	6/22/2017
MOHELA	2017-06-22-MOHELA-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	17	6/22/2017
Nelnet	2017-06-20-NNI-TPD-TPD	Monitoring Off Site	TPD	17	6/20/2017
Navient	2017-05-18-Navient-Forbearance	Monitoring On Site	Forbearance	17	5/18/2017
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA	2017-05-10-NFPSandTIVAS-Closed School Discharge Denials	Monitoring Off Site	Discharge	17	5/10/2017
Great Lakes	2017-04-26-Great Lakes-Call Center	Monitoring On Site	Call Center	17	4/26/2017
Nelnet	2017-04-21-Nelnet-General Servicing and Call Center	Monitoring On Site	Call Center,Servicing	17	4/21/2017
FedLoan Servicing	2017-04-06-FedLoanServicing-TEACH	Monitoring On Site	TEACH	17	4/6/2017
EdFinancial	2017-04-04-EdFinancial-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	17	4/4/2017
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA	2017-01-25-NFPSandTIVAS-SCRA Round 3	Monitoring Off Site	SCRA	16	1/25/2017
Call Monitoring Monthly for all servicer -Aspire, Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	Montly call monitoring for all TIVAS/NFPA	Monitoring Off Site	Phone Monitoring	17	Every month (12)
FedLoan Servicing	2016-11-04-FedLoanServicing-PSLF	Monitoring On Site	PSLF	16	11/4/2016
Nelnet	2016-11-01-Nelnet-TPD-Call Center	Monitoring On Site	Call Center	17	11/1/2016
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA	2016-10-25-NFPSandTIVAS-IDR Forgiveness Counters	Monitoring Off Site	Income Driven	16	10/25/2016
Nelnet	2016-08-31-Nelnet-REPAYE and CR3571	Monitoring On Site	Income Driven	16	8/31/2016
EdFinancial	2016-08-08-EdFinancial-REPAYE and CR3571	Monitoring On Site	Income Driven	16	8/8/2016
ECSI	2016-07-20-ECSI-Perkins	Monitoring Off Site	Perkins	16	7/20/2016
OSLA	2016-07-19-OSLA-REPAYE and CR3571	Monitoring On Site	Income Driven	16	7/19/2016
Granite State	2016-07-11-GSMR-REPAYE and CR3571	Monitoring On Site	Income Driven	16	7/11/2016
CornerStone	2016-07-08-CornerStone-REPAYE and CR3571	Monitoring On Site	Income Driven	16	7/8/2016
Great Lakes	2016-07-08-GreatLakes-CR3571	Monitoring On Site	Income Driven	16	7/8/2016

MOHELA	2016-07-08-MOHELA-REPAYE and CR3571	Monitoring On Site	Income Driven	16	7/8/2016
Nelnet	2016-07-06-NNI-TPD-TPD	Monitoring On Site	TPD	16	7/6/2016
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	2016-06-22-NFPSandTIVAS-REPAYE	Monitoring Off Site	Income Driven	16	6/22/2016
Nelnet	2016-06-20-Nelnet-REPAYE and CR3571	Monitoring On Site	Income Driven	16	6/20/2016
Navient	2016-06-10-Navient-CR3571	Monitoring On Site	Income Driven	16	6/10/2016
FedLoan Servicing	2016-05-20-FedLoanServicing-REPAYE and CR3571	Monitoring On Site	Income Driven	16	5/20/2016
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	2016-04-29-NFPSandTIVAS-SCRA Round 2	Monitoring Off Site	SCRA	16	4/29/2016
FedLoan Servicing	2016-04-28-FedLoanServicing-PSLF	Monitoring Off Site	PSLF	16	4/28/2016
ECSI	2016-04-01-ECSI-Perkins	Monitoring Off Site	Perkins	16	4/1/2016
Great Lakes	2016-03-17-GreatLakes-REPAYE	Monitoring On Site	Income Driven	16	3/17/2016
Navient	2016-03-11-Navient-REPAYE	Monitoring On Site	Income Driven	16	3/11/2016
FedLoan Servicing	2016-02-22-FedLoanServicing-PSLF	Monitoring Off Site	PSLF	16	2/22/2016
Granite State, EdFinancial, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	2016-02-09-NFPSandTIVAS-Payment Processing and ACH	Monitoring Off Site	Payments	16	2/9/2016
FedLoan Servicing	2016-01-29-FedLoanServicing-TEACH	Monitoring Off Site	TEACH	16	1/28/2016
FedLoan Servicing	2016-01-28-FedLoanServicing-TEACH	Monitoring Off Site	TEACH	16	1/28/2016
Navient and Nelnet	2016-01-08-NAVIENTandNELNETandNELNETPLATFORM-Interest Capitalization	Monitoring Off Site	Interest	16	1/8/2016
ECSI	2015-12-15-ECSI-Perkins	Monitoring Off Site	Perkins	16	12/29/2015
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	2015-12-08-NFPSandTIVAS-Higgins Compliance	Monitoring Off Site	Servicing	16	12/8/2015
FedLoan Servicing	2015-12-07-FedLoanServicing-PSLF	Monitoring On Site	PSLF	16	12/7/2015
ECSI	2015-11-02-ECSI-Perkins	Monitoring On Site	Perkins	16	11/2/2015
FedLoan Servicing	2015-10-21-FedLoanServicing-TEACH	Monitoring On Site	TEACH	15	10/21/2015
FedLoan Servicing	2015-10-20-FedLoanServicing-TEACH	Monitoring Off Site	TEACH	16	10/20/2015
FedLoan Servicing	2015-10-19-FedLoanServicing-PSLF	Monitoring Off Site	PSLF	16	10/19/2015
Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	2015-10-15-NFPSandTIVAS-Closed School Discharge	Monitoring Off Site	Discharge	16	10/13/2015

Call Monitoring Monthly for all servicer -Aspire, Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	Montly call monitoring for all TIVAS/NFPA	Monitoring Off Site	Phone Monitoring	16	Every month (12)
ECSI	2015-10-01-ECSI-Perkins	Monitoring Off Site	Perkins	15	10/1/2015
Nelnet	2015-09-28-NNI-TPD-TPD	Monitoring On Site	TPD	15	9/28/2015
Aspire, Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	2015-09-02-NFPSandTIVAS-SCRA Corrected	Monitoring Off Site	SCRA	15	9/2/2015
Aspire, Cornerstone, ECSI, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	2015-08-31-NFPSandTIVAS-Repayment Alignment	Monitoring Off Site	Repayment Plans	15	8/31/2015
Nelnet Servicing	2015-08-24- Nelnet TPD	Monitoring Off Site	TPD	15	8/24/2015
Aspire, Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	2015-08-03-NFPSandTIVAS-Military Deferments	Monitoring Off Site	Military	15	8/3/2015
ECSI	2015-07-13-ECSI-Perkins	Monitoring Off Site	Perkins	15	7/13/2015
FedLoan Servicing	2015-06-24-FedLoanServicing-PSLF	Monitoring Off Site	PSLF	15	6/24/2015
FedLoan Servicing	2015-06-24-FedLoanServicing-PSLF-FSA Response	Monitoring Off Site	PSLF	15	6/24/2015
FedLoan Servicing	2015-06-16-FedLoanServicing- TEACH	Monitoring Off Site	TEACH	15	6/16/2015
FedLoan Servicing	2015-06-16-FedLoan Servicing-TEACH	Monitoring Off Site	TEACH	15	6/16/2015
CornerStone	2015-06-05-CornerStone-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	15	6/5/2015
FedLoan Servicing	2015-04-15-FedLoanServicing-PSLF	Monitoring Off Site	PSLF	15	6/4/2015
Granite State	2015-05-31-GSMR-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	15	5/31/2015
Aspire, Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	2015-05-14-NFPsandTIVAS-Conversion to Repayment	Monitoring Off Site	Repayment Plans	15	5/14/2015
ECSI	2015-05-11-ECSI-Perkins	Monitoring On Site	Perkins	15	5/11/2015
EdFinancial	2015-05-06-EdFinancial-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	15	5/6/2015
Nelnet	2015-05-04-Nelnet-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	15	5/4/2015
Navient	2015-05-04-Navient-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	15	5/4/2015
FedLoan Servicing	2015-04-16-FedLoanServicing-TEACH	Monitoring Off Site	TEACH	15	4/16/2015
FedLoan Servicing	2015-04-16-FedLoanServicing-TEACH-FSA and FedLoan Responses	Monitoring Off Site	TEACH	15	4/16/2015
OSLA	2015-04-14-OSLA-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	15	4/14/2015
Aspire	2015-04-16-Aspire-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	15	4/6/2015
ECSI	2015-04-01-ECSI-Perkins	Monitoring Off Site	Perkins	15	4/1/2015
Great Lakes	2015-03-19-GreatLakes-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	15	3/19/2015
VSAC	2015-03-18-VSAC-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	15	3/18/2015
MOHELA	2015-03-06-MOHELA-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	15	3/6/2015
FedLoan Servicing	2015-03-04-FedLoanServicing-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	15	3/4/2015
FedLoan Servicing	2015-02-19-FedLoanServicing-PSLF	Monitoring Off Site	PSLF	15	2/19/2015
ECSI	2015-01-29-ECSI-Perkins	Monitoring Off Site	Perkins	15	1/29/2015
FedLoan Servicing	2014-11-14-FedLoanServicing-TEACH	Monitoring Off Site	TEACH	15	11/14/2014
Call Monitoring Monthly for all servicer -Aspire, Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	Montly call monitoring for all TIVAS/NFPA	Monitoring Off Site	Phone Monitoring	15	Every month (12)
Nelnet Servicing	2014-12-9- Nelnet - TPD	Monitoring Off Site	TPD	14	12/9/2014
ECSI	2014-09-19-ECSI-Perkins	Monitoring Off Site	Perkins	14	9/19/2014
Aspire, Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	2014-09-14 Due Diligence - NFP /TIVA	Monitoring Off Site	Due Diligence	14	9/18/2014
FedLoan Servicing	2014-08-20-FedLoanServicing-TEACH	Monitoring Off Site	TEACH	14	8/20/2014
Nelnet Servicing	2014-08-19- Nelnet - TPD	Monitoring Off Site	TPD	14	8/19/2014
FedLoan Servicing	2014-08-19-FedLoanServicing-PSLF	Monitoring Off Site	PSLF	14	8/9/2014
Nelnet	2014-07-31-Nelnet-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	14	7/31/2014
Nelnet Servicing	2014-06-04- Nelnet - TPD	Monitoring Off Site	TPD	14	6/4/2014
FedLoan Servicing	2014-05-29-14-FedLoanServicing-PSLF	Monitoring Off Site	PSLF	14	5/29/2014
FedLoan Servicing	2014-05-29-FedLoanServicing-TEACH	Monitoring Off Site	TEACH	14	5/29/2014
Nelnet Servicing	2014-3-27- Nelnet - TPD Heightened	Monitoring Off Site	TPD	14	3/27/2014
FedLoan Servicing	2014-03-26-FedLoanServicing-PSLF	Monitoring Off Site	PSLF	14	3/26/2014
FedLoan Servicing	2014-02-28-FedLoanServicing-TEACH	Monitoring Off Site	TEACH	14	2/28/2014
Nelnet Servicing	2014-02-18- Nelnet - TPD	Monitoring Off Site	TPD	14	2/18/2014
FedLoan Servicing	2013-12-31-FedLoanServicing-PSLF	Monitoring Off Site	PSLF	14	12/31/2013
Nelnet Servicing	2013-12-27- Nelnet - TPD	Monitoring Off Site	TPD	14	12/27/2013
FedLoan Servicing	2013-11-30-FedLoanServicing-TEACH	Monitoring Off Site	TEACH	14	11/30/2013
Call Monitoring Monthly for all servicer -Aspire, Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	Montly call monitoring for all TIVAS/NFPA	Monitoring Off Site	Phone Monitoring	14	Every month (12)
FedLoan Servicing	2013-09-06-FedLoanServicing-PSLF	Monitoring Off Site	PSLF	13	9/6/2013
Xerox	2013-08-31-ACES-TEACH	Monitoring Off Site	TEACH	13	8/31/2013
CornerStone	2013-08-19-Cornerstone-General Servicing	Monitoring On Site	Servicing	13	8/19/2013
Call Monitoring Monthly for all servicer -Aspire, Cornerstone, FedLoan Servicing, Granite State, Great Lakes, EdFinancial, MOHELA, Navient, Nelnet, OSLA, VSAC	Montly call monitoring for all TIVAS/NFPA	Monitoring Off Site	Phone Monitoring	13	Every month (12)

NOTES
Phone Monitoring also included the following servicer until decommissioned - VSAC, Aspire, CoStep, EdUCation, EdManage, KSA, Xerox and College Foundation
* Indicates Review in Process. Report date is estimated completion.
** Indicates Review Complete. Final Report Written and Pending Final Quality Review. Report Date is estimated completion.

INTERNAL CONTROLS ON SITE REVIEWS

Each review is routine and are for financial oversight, and covers financial controls as well as some operational ones.

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Great Lakes - Madison WI		7/11-7/16			4/10-4/14				
Navient - Wilkes Barre, PA		6/2 - 6/7		7/25-7/28					
Nelnet - Lincoln NE		6/23 - 6/28			5/15-5/19				
PHEAA - Harrisburg, PA		5/19 - 5/21			3/27-3/31				
Mohela - Chesterfield, MO	12/3 - 12/5	6/11 - 6/15		6/27-6/30					
EdFinancial, Knoxville, TN	2/25 - 2/28					6/25-6/29			
Cornerstone - Salt Lake City, UT	5/14 - 5/16					6/4-6/8			
Granite State - Concord NH	5/20 - 5/24					8/20-8/24			
OSLA - Oklahoma City, OK	6/17 - 6/21		7/27-7/31			7/23-7/27			
DMCS		3/18-3/21 5/13-5/16 7/7-7/11	18-May						
ECSI	N/A	N/A	4/20-4/24	5/16-5/20					
Aspire - Des Moines, IA	6/4 - 6/6		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
VSAC - Winooski, VT	8/20 - 8/23			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
EdManage - Columbia, SC	8/20 - 8/23	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ACES - Utica, NY	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bank of America		Jun-14						N/A	N/A
US Bank	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				

TIVS-NFP REVIEWS CONDUCTED 2013-PRESENT

TIVAS-NFP Reviews Conducted 2013-Present

Review Date	Review Period Start Da	Review Period End Dat	ID	ENTITY_NAME	Scope
12/13/2012	10/1/2011	10/31/2012	70050000	DEPT OF ED/MOHELA	NFP (Not for Profit)
2/13/2014	11/1/2012	10/31/2013	70050000	DEPT OF ED/MOHELA	NFP (Not for Profit)
8/21/2014	9/27/2011	4/30/2014	70050000	DEPT OF ED/MOHELA	SCRA (CIVIL RELIEF)
1/8/2015	7/1/2008	5/31/2014	70050000	DEPT OF ED/MOHELA	Mil Def/Grace
7/17/2015	11/1/2013	3/31/2015	70050000	DEPT OF ED/MOHELA	NFP (Not for Profit)
3/10/2016	4/1/2015	12/31/2015	70050000	DEPT OF ED/MOHELA	NFP (Not for Profit)
2/9/2017	1/1/2016	12/31/2016	70050000	DEPT OF ED/MOHELA	NFP (Not for Profit)
5/24/2018	2/10/2017	1/15/2018	70050000	DEPT OF ED/MOHELA	NFP (Not for Profit)
2/28/2013	1/1/2012	10/31/2012	70050100	DEPT OF ED/HESC-EDFINANCIAL	NFP (Not for Profit)
5/19/2014	11/1/2012	12/31/2013	70050100	DEPT OF ED/HESC-EDFINANCIAL	NFP (Not for Profit)
11/20/2014	8/14/2008	9/30/2014	70050100	DEPT OF ED/HESC-EDFINANCIAL	SCRA (CIVIL RELIEF)
5/22/2015	1/1/2014	3/31/2015	70050100	DEPT OF ED/HESC-EDFINANCIAL	NFP (Not for Profit)
1/28/2016	4/1/2015	11/30/2015	70050100	DEPT OF ED/HESC-EDFINANCIAL	NFP (Not for Profit)
6/15/2017	12/1/2015	3/31/2017	70050100	DEPT OF ED/HESC-EDFINANCIAL	NFP (Not for Profit)
3/22/2018	4/1/2017	12/31/2017	70050100	DEPT OF ED/HESC-EDFINANCIAL	NFP (Not for Profit)
2/8/2013	2/1/2012	10/31/2012	70050200	DEPT OF ED/CORNERSTONE	NFP (Not for Profit)
1/16/2015	1/20/2012	9/30/2014	70050200	DEPT OF ED/CORNERSTONE	NFP (Not for Profit)
3/31/2016	11/1/2012	12/31/2015	70050200	DEPT OF ED/CORNERSTONE	NFP (Not for Profit)
1/27/2017	1/1/2016	10/31/2016	70050200	DEPT OF ED/CORNERSTONE	NFP (Not for Profit)
12/8/2017	10/1/2016	9/30/2017	70050200	DEPT OF ED/CORNERSTONE	NFP (Not for Profit)
9/13/2013	4/1/2012	3/31/2013	70050300	DEPT OF ED/ASPIRE RESOURCES INC.-ISL	NFP (Not for Profit)
4/30/2015	3/30/2012	9/14/2014	70050300	DEPT OF ED/ASPIRE RESOURCES INC.-ISL	SCRA (CIVIL RELIEF)
8/6/2015	4/1/2013	3/31/2015	70050300	DEPT OF ED/ASPIRE RESOURCES INC.-ISL	NFP (Not for Profit)
8/30/2013	4/16/2012	4/30/2013	70050400	DEPT OF ED/GRANITE STATE	NFP (Not for Profit)
11/21/2014	4/16/2012	9/17/2014	70050400	DEPT OF ED/GRANITE STATE	SCRA (CIVIL RELIEF)
4/15/2016	5/1/2013	9/30/2015	70050400	DEPT OF ED/GRANITE STATE	NFP (Not for Profit)
3/17/2017	10/1/2015	9/30/2016	70050400	DEPT OF ED/GRANITE STATE	NFP (Not for Profit)
4/13/2018	10/1/2016	9/30/2017	70050400	DEPT OF ED/GRANITE STATE	NFP (Not for Profit)
5/16/2013	8/1/2012	1/31/2013	70050500	DEPT OF ED/EDMANAGE	NFP (Not for Profit)
6/27/2013	7/1/2012	5/31/2013	70050600	DEPT OF ED/OSLA SERVICING	NFP (Not for Profit)
12/5/2014	8/14/2008	9/30/2014	70050600	DEPT OF ED/OSLA SERVICING	SCRA (CIVIL RELIEF)
4/21/2016	6/1/2013	12/31/2015	70050600	DEPT OF ED/OSLA SERVICING	NFP (Not for Profit)
8/17/2017	1/1/2016	12/31/2016	70050600	DEPT OF ED/OSLA SERVICING	NFP (Not for Profit)
6/29/2018	1/1/2017	12/31/2017	70050600	DEPT OF ED/OSLA SERVICING	NFP (Not for Profit)
12/12/2013	11/1/2012	9/30/2013	70051100	DEPT OF ED/VSAC FEDERAL LOANS	NFP (Not for Profit)
3/20/2015	9/30/2013	9/30/2014	70051100	DEPT OF ED/VSAC FEDERAL LOANS	SCRA (CIVIL RELIEF)
5/10/2013	2/1/2012	1/31/2013	70057800	DEPT OF ED/Navient	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
5/5/2014	2/1/2013	1/31/2014	70057800	DEPT OF ED/Navient	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
6/6/2014	7/1/2008	5/31/2014	70057800	DEPT OF ED/Navient	SCRA (CIVIL RELIEF)
1/23/2015	6/17/2009	5/31/2014	70057800	DEPT OF ED/Navient	SCRA (CIVIL RELIEF)
5/18/2015	6/17/2009	4/30/2014	70057800	DEPT OF ED/Navient	Mil Def/Grace
8/14/2015	2/1/2014	1/31/2015	70057800	DEPT OF ED/Navient	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
3/25/2016	2/1/2015	1/31/2016	70057800	DEPT OF ED/Navient	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
1/27/2017	2/1/2016	12/31/2016	70057800	DEPT OF ED/Navient	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
11/17/2017	1/1/2017	8/31/2017	70057800	DEPT OF ED/Navient	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
3/15/2013	12/1/2011	9/30/2012	70057900	DEPT OF ED/FEDLOAN SERVICING (PHEAA)	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
3/7/2014	10/1/2012	9/30/2013	70057900	DEPT OF ED/FEDLOAN SERVICING (PHEAA)	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
8/22/2014	7/1/2008	4/30/2014	70057900	DEPT OF ED/FEDLOAN SERVICING (PHEAA)	SCRA (CIVIL RELIEF)
5/18/2015	6/17/2009	4/30/2014	70057900	DEPT OF ED/FEDLOAN SERVICING (PHEAA)	Mil Def/Grace
6/19/2015	10/1/2013	12/31/2014	70057900	DEPT OF ED/FEDLOAN SERVICING (PHEAA)	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
2/26/2016	1/1/2015	12/31/2015	70057900	DEPT OF ED/FEDLOAN SERVICING (PHEAA)	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
7/29/2016	7/1/2014	6/30/2016	70057900	DEPT OF ED/FEDLOAN SERVICING (PHEAA)	LIMITED
10/27/2017	1/1/2016	6/30/2017	70057900	DEPT OF ED/FEDLOAN SERVICING (PHEAA)	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
2/28/2013	10/1/2011	9/30/2012	70058000	DEPT OF ED/NELNET	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
12/19/2013	10/1/2012	9/30/2013	70058000	DEPT OF ED/NELNET	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
7/25/2014	8/14/2008	4/30/2014	70058000	DEPT OF ED/NELNET	SCRA (CIVIL RELIEF)
12/11/2014	7/1/2008	5/31/2014	70058000	DEPT OF ED/NELNET	Mil Def/Grace
3/6/2015	10/1/2013	9/30/2014	70058000	DEPT OF ED/NELNET	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
3/24/2016	10/1/2014	12/31/2015	70058000	DEPT OF ED/NELNET	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
1/26/2017	1/1/2016	12/11/2016	70058000	DEPT OF ED/NELNET	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
11/6/2017	1/1/2017	9/30/2017	70058000	DEPT OF ED/NELNET	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
4/1/2013	1/1/2012	12/31/2012	70058100	DEPT OF ED/GREAT LAKES	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
12/6/2013	1/1/2012	7/30/2013	70058100	DEPT OF ED/GREAT LAKES	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
8/1/2014	7/1/2008	5/31/2014	70058100	DEPT OF ED/GREAT LAKES	SCRA (CIVIL RELIEF)
2/5/2015	10/1/2013	12/31/2014	70058100	DEPT OF ED/GREAT LAKES	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
8/17/2015	7/1/2008	4/30/2014	70058100	DEPT OF ED/GREAT LAKES	Mil Def/Grace
1/25/2016	1/1/2015	10/31/2015	70058100	DEPT OF ED/GREAT LAKES	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
12/15/2016	11/1/2015	9/30/2016	70058100	DEPT OF ED/GREAT LAKES	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW
11/17/2017	12/1/2016	9/30/2017	70058100	DEPT OF ED/GREAT LAKES	TIVAS SVCR REVIEW

LOAN SERVICING OVERSIGHT AND CUSTOMER SERVICE

Question. In a March 12, 2018, notice of legal interpretation in the Federal Register regarding oversight of student loan servicing and debt collection, your Department claimed that it is providing "exemplary customer service" for borrowers. Please describe your agency's actions with respect to protecting Federal student loan borrowers that reflects this exemplary customer service.

Answer. The Department monitors servicer compliance with the Department's contracts, which include requirements related to customer service. These oversight efforts include, but are not limited to, call monitoring, process monitoring, and servicer auditing, conducted both remotely and on-site by FSA. FSA has dedicated staff with the responsibility to ensure that servicers are adhering to regulatory and contractual requirements for servicing loans. For example, FSA reviews interactions between servicers and borrowers and compares the servicers' performance against a detailed Department checklist. FSA provides its performance evaluations to servicers through written reports and meetings and requires servicers to alter their practices when needed to correct deficiencies. FSA also maintains direct access to servicer systems and therefore can review individual borrower accounts to evaluate the servicers' treatment of those accounts against regulatory and contractual requirements.

The Department's procurement and contracting requirements provide incentives for improved customer service by allocating more loans to servicers that meet performance metrics, such as high levels of customer satisfaction and by paying servicers higher rates for loans that are in a non-delinquent status, including those enrolled in an income-driven repayment plan. Poor-performing servicers lose loans in their portfolio to better-performing servicers.

FSA maintains a Feedback System, which includes a formal process for borrowers to report issues or file complaints about their loan experiences, including problems with servicing. Borrowers may also elevate complaints to the FSA Ombudsman Group—a neutral and confidential resource available to borrowers to resolve disputes related to their loans.

CONTROLS ON ABUSES IN DIRECT LOAN SERVICING

Question. There are countless examples of abuse in the student loan industry—from servicers to debt collectors—including borrowers being driven into forbearance where they face billions of dollars in unnecessary interest; being given bad advice about forgiveness options; disabled veterans erroneously reported in default; and servicers routinely miscalculating and misapplying payments. What are specific examples of when the Department has taken action to stop Direct Loan servicers from abusing student loan borrowers?

Answer. When the Department becomes aware of errors in servicing with a borrower's account, we work directly with the servicer to remediate the account. In the instances of more egregious errors, such as regulatory or contractual violations, the Department's procurement and contracting office will review and determine where/when to impose warranted fees and/or penalties.

BASIS FOR INITIATION OF ENHANCED SERVICING AT 90 DAYS

Question. In a memorandum dated May 3, 2018, the Department stated that "FSA's new vision [for debt collection] is for an enhanced servicer(s) to provide services to borrowers beginning ninety (90) days after a borrower account becomes delinquent and continue those services through the resolution of any subsequent default." What evidence supports the Departments choice of 90 day as an inflection point for borrower success?

Answer. Based on market research, FSA has determined that we must engage at-risk borrowers with more intensive outreach much earlier in the process. Consequently, FSA intends to expand its focus to include default prevention efforts 91 days after the date of delinquency.

BENEFIT OF ENHANCED SERVICING VERSUS PRIVATE COLLECTION AGENCIES

Question. In the May 3, 2018 memorandum on debt collection, the Department noted that "FSA's need for Private Collection Agency (PCA) services as a function separate from the work provided by the enhanced servicer(s) will diminish rapidly in the coming months and ultimately become nonexistent . . . FSA Business Operations has identified significant benefits to the Government and to borrowers from this new approach." Please identify the specific benefits to borrowers, including any cost savings for the borrower.

Answer. We expected that the enhanced services provided to borrowers beginning at 91 days after the date of delinquency should reduce defaults, allowing for borrowers to avoid negative credit reporting and the increased loan burden that comes with collection fees assessed at the time a student loan defaults. Additionally, focusing on default prevention means expanded options for distressed borrowers, including various repayment plans, deferments, and forbearance, most of which are not available once the loan is in default.

COSTS OF PRIVATE COLLECTION AGENCY PHASE-OUT

Question. Would the Department's plan to phase out the use of private collection agencies potentially involve any increase in collection costs for borrowers, including but not limited to shifting costs onto borrowers that are current provided through mandatory fees the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1982 (DCIA) through contingent fee contracts? If so, please describe these potential costs in detail.

Answer. No. FSA's plan will not increase collection costs for borrowers.

CONSUMER PROTECTION STANDARDS FOR SERVICING CONTRACT SELECTION

Question. The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–141) requires the Department to ensure that contractors selected for participation in the FSA Next Generation Processing and Servicing Environment have a "history of compliance with applicable consumer protections laws." Please describe the consumer protection laws upon which the Department will evaluate such history of compliance, and how previous audits and reviews of compliance with the Department's own contract requirements and standards will be used in this process.

Answer. Because the Next Generation Financial Services Environment acquisition is currently an active procurement, there are legal restrictions on the information that FSA can share publicly regarding the selection process. Information regarding the internal evaluation process is source selection information subject to the restrictions on disclosure of the Procurement Integrity Act. The Phase One solicitation includes past performance as one of the selection factors.

STUDENT LOAN RECORD DATA SHARING WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Question. In a document published on the Federal Register on June 13, 2018, regarding the Privacy Act provisions for the Customer Engagement Management System (Docket ID ED–2018–FSA–0053) the Department indicates that it is "removing former routine use (2) entitled "Disclosure for Use by Other Law Enforcement Agencies" because the Department no longer intends to disclose any records under this routine use." The effect of this change will be to deny access to student loan information that supports a legitimate law enforcement interest by a State, local, tribal, or other Federal agency charged with the responsibility of investigating or prosecuting violations or potential violations of any applicable statute, regulation, or order of a competent authority. Please provide a detailed justification for why would the Department take action to remove the sharing of student loan record data with law enforcement agencies, including how this action protects and supports student loan borrowers.

Answer. The Department is not changing policies regarding the sharing of data from the Customer Engagement Management System (CEMS). The Department is in the process of modernizing the application system for Federal student loan borrowers who wish to apply for relief under the Borrower Defense to Repayment (BD) provisions. In doing so, the Department is moving the BD system to CEMS. As a result, the CEMS SORN needed to be updated to reflect routine uses associated with processing Borrower Defense claims.

The SORN update, and specifically the removal of the law enforcement routine use, does not indicate a policy change. The Department can and will continue to share information for law enforcement purposes pursuant to 5 USC § 552a(b)(7) and the routine use governing "enforcement disclosure." We are removing this routine use as it is redundant. The Department will continue to share data from CEMS with the FTC, DOJ, and other appropriate law enforcement agencies.

HOLD ON EXPLORING ADDITIONAL BORROWER DEFENSE CATEGORIES

Question. The Department's Office of Inspector General (OIG) released a report on December 8, 2017, titled "Federal Student Aid's Borrower Defense to Repayment Loan Discharge Process" which notes, on page 16, that further research into additional categories of borrower defense claims was "placed on hold" during the current Administration. Who placed this research on hold and why?

Answer. As previously announced, the Department put a hold on certain borrower defense evaluation activities in order to conduct a comprehensive review of the program. This review was done by high-level career and political leaders. One of the recommendations based on the review was a request that the Inspector General review the overall BD adjudication process.

The IG review focused initially on the over 16,000 claims that had been approved in the previous Administration but not yet discharged. Given the significant fiscal implications of full discharge of these claims and because there were numerous complexities involved with many of the claims, the Department focused on those claims first to ensure a smooth discharge process for those borrowers.

Once the processes to discharge those loans were finalized, Department leadership decided to prioritize updating its relief methodology and assessing the large number of existing Corinthian claims not yet adjudicated, including how to handle large numbers of claims that the previous Administration had flagged for denial but had not developed any processes or procedures to effectuate.

BORROWER DEFENSE AND ITT TECH

Question. According to the OIG report on borrower defense, one category of evidence for borrower defense claims relates to ITT Education Services, Inc. ("ITT Tech") misrepresentations of guaranteed employment. Has the Department provided borrower defense discharges from former ITT Tech students due to guaranteed employment misrepresentations or any other category of evidence since January 20, 2017? Furthermore, has the Department made any additional findings or documented any additional evidence or findings that could support borrower defense claims from former ITT Tech students since January 20, 2017? If not, why not?

Answer. No. The Department continues to review borrower defense applications related to various institutions, including ITT Tech. As part of this review, the Department is considering whether the allegations in the claim would give rise to a cause of action under applicable State law. The Department is working to evaluate the merits of these claims including applicable evidence related to an institution's alleged wrongdoing.

Regarding additional findings, no. The Department put a hold on Borrower Defense (BD) claim processing during the change of Administration while it requested that the Inspector General review the overall BD adjudication process and the new Administration reviewed BD policies.

DIGITIZING PUBLIC SERVICE LOAN FORGIVENESS PAPERWORK

Question. The Government Paperwork Elimination Act calls on Federal agencies to increase their use of electronic forms, electronic filing, and electronic signatures. Although it is positive that borrowers can digitally upload many forms and documents on the web with their servicers, Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) forms have not been significantly digitized. What is the status of the Department's effort to implement a fully digital signing and uploading process for all PSLF forms and allow borrowers with any servicer to utilize such process, consistent with bipartisan requests from Congress?

Answer. FSA is currently in the process of creating and implementing a PSLF online assistance tool that will allow borrowers to submit Employment Certification Forms (ECF) and PSLF applications online. The tool will assist borrowers with a better understanding the PSLF program, knowing when they should provide the ECF or PSLF application and assist borrowers to understand what payment plans are eligible for PSLF. The tool will use NSLDS® data to provide borrower specific information and help to pre-fill forms being submitted. Borrowers with loans that do not qualify for PSLF will be advised on how they can begin a consolidation application and complete that form on the same online site. FSA anticipates the tool to be in place by the end of 2018.

PSLF EMPLOYMENT CERTIFICATION

Question. Has the Department considered improvements to make the employment certification process more efficient, including logging known employers for PSLF in a centralized database, or entering into a data match with the Office of Personnel Management to eliminate the need of Federal employees to certify Federal employment for the purposes of PSLF? If not, why not?

Answer. FSA is currently in the process of creating and implementing a PSLF online assistance tool that will allow borrowers to submit Employment Certification Forms (ECF) and PSLF applications online. FSA envisions future enhancements to this tool that will maintain a database of qualified PSLF employers and allow integration of that database with the PSLF forms simplifying the process for form com-

pletion. Integration with various sources to populate and update the employer information is being evaluated and will be implemented to the extent feasible. The implementation of this employer database feature is expected to be in place in 2019.

BORROWER DEFENSE AND COURT REPORTING INSTITUTE

Question. In a January 17, 2018, response letter to me from James Manning, Delegated the Authority to Perform the Functions and Duties of the Under Secretary, regarding the status of borrower defense discharges for victims of the Court Reporting Institute (CRI), I was told that the agency could not provide "an exact timetable for when the Department will reach a decision regarding the specific BD claims" but that the Department was "working tirelessly to reduce the number of pending claims." It has been more than a year and a half (18 months) since I asked the Department to provide debt relief to at least 335 student loan borrowers from Washington who were subject to fraud and abuse by CRI, as detailed in a November 21, 2016, letter from Washington State Attorney General Bob Ferguson to the Department. CRI induced students to enroll and finance their educations with extraordinary levels of debt by systematically misrepresenting its educational practices, instructor qualifications, graduation rates, and employment prospects.

Has this Administration reviewed the evidence provided in the November 21, 2016, letter from Washington State Attorney General Bob Ferguson to the Department regarding CRI's misrepresentations that give rise to State law causes of action under Washington's Consumer Protection Act, RCW 19.86, and common law fraud?

When will the Department answer my requests, the requests of Washington State Attorney General Ferguson, and the pleas of hundreds of former CRI students that were cheated and deserve student loan debt relief?

Answer. While we cannot comment on internal or deliberative discussions, we assure you that the Department is working tirelessly to reduce the number of pending claims.

LOAN DISCHARGE FOR TOTAL AND PERMANENT DISABILITY

Question. Is the Department aware of any single example of State tax liability for veterans receiving a total and permanent disability (TPD) discharge of their Federal student loans?

Answer. No. The Department has not reviewed each State's tax laws on this point. The Department does not have expertise on the various State tax laws and does not want inadvertently to provide inaccurate tax advice to our borrowers; however, servicer correspondence and websites encourage borrowers to contact a tax professional.

AUTOMATING LOAN-RELATED PROCESSES FOR SERVICEMEMBERS

Question. Senate Report 115–150 accompanying the 2018 appropriations bill notes that under the "Higher Education Relief Opportunities for Students Act of 2003, servicemembers enrolled in income-driven repayment programs are eligible for a waiver from annual recertification obligations of their income [and] servicemembers with Federal Perkins Loans are also eligible for a cancellation of a percentage of their debt, based on qualifying years of military service, in accordance with Section 465 of the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008." I have not received the information required by the explanatory statement on either of these provisions. Please describe the Department's plans to automate the application of both of these benefits for our Nation's service members.

Answer. The Department is currently pursuing a data matching agreement with the Department of Defense (DoD). This arrangement will commence with a "no-interest accrual" benefit. The agreement will then expand to include additional facets of data matching for borrowers who are service members.

While we move toward automation, there will be some instances, such as with the Higher Education Relief Opportunities for Students (HEROES) Act, where waivers for service members that are required as part of the Act would create a disproportionate hardship to the borrower. As the borrower (i.e., the service member) would self-determine their income information for their IDR application, this self-determination could prevent the ability for total automation.

RESTORATIONS TO PELL ELIGIBILITY DUE TO SCHOOL CLOSURE

Question. Please provide an update on Pell Grant Lifetime Eligibility Used (LEU) restored due to school closure, according to the Department's April 3, 2017, notice, Guidance on COD Processing of Pell Grant Restoration for Students who Attended Closed Schools, including total number of unduplicated students receiving restora-

tion of Pell LEU, total number of institutions which those students attended, and total number of semesters restored.

Answer. Pell Closed School Restoration as of June 27, 2018:

—Unduplicated Student Count: 309,497

—Closed School Count w/Restorations: 984

—Estimate of Equivalent Semesters: 489,436

COMMITMENT TO EXPANDING CCAMPIS TO REDUCE CHILDCARE COSTS

Question. Given the 233 percent increase in funding, will you commit to substantially expanding the overall number of CCAMPIS beneficiaries by a similar level, and, if so, how will the Department ensure that low-income students are prioritized in new CCAMPIS awards in a manner that reduces their childcare costs—and that does not supplant existing childcare funding provided by institutions?

Answer. The Department anticipates an increase in the number of grantees commensurate with the funding increase. In determining the final number of awards to make in fiscal year 2018, the Department will also take into account such factors as the number and quality of applicants and the likelihood of the current funding level being retained in future years.

STATE AUTHORIZATION FOR DISTANCE EDUCATION AND FOREIGN LOCATIONS

Question. Why does the Department believe the entire rule governing State authorization for distance education and foreign locations should be delayed if concerns have only been raised with select parts of the rule? For example, the Department did not cite any concerns about the State authorization component for foreign locations of American colleges.

Answer. The Department did not delay the entire rule. The component regarding State authorization of foreign locations of domestic institutions (34 CFR 600.9(d)) was not delayed and went into effect July 1, 2018.

COMMENT PERIOD ON DELAYED STATE AUTHORIZATION RULE

Question. Why did the Department wait so many months to publish a notice of delay regarding State authorization for distance education and foreign locations when it had more than a year to consider the rule's implementation, and then provide only a 15 day comment period?

Answer. The Department received 2 letters from representatives of regulated parties in February 2018. These letters made us realize that the extent to which clarifications to the 2016 rule were needed to implement the 2016 rule were more substantive than we initially thought. We further believed that the needed clarifications were so substantive that a delay in the effective date would be required to review and possibly revise the regulations. We do not believe that guidance would be the appropriate vehicle to provide needed clarifications. Finally, due to the complexity of the issues and the substantive nature of the necessary clarifications, we believed that, to develop workable solutions, it would be important to conduct negotiated rulemaking under the Higher Education Act in order to solicit the input of stakeholders who have been engaged in meeting these requirements.

Regarding the 15-day comment period, this was necessary because, given that the 2016 rule was scheduled to take effect on July 1, 2018, a final rule delaying the effective date needed to be published prior to that date. A longer comment period would not have allowed sufficient time for the Department to review and respond to comments and publish a final rule.

DEFERMENT APPLICATIONS AND GRANTS UNDER HBCU CAPITAL FINANCING PROGRAM

Question. The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–141) provided $10 million to allow multiple financially struggling HBCUs to apply for the deferment of HBCU capital finance loans. Applications for those deferments were due on June 8, 2018.

a. Does the Department expect to be able to provide eligible institutions with deferments by the end of the academic fiscal year, which is June 30, 2018?

b. The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–141) specifically mentioned that the authority for loan deferment would be made to eligible institutions (plural). Does the Department expect to provide all institutions that meet the qualifications named in law to all receive support from the deferment authority? If not, why not?

c. Please provide the number of institutions that applied for a deferment, the number of institutions that meet all the qualifications for a deferment as named in

law, and the number of institutions the Department expects to grant a loan deferment.

d. Does the Department plan to proactively notify the accrediting agency of an approved institution under the new deferment authority?

Answer. a. We notified successful institutions prior to June 30, 2018. The paperwork will extend past that date.

b. The deferment requests exceeded $10 million per year, so not all institutions were successful.

c. We received 15 applications. Of those, 13 were eligible. Eight institutions were notified that they would receive deferments.

d. We notified each successful applicant of its deferment pending completion of revised loan agreements. Each institution may share its notification with any other party.

CREDIT FOR HBCU PAYMENTS MADE PRIOR TO 2018 APPROPRIATION FOR MODIFICATION AND CONSOLIDATION

Question. Separately, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–141) provided $20,150,000 to cover the cost of HBCU Capital Financing Program loans, which includes the cost of modifying such loans. Some institutions are in need of relief from their loan, and some are institutions that have already made their second biannual Capital Finance Program loan payment for fiscal year 2018. In some cases, the payments were made after the provisions authorizing deferment and modification were signed into law. Institutions made the responsible choice to remain current on their loan payments, but in doing so placed the entire institution in a poorer fiscal position.

a. Does the Department plan to credit back all or some portion of a school's fiscal year 2018 payment? If not, why not?

b. If the Department plans to credit back some or all of a school's fiscal year 2018 payment, does the Department plan to assist institutions in accounting for a modification in their end of year audit?

c. If the Department plans to credit back some or all of a school's fiscal year 2018 payment, does the Department plan to proactively notify the accrediting agency of that institution's institution pending credit to a school's account?

Answer. a. The deferments are provided on a fiscal year basis, so past payments for fiscal year 2018 will be credited.

b. We are pleased to provide technical assistance within our authority. Institutions are responsible for their own financial reporting.

c. Each institution may share its situation with any other party.

HBCU CAPITAL FINANCING OUTREACH

Question. The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–141) also directed the Department to create and execute an outreach plan to work with States and the Capital Financing Advisory Board to improve outreach to States and help additional public HBCUs participate in the program. What is the status and timeline of the creation and execution of that outreach plan? Please share details on the key activities that will be undertaken under the plan.

Answer. We are making progress in developing such a plan and have so shared with GAO.

ACICS OUTCOME DATA

Question. Please provide an updated ACICS outcomes data file as of April 2, 2018, (prior to when the Secretary restored ACICS' recognition) and June 12, 2018, that shows for all ACICS-accredited colleges:

a. the date of a school's site visit, if any

b. the date that a school's application to a prospective accreditor was denied, if applicable

c. the date that a school's application to a prospective accreditor was withdrawn, if applicable

d. Compliance status of each institution with the terms of the Program Participation Agreement (PPA) in control as of April 2, 2018

e. Status of any colleges deemed non-compliant with their PPA terms, including provisions are they non-compliant with and corresponding consequences

f. For any closed or announced to be closed institutions, information on the schools' plan for closing and teach-out agreements

g. A summary of any revisions to the PPA made for each school after August 30, 2017.

h. A list of colleges that were determined subject to the June 12, 2018, deadline at the time of the Secretary's April 3rd decision to restore ACICS as a federally recognized agency and any updates in accredited status since then.

i. The status and applicability of the June 12, 2018, deadline for each school to find a new accreditor.

Answer. Please refer to the following attachments for responses to parts a–i of this question.

Participation Status Summary Dashboard Data as of 20180402
Public Status

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
030106	Virginia College	Birmingham	AL	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	03/06/17			02/28/18		
040513	Art Institute of Phoenix (The)	Phoenix	AZ	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	WASCCS	03/07/17					
022188	Brookline College	Phoenix	AZ	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	12/16/16				ABHES	
026167	Le Cordon Bleu College of Culinary Arts	Scottsdale	AZ	N	Yes	Closed School							09/29/17
007164	Bryan University	Tempe	AZ	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/02/17				ACCSC	
004467	Tucson College	Tucson	AZ	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCET	03/10/17					04/28/17
033083	Bristol University	Anaheim	CA	N	No	Title IV Ineligible	ACCSC	08/01/16					12/26/14
041331	California University of Management and Sciences	Anaheim	CA	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	WASCSR	11/01/15					
025779	Santa Barbara Business College	Bakersfield	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/08/17			09/06/17		
041855	Beverly Hills Design Institute	Beverly Hills	CA	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/13/15					
032783	Charter College	Canyon Country	CA	N	No	Closed School							05/15/16
042506	California Institute of Advanced Management	El Monte	CA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCSR	11/01/15				WASCSR	
021884	Sierra Valley College of Court Reporting	Fresno	CA	N	Yes	Closed School							03/24/17
031258	Premiere Career College	Irwindale	CA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/13/16			11/03/16	ABHES	
034275	University of Antelope Valley	Lancaster	CA	C	No	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCSR	12/01/12				WASCSR	
031633	Pacific States University	Los Angeles	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	02/24/17			10/18/17		
042058	SAE Institute of Technology, Los Angeles	Los Angeles	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/10/17			11/16/17		
041933	Shepherd University	Los Angeles	CA	N	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCSR	02/01/09				WASCSR	08/14/17
030695	Sage College	Moreno Valley	CA	N	Yes	Closed School							12/22/16
006975	Lincoln University	Oakland	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	WASCSR	02/13/17					
022774	South Coast College	Orange	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/05/17			10/10/17		
042288	Bay Area College of Nursing	Palo Alto	CA	N	No	Closed School							08/08/16
032103	Le Cordon Bleu College of Culinary Arts	Pasadena	CA	N	Yes	Closed School							09/29/17
041501	Golden State College of Court Reporting & Captioning	Pleasanton	CA	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCET	02/13/17					03/09/18
041812	Southern California Health Institute (SOCHI)	Reseda	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	03/11/17			09/27/17		
041763	Bergin University of Canine Studies	Rohnert Park	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	11/02/16			08/31/17		
023519	Brightwood College	Sacramento	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
023063	Brightwood College	Salida	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
020917	Brightwood College	San Diego	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
041897	California Miramar University	San Diego	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	DETC	03/08/17			09/07/17		
007296	Coleman University	San Diego	CA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCSR	02/19/16				WASCSR	
022980	Design Institute of San Diego	San Diego	CA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCSR	10/11/16			09/14/17	WASCSR	
042347	Niels Brock University San Diego	San Diego	CA	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							11/05/15
042657	San Diego Global Knowledge University	San Diego	CA	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							
041955	Southern States University	San Diego	CA	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	WASCSR	10/05/16					
042237	Bay Area Medical Academy	San Francisco	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/13/17			02/07/18		
022202	Le Cordon Bleu College of Culinary Arts	San Francisco	CA	N	Yes	Closed School							09/28/17
041414	Laurus College	San Luis Obispo	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	01/18/17			08/14/17		

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
025780	Santa Barbara Business College	Santa Maria	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/08/17			10/17/17		
009032	Empire College	Santa Rosa	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/07/17			10/30/17		
032253	American University of Health Sciences	Signal Hill	CA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCSR	07/15/15				WASCSR	
033673	Professional Golfers Career College	Temecula	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	02/26/17			09/21/17		
025391	Brightwood College	Van Nuys	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
001123	Brooks Institute	Ventura	CA	N	No	Closed School							08/19/16
009989	Santa Barbara Business College	Ventura	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/08/17			10/18/17		
025490	Brightwood College	Vista	CA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
038743	Cambridge Junior College	Yuba City	CA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	08/01/16			08/30/17	ACCSC	
007297	Spartan College of Aeronautics and Technology	Broomfield	CO	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/27/17				ACCSC	
004503	Altierus Career College	Colorado Springs	CO	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/07/16				ACCSC	
008635	IBMC College	Colorado Springs	CO	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCSC	03/20/17					12/31/17
032893	Colorado Heights University	Denver	CO	N	Yes	Title IV Ineligible							10/13/17
030063	IBMC College	Fort Collins	CO	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/20/17				ACCSC	
004507	Altierus Career College	Thornton	CO	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/09/16				ACCSC	
020740	Branford Hall Career Institute	Branford	CT	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	10/22/16			12/22/17		
021123	Ridley - Lowell Business & Technical Institute	New London	CT	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	03/10/17			10/13/17		
021066	American Institute	West Hartford	CT	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ABHES	08/22/16			10/20/17		
012425	Stone Academy	West Haven	CT	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/22/16			10/17/16	ABHES	
041900	Radians College	Washington	DC	N	No	Closed School							09/23/16
030799	City College	Altamonte Springs	FL	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	09/30/16				ABHES	
041274	Digital Media Arts College	Boca Raton	FL	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCSC	12/16/16					10/18/17
042479	International College of Health Sciences	Boynton Beach	FL	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							
035493	Ultimate Medical Academy	Clearwater	FL	P	No	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	06/15/16				ABHES	
041825	Millennia Atlantic University	Doral	FL	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/07/17			10/17/17		
042169	San Ignacio University	Doral	FL	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/13/17			01/31/18		
010195	Art Institute of Fort Lauderdale (The)	Fort Lauderdale	FL	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	WASCCS	03/06/17					
025154	City College	Fort Lauderdale	FL	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	09/30/16				ABHES	
023251	Key College	Fort Lauderdale	FL	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/08/17					
042585	Premiere International College	Fort Myers	FL	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							
022788	Southern Technical College	Fort Myers	FL	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	03/10/17	06/09/17		02/01/18		
042608	School of Med Technology	Hialeah	FL	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							
001497	Jones College	Jacksonville	FL	N	Yes	Closed School							08/19/17
026164	Sanford-Brown College	Jacksonville	FL	N	No	Closed School							10/15/16
023141	Schiller International University	Largo	FL	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	HLC	02/27/17			07/26/17		
030716	College of Business & Technology	Miami	FL	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/09/17			11/29/17		
023058	Florida Career College	Miami	FL	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	COE	03/02/17			07/17/17		
042617	Life-Line Med Training	Miami	FL	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
041284	Miami Regional University	Miami Springs	FL	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/13/17			12/20/17		
042332	Unilatina International College	Miramar	FL	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/09/17			11/15/17		
042079	SAE Institute of Technology - Miami	North Miami Beach	FL	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	03/10/17			10/27/17		
034343	Fortis College	Orange Park	FL	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/13/17			11/01/17		
022187	Florida Technical College	Orlando	FL	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	MSACHE	02/27/17				MSACHE	
039035	Southern Technical College	Orlando	FL	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	03/10/17	06/09/17		12/07/17		
041620	Jose Maria Vargas University	Pembroke Pines	FL	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	SACSCC	06/19/17					
042517	Hope College of Arts and Sciences	Pompano Beach	FL	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ABHES	02/09/17			10/27/17		
034297	East West College of Natural Medicine	Sarasota	FL	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACAOM	10/03/16			02/21/18		
001499	Everest University	Tampa	FL	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/09/16				ACCSC	
042066	SAE Institute of Technology - Atlanta	Atlanta	GA	N	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/08/17				ACCSC	09/21/17
025830	Gwinnett College	Lilburn	GA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/05/17			10/19/17		
042452	Pacific Institute of Technology	Morrow	GA	N	Yes	Title IV Ineligible							03/20/17
034483	Business Industrial Resources	Chicago	IL	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							08/04/14
031285	National Latino Education Institute	Chicago	IL	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/10/17			11/29/17	ACCSC	
021603	Sanford-Brown College	Chicago	IL	N	Yes	Closed School							06/30/17
011810	Taylor Business Institute	Chicago	IL	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	HLC	04/28/11			05/27/16	HLC	
041956	Tribeca Flashpoint College	Chicago	IL	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCSR	11/18/16			12/06/16	WASCSR	
022960	Prince Institute - Southeast	Elmhurst	IL	N	Yes	Closed School							03/16/17
041247	Ambria College of Nursing	Hoffman Estates	IL	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	01/24/17			09/25/17	ABHES	
041791	PCCTI Healthcare	Oak Brook	IL	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	05/24/17			12/12/17	COE	
004560	Gem City College	Quincy	IL	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	COE	04/10/17			11/30/17	COE	
042450	Northwest Suburban College	Rolling Meadows	IL	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	02/24/17	02/23/18				
041685	SOLEX College	Wheeling	IL	N	Yes	Title IV Ineligible							05/17/17
004579	International Business College	Fort Wayne	IN	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	02/27/17				ACCSC	
022018	Brightwood College	Hammond	IN	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
021584	Harrison College	Indianapolis	IN	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	01/25/17			04/10/17	ABHES	
007329	ITT Technical Institute	Indianapolis	IN	N	No	Closed School							09/03/16
007362	Medtech College	Indianapolis	IN	N	No	Closed School							09/16/16
042328	Radiological Technologies University VT	South Bend	IN	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/06/17			11/14/17	ACCSC	
026158	College of Court Reporting	Valparaiso	IN	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	DETC	07/07/17					
026130	Pinnacle Career Institute	Lawrence	KS	N	Yes	Title IV Ineligible							08/15/17
030662	Bryan University	Topeka	KS	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	10/26/16			09/17/17		
024911	Beckfield College	Florence	KY	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	08/31/16				ABHES	
010489	American National University	Lexington	KY	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ABHES	01/31/17			10/12/17		
004618	Spencerian College	Louisville	KY	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	09/20/16				ABHES	
012088	Sullivan College of Technology and Design	Louisville	KY	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	SACSCC	03/13/17			09/19/17		
009313	Daymar College	Owensboro	KY	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/10/17					

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
030235	Camelot College	Baton Rouge	LA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	COE	03/03/17			02/01/17		
041123	Louisiana Culinary Institute	Baton Rouge	LA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	COE	12/31/16				COE	
020555	Delta School of Business and Technology	Lake Charles	LA	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	03/03/17					
004666	Salter College	West Boylston	MA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	02/04/17			12/22/17		
007491	Brightwood College	Baltimore	MD	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
020836	Brightwood College	Beltsville	MD	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/18/17			02/28/18		
010410	Brightwood College	Towson	MD	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
005204	Beal College	Bangor	ME	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	12/21/16			08/25/17	ACCSC	
030057	Detroit Business Institute - Downriver	Riverview	MI	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/10/17				ACCSC	
004692	Dorsey School of Business	Southgate	MI	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	COE	03/10/17			12/11/18	COE	
020503	Academy College	Bloomington	MN	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	12/14/16			10/17/17		
007351	Sanford-Brown College	Brooklyn Center	MN	N	Yes	Closed School							04/23/17
009892	Duluth Business University	Duluth	MN	P	Yes	Intending to Close				06/12/17			
010248	Art Institutes International Minnesota (The)	Minneapolis	MN	N	Yes	Closed School							12/15/17
004646	Minnesota School of Business	Richfield	MN	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							12/31/16
004645	Minneapolis Business College	Roseville	MN	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	02/27/17				ACCSC	
004642	Globe University	Woodbury	MN	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							12/31/16
042557	Bolivar Technical College	Bolivar	MO	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	09/20/16			09/19/17	ABHES	
009795	Missouri College	Brentwood	MO	N	No	Closed School							11/01/16
021802	Metro Business College	Cape Girardeau	MO	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	03/09/17			01/22/18		
021192	Court Reporting Institute of St Louis	Clayton	MO	N	Yes	Closed School							03/26/17
035793	Texas County Technical Institute	Houston	MO	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	09/20/16			09/21/17	ABHES	
010405	Pinnacle Career Institute	Kansas City	MO	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	02/24/17			10/10/17	ACCSC	
010279	Hickey College	Saint Louis	MO	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	02/27/17					
030663	Bryan University	Springfield	MO	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	10/26/16			09/18/17		
022506	Everest College	Springfield	MO	N	Yes	Closed School							06/20/17
008552	Stevens - The Institute of Business & Arts	St Louis	MO	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/02/17			11/13/17	ACCSC	
010264	South College-Asheville	Asheville	NC	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							09/14/16
002937	King's College	Charlotte	NC	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	01/24/17			10/11/18		
031090	School of Communication Arts of North Carolina	Raleigh	NC	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	SACSCC	04/17/17					
021040	Harris School of Business	Cherry Hill	NJ	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	10/21/16			12/27/17		
041814	Best Care College	East Orange	NJ	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/03/17			08/26/17		
012462	Eastwick College - Hackensack Campus.	Hackensack	NJ	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/09/17			10/11/17		
012461	Lincoln Technical Institute	Iselin	NJ	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	08/04/16			10/03/17		
036506	PC Age	Jersey City	NJ	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	COE	12/14/16			12/11/17	COE	
020923	Eastwick College - Nutley Campus	Nutley	NJ	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/09/17			10/11/17		
042160	Universal Training Institute	Perth Amboy	NJ	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	NLNAC	01/25/17					
020537	Eastwick College	Ramsey	NJ	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/09/17			10/11/17		

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
022375	Altierus Career College	Henderson	NV	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/07/16				ACCSC	
030432	Brightwood College	Las Vegas	NV	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
022195	Mildred Elley	Albany	NY	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	12/14/16			09/01/17	ABHES	
020924	Ridley-Lowell School of Business	Binghamton	NY	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCET	03/09/17					11/22/17
041171	EDP School of Computer Programming	Brooklyn	NY	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	MSACSS	03/02/17			11/15/17		
031933	Manhattan School of Computer Technology	Brooklyn	NY	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	12/15/16			06/20/17		
009043	Elmira Business Institute	Elmira	NY	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	02/09/17				ABHES	
020937	Long Island Business Institute	Flushing	NY	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	NYBRE	10/12/16			10/05/17		
026150	Sanford-Brown College	Garden City	NY	N	Yes	Closed School							12/26/16
022060	Hunter Business School	Levittown	NY	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	MSACSS	12/02/16			08/01/17	MSACSS	
011647	SBI Campus - an affiliate of Sanford-Brown	Melville	NY	N	No	Closed School							11/09/16
025256	Art Institute of New York City (The)	New York	NY	N	Yes	Closed School							06/14/17
039883	SAE Institute of Technology, New York	New York	NY	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	03/10/17			09/15/17		
024914	Spanish-American Institute	New York	NY	N	Yes	Title IV Ineligible							04/04/17
021760	Cheryl Fell's School of Business	Niagara Falls	NY	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	COE	04/18/17			12/19/17	COE	
004853	Bradford School	Columbus	OH	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	02/27/17				ACCSC	
042350	Felbry College-School of Nursing	Columbus	OH	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	03/10/17			02/07/18	ABHES	
020520	Brightwood College	Dayton	OH	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
041773	Ohio Medical Career College	Dayton	OH	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	01/01/17			11/28/17		
023014	Ohio Valley College of Technology	East Liverpool	OH	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/21/16				ABHES	
030079	Gallipolis Career College	Gallipolis	OH	N	Yes	Closed School			06/09/17				12/13/17
034685	MDT College of Health Sciences	Highland Heights	OH	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ABHES	03/10/17			10/31/17		
004866	Stautzenberger College	Maumee	OH	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/10/17				ACCSC	
020568	Daymar College	New Boston	OH	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCSC	03/10/17					09/19/16
021585	Ohio Business College	Sheffield	OH	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	COE	12/12/16			12/04/17	COE	
020543	Trumbull Business College	Warren	OH	N	Yes	Closed School							03/21/17
040743	Hondros College	Westerville	OH	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ABHES	07/31/16			10/30/17		
033674	Community Care College	Tulsa	OK	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	12/22/16			09/21/17		
009079	Everest College	Portland	OR	N	No	Closed School							08/22/16
030226	Le Cordon Bleu College of Culinary Arts	Portland	OR	N	Yes	Closed School							09/29/17
021049	Sumner College	Portland	OR	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	06/17/16				ABHES	
023301	Pioneer Pacific College	Wilsonville	OR	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ABHES	01/26/17			08/09/17		
007781	Brightwood Career Institute	Broomall	PA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
004893	DuBois Business College	DuBois	PA	N	No	Closed School							09/22/16
030108	Fortis Institute	Erie	PA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/13/17			11/01/17		
004910	Brightwood Career Institute	Harrisburg	PA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
004889	Cambria-Rowe Business College	Johnstown	PA	N	No	Closed School							08/24/16
030299	Consolidated School of Business	Lancaster	PA	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCET	11/04/16					02/13/17

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
020683	Douglas Education Center	Monessen	PA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	11/18/16			08/07/17	ACCSC	
007779	Lansdale School of Business	North Wales	PA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/10/17			02/14/18		
022898	Brightwood Career Institute	Philadelphia	PA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
009721	Bradford School	Pittsburgh	PA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	12/20/16				ACCSC	
007436	Brightwood Career Institute	Pittsburgh	PA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
022023	Pittsburgh Career Institute	Pittsburgh	PA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ABHES	09/26/16			04/11/17		
004898	McCann School of Business & Technology	Pottsville	PA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	03/10/17	06/09/17				
020925	Laurel Technical Institute	Sharon	PA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/24/17				ACCSC	
013263	South Hills School of Business & Technology	State College	PA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	06/27/16			05/17/17	ACCSC	
025462	Laurel Business Institute	Uniontown	PA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/24/17				ACCSC	
004902	Penn Commercial Business/Technical School	Washington	PA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	01/20/17			08/23/17		
037813	PITC Institute	Wyncote	PA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	12/12/16				ABHES	
022539	Berks Technical Institute	Wyomissing	PA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCET	03/10/17	06/09/17			ACCSC	
025578	Art Institute of York (The) - Pennsylvania	York	PA	N	Yes	Closed School							09/23/17
022896	Consolidated School of Business	York	PA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	11/04/16			10/25/17		
030619	Colegio Technologico y Comercial de Puerto Rico	Aguada	PR	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	03/12/17			02/27/18		
030297	Universal Technology College of Puerto Rico	Aguadilla, PR	PR	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	08/03/16			03/17/17	ABHES	
023038	American Educational College	Bayamon	PR	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	02/24/17					
030219	EDIC College	Caguas	PR	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/12/16			03/06/17	ABHES	
042409	PPG Technical College	Caguas	PR	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	01/11/17					
025054	Atlantic University College	Guaynabo	PR	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	12/22/16					
031121	Dewey University	Hato Rey	PR	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/10/17					
021664	Instituto de Banca y Comercio	Hato Rey	PR	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	MSACHE	02/27/17				MSACHE	
023406	Humacao Community College	Humacao	PR	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	01/19/17					
031159	Trinity College of Puerto Rico	Ponce	PR	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	COE	04/20/17			03/09/18		
020631	MBTI Business Training Institute	San Juan	PR	N	No	Closed School							09/30/16
004924	Forrest College	Anderson	SC	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	06/30/16			12/01/17		
004934	Daymar College	Clarksville	TN	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/10/17					
026142	Miller - Motte Technical College	Clarksville	TN	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	03/10/17	06/09/17				
004947	West Tennessee Business College	Jackson	TN	P	Yes	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	COE	03/10/17					
023262	Brightwood College	Nashville	TN	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
004617	National College	Nashville	TN	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ABHES	01/31/17			08/10/17		
038303	SAE Institute of Technology	Nashville	TN	C	No	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	09/12/16				ACCSC	
025693	Le Cordon Bleu College of Culinary Arts	Austin	TX	N	Yes	Closed School							09/28/17
042480	Recording Conservatory of Austin, (The)	Austin	TX	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	12/22/16			08/30/17		
031795	Texas Health and Science University	Austin	TX	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/03/17			12/11/17		
032723	Brightwood College	Dallas	TX	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
041687	Peloton College	Dallas	TX	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	COE	07/01/16			04/19/17		

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
025919	Brightwood College	El Paso	TX	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
023122	Brightwood College	Houston	TX	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
026047	Center for Advanced Legal Studies	Houston	TX	C	No	New Accreditor Obtained	COE	03/11/14				COE	
021160	Sanford-Brown College	Houston	TX	N	Yes	Closed School							02/10/17
021448	Vet Tech Institute of Houston	Houston	TX	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	10/26/16				ACCSC	
009466	Brightwood College	San Antonio	TX	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
031158	Brightwood College	San Antonio	TX	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18		
025911	Career Point College	San Antonio	TX	N	No	Closed School							10/16/16
041795	North American University	Stafford	TX	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	02/23/17				ACCSC	
021785	Eagle Gate College	Murray	UT	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/15/16			02/08/17	ABHES	
023608	Provo College	Provo	UT	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/15/16			02/07/17	ABHES	
010098	Neumont College of Computer Science	Salt Lake City	UT	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	12/19/16			07/07/17	ACCSC	
011166	Broadview University	West Jordan	UT	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	05/30/17			12/04/17	ACCSC	
041400	Global Health College	Alexandria	VA	N	Yes	Title IV Ineligible							12/31/17
009267	Altierus Career College	Chesapeake	VA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/07/16				ACCSC	
031065	Sentara College of Health Sciences	Chesapeake	VA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/28/16				ABHES	
041440	Virginia International University	Fairfax	VA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	11/18/16					
042395	Virginia University of Oriental Medicine	Fairfax	VA	P	No	New Accreditor Obtained	ACAOM	02/10/15				ACAOM	
042552	American College of Commerce and Technology	Falls Church	VA	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							
025412	Stratford University	Falls Church	VA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	SACSCC	10/11/16			01/08/18		
004992	Miller-Motte Technical College	Lynchburg	VA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCET	03/10/17	06/09/17				
023427	Fortis College	Norfolk	VA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/13/17			11/01/17		
010043	Bon Secours Memorial College of Nursing	Richmond	VA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/13/16				ABHES	
003726	American National University	Salem	VA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	DETC	01/20/17			09/25/17		
042190	IGlobal University	Vienna	VA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	11/22/16			11/28/17	ACCSC	
026175	Altierus Career College	Woodbridge	VA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/09/16				ACCSC	
023001	Altierus Career College	Everett	WA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/07/16				ACCSC	
041612	Pinchot University	Seattle	WA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	WASCSR	11/04/16			06/13/16		
030314	Sanford-Brown College	Seattle	WA	P	Yes	Intending to Close							
042580	Seattle Film Institute	Seattle	WA	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	10/31/16			09/28/17		
030718	ITT Technical Institute	Spokane Valley	WA	N	No	Closed School							09/03/16
025769	Charter College	Vancouver	WA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	01/31/17				ABHES	
042374	Wright Graduate University for the Realization of Human Potential	Elkhorn	WI	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	DETC	09/08/16				DETC	
010913	Madison Media Institute	Madison	WI	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/03/17				ACCSC	
030844	Valley College	Beckley	WV	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	10/26/16				ACCSC	
010573	West Virginia Junior College	Charleston	WV	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	09/02/16				ABHES	
026094	Valley College	Martinsburg	WV	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	10/26/16				ACCSC	
005007	West Virginia Junior College	Morgantown	WV	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	09/02/16				ABHES	

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
005008	Mountain State College	Parkersburg	WV	P	Yes	Compliant with PPPA terms	ACCSC	03/10/17			01/18/18		
030842	Valley College	Princeton	WV	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	10/26/16				ACCSC	
010861	West Virginia Business College	Wheeling	WV	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCET	12/27/16	06/09/17				06/08/17

Notes:

*Disclosed below are descriptions for each Current Status identified in the chart above:

- *Compliant with PPPA terms* - School has submitted teach out plans; provided proof of application to new accreditor or submitted a teach out agreement, submitted a records retention plan, submitted montly student loan lists and made a direct disclosure to students regarding its loss of federally-recognized accreditation; positive affirmations of other terms are still being collected.
- *New Accreditor* - A new, approved accreditor is in place.
- *Non-Compliant with PPPA terms* - School is non-compliant with the terms and conditions outlined in its PPPA.
- *Intending to Close* - Schools that have announced to the U.S. Department of Education that they will be closing at a certain date in the future.
- *School Closed* - Either before or after Secretary's 12/12/16 final decision.
- *Title IV Ineligible* - Includes schools that had initial participation application denied or recertification denial, etc. Schools that had an initial participation application denied will not show a date in the "Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date" column because the schools were never a participant in the Title IV programs.

**Globe University (OPEID# 004642) and Minnesota School of Business (OPEID# 004646) were notified by the Administrative Actions and Appeals Service Group (AAASG) on December 2, 2016 regarding the denial of their recertification applications. When a school is denied recertification, they are notified by AAASG and then the denial becomes effective at the end of the month in the Postsecondary Education Participants System (PEPS). Therefore, the two schools loss of eligibility became effective on December 31, 2016.

***SAE Institute of Technology - Atlanta (OPEID# 042066) became a new additional location of SAE Institute of Technology (OPEID# 038303) on September 21, 2017 and, therefore, obtained ACCSC as a new accreditor under OPEID# 03830302.

****237 schools were notified to sign a new a pPPA as a result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 decision. These schools will show a value of "Yes" in the "Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?" column of the table above. One of the 237 schools (Sage College) did not return a signed pPPA and closed. The remaining 32 schools that were identified as having ACICS as the primary accreditor did not receive a pPPA (some had closed, lost eligibility, obtained a new accreditor or had an initial certification application in-process).

Participation Status Summary Dashboard Data as of 20180621
Public Status

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
030106	Virginia College	Birmingham	AL	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	03/06/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
040513	Art Institute of Phoenix (The)	Phoenix	AZ	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCCS	03/07/17				WASCSR	
022188	Brookline College	Phoenix	AZ	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	12/16/16				ABHES	
026167	Le Cordon Bleu College of Culinary Arts	Scottsdale	AZ	N	Yes	Closed School							09/29/17
007164	Bryan University	Tempe	AZ	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/02/17				ACCSC	
004467	Tucson College	Tucson	AZ	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCET	03/10/17					04/28/17
042506	California Institute of Advanced Management	Alhambra	CA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCSR	11/01/15				WASCSR	
033083	Bristol University	Anaheim	CA	N	No	Title IV Ineligible	ACCSC	08/01/16					12/26/14
041331	California University of Management and Sciences	Anaheim	CA	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	WASCSR	11/01/15				ACICS	
025779	Santa Barbara Business College	Bakersfield	CA	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/08/17			09/06/17	ACICS	
041855	Beverly Hills Design Institute	Beverly Hills	CA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/13/15				ACICS	
032783	Charter College	Canyon Country	CA	N	No	Closed School							05/15/16
021884	Sierra Valley College of Court Reporting	Fresno	CA	N	Yes	Closed School							03/24/17
031258	Premiere Career College	Irwindale	CA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/13/16			11/03/16	ABHES	
034275	University of Antelope Valley	Lancaster	CA	C	No	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCSR	12/01/12				WASCSR	
031633	Pacific States University	Los Angeles	CA	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	02/24/17			10/18/17	ACICS	
042058	SAE Institute of Technology, Los Angeles	Los Angeles	CA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/10/17			11/16/17	ACCSC	
041933	Shepherd University********	Los Angeles	CA	N	Yes	Bankruptcy	WASCSR	02/01/09				WASCSR	08/14/17
030695	Sage College	Moreno Valley	CA	N	Yes	Closed School							12/22/16
006975	Lincoln University	Oakland	CA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	WASCSR	02/13/17				ACICS	
022774	South Coast College	Orange	CA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/05/17			10/10/17	ACCSC	
042288	Bay Area College of Nursing	Palo Alto	CA	N	No	Closed School							08/08/16
032103	Le Cordon Bleu College of Culinary Arts	Pasadena	CA	N	Yes	Closed School							09/29/17
041501	Golden State College of Court Reporting & Captioning	Pleasanton	CA	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCET	02/13/17					03/09/18
041812	Southern California Health Institute (SOCHI)	Reseda	CA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCET	03/11/17			09/27/17	ACCET	
041763	Bergin University of Canine Studies	Rohnert Park	CA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	11/02/16			08/31/17	ACICS	
023519	Brightwood College	Sacramento	CA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
023063	Brightwood College	Salida	CA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
020917	Brightwood College	San Diego	CA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
041897	California Miramar University	San Diego	CA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	DETC	03/08/17			09/07/17	ACICS	
007296	Coleman University	San Diego	CA	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	WASCSR	02/19/16				ACICS	
022980	Design Institute of San Diego	San Diego	CA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCSR	10/11/16			09/14/17	WASCSR	
042347	Niels Brock University San Diego	San Diego	CA	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							11/05/15
042657	San Diego Global Knowledge University	San Diego	CA	N	No	Initial Denied							
041955	Southern States University	San Diego	CA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	WASCSR	10/05/16				ACICS	
042237	Bay Area Medical Academy	San Francisco	CA	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/13/17			02/07/18	ACICS	
022202	Le Cordon Bleu College of Culinary Arts	San Francisco	CA	N	Yes	Closed School							09/28/17

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
041414	Laurus College	San Luis Obispo	CA	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	01/18/17			08/14/17	ACICS	
025780	Santa Barbara Business College	Santa Maria	CA	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/08/17			10/17/17	ACICS	
009032	Empire College	Santa Rosa	CA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/07/17			10/30/17	ACICS	
032253	American University of Health Sciences	Signal Hill	CA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCSR	07/15/15				WASCSR	
033673	Professional Golfers Career College	Temecula	CA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	02/26/17			09/21/17	ACICS	
025391	Brightwood College	Van Nuys	CA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
001123	Brooks Institute	Ventura	CA	N	No	Closed School							08/19/16
009989	Santa Barbara Business College	Ventura	CA	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/08/17			10/18/17	ACICS	
025490	Brightwood College	Vista	CA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
038743	Cambridge Junior College	Yuba City	CA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	08/01/16			08/30/17	ACCSC	
007297	Spartan College of Aeronautics and Technology	Broomfield	CO	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/27/17				ACCSC	
004503	Altierus Career College	Colorado Springs	CO	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/07/16				ACCSC	
008635	IBMC College	Colorado Springs	CO	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCSC	03/20/17					12/31/17
032893	Colorado Heights University******	Denver	CO	N	Yes	Voluntarily Withdrawn from TIV							07/31/17
030063	IBMC College	Fort Collins	CO	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/20/17				ACCSC	
004507	Altierus Career College	Thornton	CO	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/09/16				ACCSC	
020740	Branford Hall Career Institute	Branford	CT	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	10/22/16			12/22/17	ACICS	
021123	Ridley - Lowell Business & Technical Institute	New London	CT	C	Yes	Closed School	ACCET	03/10/17			10/13/17		04/04/18
021066	American Institute	West Hartford	CT	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ABHES	08/22/16			10/20/17	ACICS	
012425	Stone Academy	West Haven	CT	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/22/16			10/17/16	ABHES	
041900	Radians College	Washington	DC	N	No	Closed School							09/23/16
030799	City College	Altamonte Springs	FL	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	09/30/16				ABHES	
041274	Digital Media Arts College	Boca Raton	FL	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCSC	12/16/16					10/18/17
042479	International College of Health Sciences	Boynton Beach	FL	N	No	Initial Denied							
035493	Ultimate Medical Academy	Clearwater	FL	P	No	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	06/15/16				ABHES	
041825	Millennia Atlantic University	Doral	FL	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/07/17			10/17/17	ACICS	
042169	San Ignacio University	Doral	FL	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/13/17			01/31/18	ACICS	
010195	Art Institute of Fort Lauderdale (The)	Fort Lauderdale	FL	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCCS	03/06/17				WASCSR	
025154	City College	Fort Lauderdale	FL	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	09/30/16				ABHES	
023251	Key College	Fort Lauderdale	FL	N	Yes	Title IV Ineligible	ACCSC	03/08/17					06/13/18
042585	Premiere International College	Fort Myers	FL	N	No	Initial Denied							
022788	Southern Technical College	Fort Myers	FL	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	03/10/17	06/09/17		02/01/18	ACICS	
042608	School of Med Technology	Hialeah	FL	N	No	Initial Denied							
001497	Jones College	Jacksonville	FL	N	Yes	Closed School							08/19/17
026164	Sanford-Brown College	Jacksonville	FL	N	No	Closed School							10/15/16
023141	Schiller International University	Largo	FL	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	HLC	02/27/17			07/26/17	ACICS	
030716	College of Business & Technology	Miami	FL	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/09/17			11/29/17	ACICS	

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
023058	Florida Career College	Miami	FL	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	COE	03/02/17			07/17/17	ACICS	
042617	Life-Line Med Training	Miami	FL	N	No	Initial Denied							
041284	Miami Regional University	Miami Springs	FL	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/13/17			12/20/17	ACICS	
042332	Unilatina International College	Miramar	FL	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/09/17			11/15/17	ACICS	
042079	SAE Institute of Technology - Miami***	North Miami Beach	FL	N	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCET	03/10/17			10/27/17	ACCSC	
034343	Fortis College	Orange Park	FL	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/13/17			11/01/17	ACICS	
022187	Florida Technical College	Orlando	FL	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	MSACHE	02/27/17				MSACHE	
039035	Southern Technical College	Orlando	FL	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	03/10/17	06/09/17		12/07/17	ACICS	
041620	Jose Maria Vargas University	Pembroke Pines	FL	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	SACSCC	06/19/17				ACICS	
042517	Hope College of Arts and Sciences	Pompano Beach	FL	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ABHES	02/09/17			10/27/17	ACICS	
034297	East West College of Natural Medicine	Sarasota	FL	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACAOM	10/03/16			02/21/18	ACICS	
001499	Altierus Career College	Tampa	FL	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/09/16				ACCSC	
042066	SAE Institute of Technology - Atlanta***	Atlanta	GA	N	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/08/17				ACCSC	
025830	Gwinnett College	Lilburn	GA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/05/17			10/19/17	ACICS	
042452	Pacific Institute of Technology	Morrow	GA	N	Yes	Title IV Ineligible							03/20/17
034483	Business Industrial Resources	Chicago	IL	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							08/04/14
031285	National Latino Education Institute	Chicago	IL	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/10/17			11/29/17	ACICS	
021603	Sanford-Brown College	Chicago	IL	N	Yes	Closed School							06/30/17
011810	Taylor Business Institute	Chicago	IL	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	HLC	04/28/11			05/27/16	HLC	
041956	Tribeca Flashpoint College****	Chicago	IL	N	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCSR	11/18/16			12/06/16	WASCSR	
022960	Prince Institute - Southeast	Elmhurst	IL	N	Yes	Closed School							03/16/17
041247	Ambria College of Nursing	Hoffman Estates	IL	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	01/24/17			09/25/17	ABHES	
041791	PCCTI Healthcare	Oak Brook	IL	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	05/24/17			12/12/17	COE	
004560	Gem City College	Quincy	IL	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	COE	04/10/17			11/30/17	COE	
042450	Northwest Suburban College	Rolling Meadows	IL	N	Yes	Title IV Ineligible	ACCSC	02/24/17	02/23/18				06/13/18
041685	SOLEX College	Wheeling	IL	N	Yes	Voluntarily Withdrawn from TIV							12/31/17
004579	International Business College	Fort Wayne	IN	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	02/27/17				ACCSC	
022018	Brightwood College	Hammond	IN	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
021584	Harrison College	Indianapolis	IN	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	01/25/17			04/10/17	ABHES	
007329	ITT Technical Institute	Indianapolis	IN	N	No	Closed School							09/03/16
007362	Medtech College	Indianapolis	IN	N	No	Closed School							09/16/16
042328	Radiological Technologies University VT	South Bend	IN	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/06/17			11/14/17	ACCSC	
026158	College of Court Reporting	Valparaiso	IN	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	DETC	07/07/17				ACICS	
026130	Pinnacle Career Institute	Lawrence	KS	N	Yes	Voluntarily Withdrawn from TIV							08/15/17
030662	Bryan University	Topeka	KS	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	10/26/16			09/17/17	ACICS	
024911	Beckfield College	Florence	KY	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	08/31/16				ABHES	
010489	American National University	Lexington	KY	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ABHES	01/31/17			10/12/17	ACICS	

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
004618	Spencerian College	Louisville	KY	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	09/20/16				ABHES	
012088	Sullivan College of Technology and Design	Louisville	KY	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	SACSCC	03/13/17			09/19/17	ACICS	
009313	Daymar College	Owensboro	KY	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/10/17				ACICS	
030235	Camelot College	Baton Rouge	LA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACICS	03/20/18			02/01/17	ACICS	
041123	Louisiana Culinary Institute	Baton Rouge	LA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	COE	12/31/16				COE	
020555	Delta School of Business and Technology	Lake Charles	LA	N	Yes	Title IV Ineligible	ACCET	03/03/17		03/20/18			06/13/18
004666	Salter College	West Boylston	MA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	02/04/17			12/22/17	ACICS	
007491	Brightwood College	Baltimore	MD	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
020836	Brightwood College	Beltsville	MD	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/18/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
010410	Brightwood College	Towson	MD	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
005204	Beal College	Bangor	ME	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	12/21/16			08/25/17	ACCSC	
030057	Detroit Business Institute - Downriver	Riverview	MI	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/10/17				ACCSC	
004692	Dorsey School of Business	Southgate	MI	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	COE	03/10/17			12/11/18	COE	
020503	Academy College	Bloomington	MN	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	12/14/16			10/17/17	ACICS	
007351	Sanford-Brown College	Brooklyn Center	MN	N	Yes	Closed School							04/23/17
009892	Duluth Business University*******	Duluth	MN	N	Yes	Closed School				06/12/17			06/12/18
010248	Art Institutes International Minnesota (The)	Minneapolis	MN	N	Yes	Closed School							12/15/17
004646	Minnesota School of Business**	Richfield	MN	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							12/31/16
004645	Minneapolis Business College	Roseville	MN	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	02/27/17				ACCSC	
004642	Globe University**	Woodbury	MN	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							12/31/16
042557	Bolivar Technical College	Bolivar	MO	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	09/20/16			09/19/17	ABHES	
009795	Missouri College	Brentwood	MO	N	No	Closed School							11/01/16
021802	Metro Business College	Cape Girardeau	MO	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	03/09/17			01/22/18	ACICS	
021192	Court Reporting Institute of St Louis	Clayton	MO	N	Yes	Closed School							03/26/17
035793	Texas County Technical Institute	Houston	MO	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	09/20/16			09/21/17	ABHES	
010405	Pinnacle Career Institute	Kansas City	MO	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	02/24/17			10/10/17	ACCSC	
010279	Hickey College	Saint Louis	MO	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	02/27/17				ACICS	
030663	Bryan University	Springfield	MO	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	10/26/16			09/18/17	ACICS	
022506	Everest College	Springfield	MO	N	Yes	Closed School							06/20/17
008552	Stevens - The Institute of Business & Arts	St Louis	MO	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/02/17			11/13/17	ACCSC	
010264	South College-Asheville	Asheville	NC	N	No	Title IV Ineligible							09/14/16
002937	King's College	Charlotte	NC	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/24/17			10/11/18	ACCSC	
031090	School of Communication Arts of North Carolina	Raleigh	NC	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	SACSCC	04/17/17				ACICS	
021040	Harris School of Business	Cherry Hill	NJ	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	10/21/16			12/27/17	ACICS	
041814	Best Care College	East Orange	NJ	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/03/17			08/26/17	ACICS	
012462	Eastwick College - Hackensack Campus.	Hackensack	NJ	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/09/17			10/11/17	ACICS	
012461	Lincoln Technical Institute	Iselin	NJ	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	08/04/16			10/03/17	ACCSC	

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
036506	PC Age	Jersey City	NJ	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	COE	12/14/16			12/11/17	COE	
020923	Eastwick College - Nutley Campus	Nutley	NJ	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/09/17			10/11/17	ACICS	
042160	Universal Training Institute	Perth Amboy	NJ	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	NLNAC	01/25/17				ACICS	
020537	Eastwick College	Ramsey	NJ	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/09/17			10/11/17	ACICS	
022375	Altierus Career College	Henderson	NV	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/07/16				ACCSC	
030432	Brightwood College	Las Vegas	NV	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
022195	Mildred Elley	Albany	NY	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	12/14/16			09/01/17	ABHES	
020924	Ridley-Lowell School of Business	Binghamton	NY	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCET	03/09/17					11/22/17
041171	EDP School of Computer Programming	Brooklyn	NY	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	MSACSS	03/02/17			11/15/17	MSACSS	
031933	Manhattan School of Computer Technology	Brooklyn	NY	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCET	12/15/16			06/20/17	ACCET	
009043	Elmira Business Institute	Elmira	NY	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	02/09/17				ABHES	
020937	Long Island Business Institute	Flushing	NY	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	NYBRE	10/12/16			10/05/17	ACICS	
026150	Sanford-Brown College	Garden City	NY	N	Yes	Closed School							12/26/16
022060	Hunter Business School	Levittown	NY	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	MSACSS	12/02/16			08/01/17	MSACSS	
011647	SBI Campus - an affiliate of Sanford-Brown	Melville	NY	N	No	Closed School							11/09/16
025256	Art Institute of New York City (The)	New York	NY	N	Yes	Closed School							06/14/17
039883	SAE Institute of Technology, New York***	New York	NY	N	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCET	03/10/17			09/15/17	ACCSC	
024914	Spanish-American Institute	New York	NY	N	Yes	Title IV Ineligible							04/04/17
021760	Cheryl Fell's School of Business	Niagara Falls	NY	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	COE	04/18/17			12/19/17	COE	
004853	Bradford School	Columbus	OH	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	02/27/17				ACCSC	
042350	Felbry College-School of Nursing	Columbus	OH	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ABHES	03/10/17			02/07/18	ACICS	
020520	Brightwood College	Dayton	OH	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
041773	Ohio Medical Career College	Dayton	OH	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/01/17			11/28/17	ACCSC	
023014	Ohio Valley College of Technology	East Liverpool	OH	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/21/16				ABHES	
030079	Gallipolis Career College	Gallipolis	OH	N	Yes	Closed School			06/09/17				12/13/17
034685	MDT College of Health Sciences	Highland Heights	OH	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	03/10/17			10/31/17	ABHES	
004866	Stautzenberger College	Maumee	OH	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/10/17				ACCSC	
020568	Daymar College	New Boston	OH	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCSC	03/10/17					09/19/16
021585	Ohio Business College	Sheffield	OH	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	COE	12/12/16			12/04/17	COE	
020543	Trumbull Business College	Warren	OH	N	Yes	Closed School							03/21/17
040743	Hondros College	Westerville	OH	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ABHES	07/31/16			10/30/17	ACICS	
033674	Community Care College	Tulsa	OK	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	12/22/16			09/21/17	ACCSC	
009079	Everest College	Portland	OR	N	No	Closed School							08/22/16
030226	Le Cordon Bleu College of Culinary Arts	Portland	OR	N	Yes	Closed School							09/29/17
021049	Sumner College	Portland	OR	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	06/17/16				ABHES	
023301	Pioneer Pacific College	Wilsonville	OR	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ABHES	01/26/17			08/09/17	ACICS	
007781	Brightwood Career Institute	Broomall	PA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
004893	DuBois Business College	DuBois	PA	N	No	Closed School							09/22/16
030108	Fortis Institute	Erie	PA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/13/17			11/01/17	ACICS	
004910	Brightwood Career Institute	Harrisburg	PA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
004889	Cambria-Rowe Business College	Johnstown	PA	N	No	Closed School							08/24/16
030299	Consolidated School of Business	Lancaster	PA	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCET	11/04/16					02/13/17
020683	Douglas Education Center	Monessen	PA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	11/18/16			08/07/17	ACCSC	
007779	Lansdale School of Business	North Wales	PA	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/10/17			02/14/18	ACICS	
022898	Brightwood Career Institute	Philadelphia	PA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
009721	Bradford School	Pittsburgh	PA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	12/20/16				ACCSC	
007436	Brightwood Career Institute	Pittsburgh	PA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
022023	Pittsburgh Career Institute	Pittsburgh	PA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ABHES	09/26/16			04/11/17	ACICS	
004898	McCann School of Business & Technology	Pottsville	PA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	03/10/17	06/09/17			ACICS	
020925	Laurel Technical Institute	Sharon	PA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/24/17				ACCSC	
013263	South Hills School of Business & Technology	State College	PA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	06/27/16			05/17/17	ACCSC	
025462	Laurel Business Institute	Uniontown	PA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/24/17				ACCSC	
004902	Penn Commercial Business/Technical School	Washington	PA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	01/20/17			08/23/17	ACCSC	
037813	PITC Institute	Wyncote	PA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	12/12/16				ABHES	
022539	Berks Technical Institute	Wyomissing	PA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCET	03/10/17	06/09/17			ACCSC	
025578	Art Institute of York (The) - Pennsylvania	York	PA	N	Yes	Closed School							09/23/17
022896	Consolidated School of Business********	York	PA	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCET	11/04/16			10/25/17		06/12/18
030619	Colegio Technologico y Comercial de Puerto Rico	Aguada	PR	N	Yes	Title IV Ineligible	ACCET	03/12/17	06/11/18		02/27/18		06/13/18
030297	Universal Technology College of Puerto Rico	Aguadilla, PR	PR	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	08/03/16			03/17/17	ABHES	
023038	American Educational College	Bayamon	PR	N	Yes	Title IV Ineligible	ACCSC	02/24/17					06/13/18
030219	EDIC College	Caguas	PR	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/12/16			03/06/17	ABHES	
042409	PPG Technical College	Caguas	PR	N	Yes	Title IV Ineligible	ACCSC	01/11/17			04/05/18		06/13/18
025054	Atlantic University College	Guaynabo	PR	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	12/22/16				ACICS	
031121	Dewey University	Hato Rey	PR	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/10/17			04/01/18	ABHES	
021664	Instituto de Banca y Comercio	Hato Rey	PR	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	MSACHE	02/27/17				MSACHE	
023406	Humacao Community College	Humacao	PR	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	01/19/17			04/03/18	ACICS	
031159	Trinity College of Puerto Rico	Ponce	PR	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	COE	04/20/17			03/09/18	ACICS	
020631	MBTI Business Training Institute	San Juan	PR	N	No	Closed School							09/30/16
004924	Forrest College	Anderson	SC	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	06/30/16			12/01/17	ACICS	
004934	Daymar College	Clarksville	TN	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/10/17				ACICS	
026142	Miller - Motte Technical College	Clarksville	TN	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	03/10/17	06/09/17			ACICS	
004947	West Tennessee Business College	Jackson	TN	N	Yes	Voluntarily Withdrawn from TIV	COE	03/10/17					06/12/18
023262	Brightwood College	Nashville	TN	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
004617	National College	Nashville	TN	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ABHES	01/31/17			08/10/17	ACICS	

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
038303	SAE Institute of Technology	Nashville	TN	P	No	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	09/12/16				ACCSC	
025693	Le Cordon Bleu College of Culinary Arts	Austin	TX	N	Yes	Closed School							09/28/17
042480	Recording Conservatory of Austin, (The)	Austin	TX	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	12/22/16			08/30/17	ACCSC	
031795	Texas Health and Science University	Austin	TX	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/03/17			12/11/17	ACICS	
032723	Brightwood College	Dallas	TX	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
041687	Peloton College	Dallas	TX	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	COE	07/01/16			04/19/17	ACICS	
025919	Brightwood College	El Paso	TX	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
023122	Brightwood College	Houston	TX	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
026047	Center for Advanced Legal Studies	Houston	TX	C	No	New Accreditor Obtained	COE	03/11/14				COE	
021160	Sanford-Brown College	Houston	TX	N	Yes	Closed School							02/10/17
021448	Vet Tech Institute of Houston	Houston	TX	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	10/26/16				ACCSC	
009466	Brightwood College	San Antonio	TX	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
031158	Brightwood College	San Antonio	TX	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	01/28/17			02/28/18	ACICS	
025911	Career Point College	San Antonio	TX	N	No	Closed School							10/16/16
041795	North American University	Stafford	TX	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	02/23/17				ACCSC	
021785	Eagle Gate College	Murray	UT	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/15/16			02/08/17	ABHES	
023608	Provo College	Provo	UT	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/15/16			02/07/17	ABHES	
010098	Neumont College of Computer Science	Salt Lake City	UT	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	12/19/16			07/07/17	ACCSC	
011166	Broadview University	West Jordan	UT	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	05/30/17			12/04/17	ACICS	
041400	Global Health College	Alexandria	VA	N	Yes	Voluntarily Withdrawn from TIV							12/31/17
009267	Altierus Career College	Chesapeake	VA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/07/16				ACCSC	
031065	Sentara College of Health Sciences	Chesapeake	VA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/28/16				ABHES	
041440	Virginia International University	Fairfax	VA	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	11/18/16				ACICS	
042395	Virginia University of Integrative Medicine	Fairfax	VA	P	No	New Accreditor Obtained	ACAOM	02/10/15				ACAOM	
042552	American College of Commerce and Technology	Falls Church	VA	N	No	Initial Denied							
025412	Stratford University	Falls Church	VA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	SACSCC	10/11/16			01/08/18	ACICS	
004992	Miller-Motte Technical College	Lynchburg	VA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCET	03/10/17	06/09/17			ACICS	
023427	Fortis College	Norfolk	VA	P	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/13/17			11/01/17	ACICS	
010043	Bon Secours Memorial College of Nursing	Richmond	VA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	07/13/16				ABHES	
003726	American National University	Salem	VA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	DETC	01/20/17			09/25/17	DETC	
042190	IGlobal University	Vienna	VA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	11/22/16			11/28/17	ACCSC	
026175	Altierus Career College	Woodbridge	VA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/09/16				ACCSC	
023001	Altierus Career College	Everett	WA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/07/16				ACCSC	
041612	Pinchot University	Seattle	WA	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	WASCSR	11/04/16			06/13/16	WASCSR	
030314	Sanford-Brown College	Seattle	WA	N	Yes	Closed School							04/29/18
042580	Seattle Film Institute	Seattle	WA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	10/31/16			09/28/17	ACCSC	
030718	ITT Technical Institute	Spokane Valley	WA	N	No	Closed School							09/03/16

OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Cert Type CD*	Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?	Current Status	Prospective Accreditor	Date of Application to New Accreditor	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Denied	Date App to Prospective Accreditor Withdrawn	Date Site Visit Made	New Accreditor	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
025769	Charter College	Vancouver	WA	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	01/31/17				ABHES	
042374	Wright Graduate University for the Realization of Human Potential	Elkhorn	WI	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	DETC	09/08/16				DETC	
010913	Madison Media Institute	Madison	WI	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	03/03/17				ACCSC	
030844	Valley College	Beckley	WV	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	10/26/16				ACCSC	
010573	West Virginia Junior College	Charleston	WV	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	09/02/16				ABHES	
026094	Valley College	Martinsburg	WV	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	10/26/16				ACCSC	
005007	West Virginia Junior College	Morgantown	WV	C	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	09/02/16				ABHES	
005008	Mountain State College	Parkersburg	WV	C	Yes	Currently ACICS Accredited	ACCSC	03/10/17			01/18/18	ACICS	
030842	Valley College	Princeton	WV	P	Yes	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	10/26/16				ACCSC	
010861	West Virginia Business College	Wheeling	WV	N	Yes	Closed School	ACCET	12/27/16	06/09/17				06/08/17

Notes:

*Disclosed below are descriptions for each Current Status identified in the chart above:

- *Compliant with PPPA terms* - School has submitted teach out plans; provided proof of application to new accreditor or submitted a teach out agreement, submitted a records retention plan, submitted montly student loan lists and made a direct disclosure to students regarding its loss of federally-recognized accreditation; positive affirmations of other terms are still being collected.
- *New Accreditor* - A new, approved accreditor is in place or the school remained accredited by ACICS following the restoration of ACICS's status as a fully recognized agency.
- *Non-Compliant with PPPA terms* - School is non-compliant with the terms and conditions outlined in its PPPA.
- *Intending to Close* - Schools that have announced to the U.S. Department of Education that they will be closing at a certain date in the future.
- *School Closed* - Either before or after Secretary's 12/12/16 final decision.
- *Title IV Ineligible* - Includes schools that had recertification denial, etc.
- *Initial Denied* - Includes schools that had initial participation application denied. Schools that had an initial participation application denied will not show a date in the "Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date" column because the schools were never a participant in the Title IV programs.
- *Bankruptcy* - School has filed for bankruptcy.
- *Voluntarily Withdrawn from TIV* - School voluntarily withdrawn from the Title IV programs.

**Globe University (OPEID# 004642) and Minnesota School of Business (OPEID# 004646) were notified by the Administrative Actions and Appeals Service Group (AAASG) on December 2, 2016 regarding the denial of their recertification applications. When a school is denied recertification, they are notified by AAASG and then the denial becomes effective at the end of the month in the Postsecondary Education Participants System (PEPS). Therefore, the two schools loss of eligibility became effective on December 31, 2016.

***SAE Institute of Technology - Atlanta (OPEID# 042066) became a new additional location of SAE Institute of Technology (OPEID# 038303) on September 21, 2017 and, therefore, obtained ACCSC as a new accreditor under OPEID# 03830302. On June 12, 2018, SAE Institute of Technology - Miami (OPEID# 042079) and SAE Institute of Technology, New York (OPEID# 039883) also became a new additional locations of SAE Institute of Technology (OPEID# 038303) and, therefore, obtained ACCSC as a new accreditor.

****Tribeca Flashpoint College (OPEID# 041956) became a new additional location of Columbia College Hollywood (OPEID# 021102) on June 11, 2018 and, therefore, obtained WASCSR as a new accreditor under OPEID# 02110205.

*****237 schools were notified to sign a new a pPPA as a result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 decision. These schools will show a value of "Yes" in the "Notified to Sign a New pPPA as a Result of the Secretary's 12/12/16 Decision?" column of the table above. One of the 237 schools (Sage College) did not return a signed pPPA and closed. The remaining 32 schools that were identified as having ACICS as the primary accreditor did not receive a pPPA (some had closed, lost eligibility, obtained a new accreditor or had an initial certification application in-process).

******Colorado Heights University (OPEID# 032893) voluntarily withdrew on July 31, 2017 and, later, closed on October 13, 2017.
*******Duluth Business University (OPEID# 009892) closed on June 12, 2018. All students completed their program prior to closure.
********Consolidated School of Business (OPEID# 022896) closed on June 12, 2018. All students completed their program prior to closure.
*********Shepherd University's (OPEID# 041933) new accreditor approval occurred on June 14, 2017. The school filed for bankruptcy on August 14, 2017 causing loss of eligibility.

ACICS Schools Non-Compliant with PPPA Terms as of 04/02/18

School Information							PPPA Conditions School Not Complying With as of 04/02/18							
SPD	Common Owner/School Group	OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Status as of 04/02/18	Compliant w/ PPPA Condition #11 (App w/in 90 days)?	Compliant w/ PPPA Condition #14 (App w/in 180 days)?	Compliant w/ PPPA Condition #12 (Teach Out Agreement)?	Compliant w/ PPPA Condition #13 (Direct Disclosure to Students)?	Compliant w/ PPPA Condition #15 (Addl. Direct Disclosure to Students)?	Compliant w/ PPPA Condition #16 (Record Retention & Reporting)?	Compliant w/ PPPA Condition #17 (Monthly Student Lists)?	Compliant w/ Condition #20 (Site Visit Requirement)?
ATL		041620	Jose Maria Vargas University	Pembroke Pines	FL	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
ATL		031090	School of Communication Arts of North Carolina	Raleigh	NC	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
ATL	Wicks Capital Partners IV, L.P.	022788	Southern Technical College	Fort Myers	FL	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
ATL	Wicks Capital Partners IV, L.P.	039035	Southern Technical College	Orlando	FL	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
CHI-DEN		026158	College of Court Reporting	Valparaiso	IN	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CHI-DEN		042450	Northwest Suburban College	Rolling Meadows	IL	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
CHI-DEN	Myher	009892	Duluth Business University	Duluth	MN	Intending to Close	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
DAL		020555	Delta School of Business and Technology	Lake Charles	LA	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
KC		024947	West Tennessee Business College	Jackson	TN	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
MRFS	Bradford Schools, Inc.	010279	Hickey College	Saint Louis	MO	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
MRFS	Career Education Corporation	030314	Sanford-Brown College	Seattle	WA	Intending to Close	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
MRFS	The Mark A. Gabis Revocable Inter Vivos Trust	004934	Daymar College	Clarksville	TN	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
MRFS	The Mark A. Gabis Revocable Inter Vivos Trust	009313	Daymar College	Owensboro	KY	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
NY-BOS		042160	Universal Training Institute	Perth Amboy	NJ	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
SF-SEA		041855	Beverly Hills Design Institute	Beverly Hills	CA	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
SF-SEA		041331	California University of Management and Sciences	Anaheim	CA	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
SF-SEA		041955	Southern States University	San Diego	CA	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

ADDENDUM – LOSS OF RECOGNIZED ACCREDITING AGENCY ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS
[Provisional Approval]

Effective Date of Approval: The date on which this Addendum is signed on behalf of the United States Secretary of Education

Whereas, on December 12, 2016 the United States Secretary of Education (the "Secretary") withdrew the federal recognition of the accrediting agency that accredits the postsecondary educational institution identified above (the "Institution");

Whereas, when the Secretary withdraws the recognition of its accrediting agency, a postsecondary educational institution may be allowed to continue its participation on a provisional basis in those student financial assistance programs authorized by Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (Title IV, HEA Programs) for a period not to exceed 18 months;

Whereas, the Institution has signed a provisional Program Participation Agreement ("PPPA") to allow it to continue to participate on a provisional basis, which PPPA is effective as of the date the PPPA is signed on behalf of the Secretary; and

Whereas, the Institution and the Secretary agree to the following additional terms and conditions under which the Institution may participate in Title IV, HEA Programs on a provisional basis, and the terms and conditions of this Addendum are hereby incorporated into the PPPA as if fully set forth therein, and in the event of a conflict between the terms of the PPPA and this Addendum, this Addendum shall govern:

1. Continued Accreditation. Notwithstanding the loss of recognition of its accrediting agency, the Secretary deems the Institution to hold recognized accreditation while the PPPA is in effect, which shall be no longer than 18 months. In recognition of the attendant risks the Department undertakes in entering into the PPPA with the Institution, the Institution agrees to the terms and the additional conditions set forth below. The Institution also acknowledges that during the term of the PPPA, the Department may impose additional conditions or take other remedial actions, if it has a basis for doing so. In addition, this PPPA shall not be construed by the Institution as approving any change of status or other changes currently under review and not yet explicitly approved by the Department. The requirement for any previously imposed letter of credit or method of payment shall remain in effect during the period of provisional participation.

2. Month to Month Participation. Notwithstanding the approval expiration date identified in the PPPA, if at the time the Institution signs the PPPA it participates in Title IV, HEA programs on a month to month basis, or a temporary month to month basis, the Institution agrees that its term of provisional participation under the PPPA and this Addendum shall also be on a month to month basis or temporary month to month basis (as applicable), and the provisions of 34 C.F.R. § 668.13(d) shall not apply.

3. Closing Institutions. If, prior to the execution of the PPPA, or at any time during the term of the PPPA, the Institution has advised (or advises) the Department that following the loss of its federally-recognized accrediting agency, it will close rather than seek a new accrediting agency ("Closing Institution"), its term of provisional participation will be limited to an orderly close-out, and the Closing Institution must immediately cease enrolling students. During the term of its close out, the Closing Institution will be subject to all of the conditions set forth below, with the following exceptions: the Closing Institution will not be allowed to add any new programs or new locations, and the Closing Institution will not be required to submit an application to an alternative accrediting agency. With regard to the conditions described below that are triggered by the failure to have an In Process Application with a new accrediting agency (as defined in 4.(c) below) within 90 calendar days, the Closing Institution shall comply with those conditions within 30 calendar days of the date that the Closing Institution's governing or managing body makes the decision to close, or within 30 calendar days from the first date that the Institution begins to take steps to close, including by notifying contractual parties (e.g., health insurance carrier, collective bargaining representatives), whichever is earlier ("Closing Decision"). With regard to the conditions described below that are triggered by the failure to have an In Process Application with a new accrediting agency within 180 calendar days, the Closing Institution shall comply with those conditions within 30 calendar days of its Closing Decision. In any event, a Closing Institution shall comply with all conditions within 210 calendar days of the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency.

4. New Accrediting Agency. Except for an Institution that has decided to close, the Institution should begin discussions with prospective new federally-recognized accrediting agencies as soon as practicable after the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency. The Institution shall notify the Department as follows:

(a) the Institution shall notify the Department of the name of the potential new federally-recognized accrediting agency within 7 calendar days of submitting of a statement of interest or intent, or pre-workshop application to the accrediting agency;
(b) the Institution shall notify the Department within 7 calendar days after submitting its completed application to a federally-recognized accrediting agency;
(c) the Institution shall notify the Department within 7 calendar days after receiving confirmation from the accrediting agency of the accrediting agency's acceptance or acknowledgment of the application for processing ("In Process Application"); and
(d) the Institution shall notify the Department within 7 calendar days after receiving notification from the accrediting agency of its decision on the Institution's application.

5. Special Requirements for Major Changes During Term of Provisional Certification. During the term of the PPPA, the Institution must apply for and receive approval by the Secretary for expansion or for any Major Change (as hereinafter identified), before it may award, disburse or distribute Title IV, HEA funds based on the Major Change. Major Changes generally include, but are not limited to: (a) establishment of an additional location; (b) increase in the level of academic offering beyond those listed in the Institution's Eligibility and Certification Approval Report (ECAR); or (c) addition of any educational program (including degree, non-degree, or short-term training programs). Major Change also includes

those changes described as "substantive changes" under 34 C.F.R. § 602.22(a). If the Institution applies for the Secretary's approval of a Major Change, the Institution must demonstrate that it has the financial and administrative resources necessary to assure the Institution's continued compliance with the standards of financial responsibility (34 C.F.R. § 668.15) and administrative capability (34 C.F.R. § 668.16). Because the Institution is without a federally-recognized accrediting agency, the Institution acknowledges that the Secretary will only approve a Major Change in limited circumstances, to include, in the Secretary's discretion, situations where as of the date of the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency, the Institution had received that accrediting agency's approval of the Major Change, or where the Secretary believes that the change meets the conditions for approval that are specified in the standards of the former accrediting agency, as well as the requirements of the HEA.

6. Teach Out Plans. The Institution will submit a teach-out plan to the Department within 30 calendar days of the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency. Extensions may be granted by the Secretary, in the Secretary's sole discretion, for good cause shown. At a minimum, the teach-out plan should include:

(a) a listing, by campus, of all students, which includes the student's name and contact information, program of study, and expected graduation date; and

(b) a listing, by campus, of comparable programs (including online programs, if applicable) offered at other, unaffiliated institutions in case teach-out agreements or transfer agreements are needed for students to complete their programs elsewhere.

7. Licensing/Certification Confirmation and Notifications. If, as a result of its accrediting agency's loss of federal recognition, the Institution's students (either past, current, or future) become ineligible to sit for any licensing or certification exam that is reasonably related to the students' educational program, and/or that any students reasonably could have expected the Institution to prepare them for, then:

(a) The Institution must immediately notify the Department within 7 calendar days of the Secretary's execution of the PPPA;

(b) The Institution must permit any currently enrolled students to take a leave of absence;

(c) The Institution will not be eligible to receive any funds under Title IV, HEA programs, for any students who enroll in any programs so affected after the date of the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency for any programs so affected;

(d) The Institution must make an affirmative disclosure of potential ineligibility: to any currently enrolled students that might be affected by loss of eligibility to take licensing or certification exam(s); to all students who have completed the programs so affected in the two year period prior to the Institution's loss of its Department-recognized accrediting agency; to any other former students who completed the program and for whom the Institution has information that they have not sat for the licensing or certification exam, or have not passed that exam; and to any new students who apply to or are enrolling, including those who have previously attended and are considering or are returning to the Institution;

(e) For currently enrolled students, the Institution must disclose the options available to such students, including a leave of absence, or transfer to another institution; and

(f) The disclosures required by (d) and (e) above must be made within 7 calendar days of the Secretary's execution of the PPPA.

8. State Authorization Confirmation and Notifications. If, as a result of its accrediting agency's loss of federal recognition, the Institution loses its authorization/license from its governing State entity to operate and issue postsecondary certificates and/or degrees, the Institution will not be eligible to receive any funds under Title IV, HEA programs for any programs affected unless the State grants the Institution authorization to continue operating. If the Institution learns or has reason to believe that its State has withdrawn authorization to operate:

(a)The Institution shall immediately, but in no event later than 7 calendar days, notify the Department about its loss of authorization to operate from the State; and

(b) Following notification to the Department of the Institution's loss of State authorization to operate, as set forth in subsection (a) above, the Institution shall immediately, but in no event later than 7 calendar days thereafter, notify all currently enrolled and prospective students of its loss of eligibility, and their inability to receive funds under Title IV, HEA programs.

9. Reports of Student Complaint Proceedings and Investigations. Within 30 days following the Secretary's final decision withdrawing the recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency ("Initial Report"), and updated every 90 days thereafter for the entire term of the Institution's provisional participation under the PPPA, the Institution shall provide the Department with the following reports:

(a) a report of all lawsuits or arbitration proceedings against the Institution or related entities relating to student complaints (as described below), including information when those proceedings are resolved. These reports are limited to arbitration or litigation proceedings relating to Title IV eligibility or administration, the quality of education received at the Institution, or to the accreditation standards of its formerly-recognized accrediting agency. The reports should be submitted to the Department in spreadsheet form, and must have all personally identifiable information (for students and employees) redacted; and

(b) a report of all known investigations (including but not limited to local, state, federal and foreign governments, and any accrediting agency), including the scope of any document request and the purpose of the investigation, and the Initial Report must also identify all investigations that were closed within the most recent 5 year period, including the purpose of the investigation, and the disposition of the investigation, including a description of any settlements and/or fines levied.

10. Compliance Audit Expanded Reporting. To ensure the Institution's compliance with the standards of an accrediting agency during the term of the provisional PPA, the Institution shall be required to engage its third-party auditor to evaluate key data and compliance indicators, to include fiscal information and measures of student achievement, and any enhanced evaluation deemed appropriate by the auditor. This requirement for this evaluation shall be included in the Institution's engagement letter with its auditor, and the evaluation shall be submitted to the Department with its annual compliance audit. At a minimum, the evaluation shall include:

(a) Data related to outcome measures, including cohort default rates, loan repayment statistics, and any job placement data the Institution collects;
(b)Financial responsibility metrics;
(c)Retention rates (defined in terms of the total student enrollment, minus those students who withdraw, divided by the total student enrollment and expressed as a percent. The retention rate is calculated at both the program and campus levels), transfer rates, and completion rates (defined as receiving the terminal recognition offered by the program, such as a degree or certification for a non-degree program); and
(d) Confirmation that the Institution has posted a notice to its public-facing website about its loss of accreditation. At a minimum, this notice shall include the following information:

(i) that the Institution's accrediting agency is no longer recognized by the Department;
(ii) that the Institution has 18 months following the loss of its Department-recognized accrediting agency, to find a new accrediting agency to maintain eligibility to receive funds under Title IV, HEA programs, and that if the Institution does not obtain accreditation within that 18 month period, the Institution would no longer be eligible to receive funds under Title IV, HEA programs;
(iii) the date of the expiration of the 18 month period referred to in (ii);
(iv) that any student at the Institution who has a complaint relating to Title IV eligibility or administration, the quality of education received at the Institution, or otherwise relating to the accreditation standards of its former accrediting agency can submit that complaint to the Institution and/or to any of the following: the Department's Student Complaint website, the State authorizing authority, the State Office of Attorney General, the State Office of Consumer Affairs; and
(v) the mail or e-mail addresses for the parties identified in (iv).

(e) Confirmation that no Title IV, HEA program funds were paid to any ineligible programs.

11. No In Process Application within 90 Calendar Days. In addition to all of the foregoing conditions, if the Institution does not have an In Process Application within 90 calendar days of the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency, then the Institution shall comply with the following "Teach Out Agreement" and "Direct Disclosures" conditions within 30 calendar days thereafter (i.e., 120 calendar days after the Department's withdrawal of recognition).

12. Teach Out Agreement. If the Institution does not have an In Process Application within 90 calendar days of the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency, the Institution shall submit a teach-out agreement with one or more institutions that are currently accredited by a recognized accrediting agency. At a minimum, this agreement shall:

(a) be with an unaffiliated institution(s) that is accredited by a federally-recognized accrediting agency;
(b) be consistent with the requirements for teach-out agreements set forth in 34 C.F.R. § 602.24;
(c) be in compliance with the standards of the Institution's formerly federally-recognized accrediting agency; and
(d) provide for the equitable treatment of students by ensuring that:

(i) the teach-out institution has the necessary experience, resources, and support services to provide an educational program that is of acceptable quality and reasonably similar in content, structure, and scheduling to that provided by the Institution that is ceasing operations either entirely or at one of its locations, and remain stable, carry out its mission, and meet all obligations to the Institution's existing students; and
(ii) the teach-out institution demonstrates that it can provide students access to the program and services without requiring them to move or travel substantial distances and that it will provide students with information about additional charges, if any.

Upon prior approval by the Department, which shall be in the Department's sole discretion to give, the Institution may submit an alternative means to ensure a path to completion for its students.

13. Direct Disclosures to Students. If the Institution does not have an In Process Application with a prospective federally-recognized accrediting agency within 90 calendar days of the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency, the Institution shall send to every currently enrolled and prospective student a notice regarding the Institution's loss of federally-recognized accreditation, either by electronic mail, U.S. mail first class, or other comparable method of delivery. At a minimum, this notice must include a statement that (a) the Institution's accrediting agency is no longer recognized by the Department; (b) that the Institution has 18 months following the accrediting agency's loss of recognition to find a new federally-recognized accrediting agency to maintain eligibility to receive funds under Title IV, HEA programs, and that after that 18 month period, the Institution will no longer be eligible to receive funds under Title IV, HEA programs; (c) identifies the date by which the Institution must obtain a new federally-recognized accrediting agency; and (d) that the Institution had not submitted an In Process Application to a new federally-recognized accrediting agency within 90 calendar days of the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency. This notice must be sent within 120 calendar days of the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency.

14. No In Process Application within 180 calendar days. In addition to all of the foregoing conditions, if the Institution does not have an In Process Application with a prospective federally-recognized accrediting agency within 180 calendar days of the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency, then the Institution shall comply with the following "Additional Direct Disclosures to Students," "Record Retention and Reporting," "Monthly Student Lists," "No Title IV Funds for New Enrollees," and "Surety Requirement" conditions within 30 calendar days thereafter (i.e., 210 calendar days after the Department's withdrawal of recognition).

15. Additional Direct Disclosures to Students. The Institution shall send to every currently enrolled and prospective student a notice regarding the likely loss of eligibility for Title IV, HEA programs, by electronic mail, U.S. mail first class, or other comparable method of delivery. At a minimum, this notice must include: (a) a statement that if the Institution is not able to become accredited by another federally-recognized accrediting agency by the end of the applicable 18 month period (and to identify the exact date), students will no longer be eligible for federal financial aid and that it is not likely that

the Institution will be able to find another accrediting agency; (b) any other consequences, such as loss of ability to sit for certification exams or the school's potential closure; (c) details that reasonably describe the process for participating in a teach-out program. This notice must be sent within 210 calendar days of the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency.

16. Record Retention and Reporting. To ensure the Institution can meet its obligations to retain records, the Institution shall, within 30 calendar days thereafter (i.e., within 210 calendar days of the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the accrediting agency), submit to the Department a records retention plan detailing the Institution's structure for retaining, at a minimum, the following documents: (a) all documents required to be preserved by any applicable regulations, including, without limitation, 34 C.F.R. §§ 668.16(d), 668.23(e), 668.24, and 668.26(b)(3); (b) all documents relating or pertaining to the Institution's administration of Title IV, HEA program funds; (c) all documents constituting student admissions, financial aid, and educational files including student transcripts; (d) all documents relating to the Institution's marketing and recruiting practices and representations, including documents constituting or relating to representations concerning post-graduation outcomes of the Institution's students and the factual and methodological basis for those representations; and (e) all documents constituting submissions the Institution has made to its accrediting agency and any state authorizing agencies. As part of its plan, the Institution must designate a specific individual who may act as a point of contact for records retention matters in the event of a closure of the Institution. In addition, within 270 calendar days of the date of the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the accrediting agency, the Institution must notify the Department it has a signed agreement with a State or other entity providing for record retention in the event of a closure of the Institution. Such notification must identify the process by which students and graduates can access their educational and financial records following any closure of the Institution, including contact information for an individual or entity who can meet such requests and a description of the financial resources available to ensure that students can complete their programs or receive refunds in the event that the Institution does suspend or cease operations.

17. Monthly Student Lists. The Institution shall submit to the Department a monthly report, to be due on the 1st day of every month, beginning on the 1st day of the next month following the date that is 180 calendar days after the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency. The monthly report must list the full names and social security numbers of all currently enrolled students at every location (listed by location), the then-current program and location/campus in which the student is engaged and their anticipated graduation date, student contact information to include address, email, and telephone number; the aggregate total, by campus, of the status of unearned tuition, status of refunds due, and current student account balances; and any changes to the status of any student since the prior report (e.g., any withdrawals, graduations, transfers, or campus location closures). The student lists must be encrypted and password-protected, and the Department's individual School Participation Divisions ("SPD") will notify the Institution of the SPD e-mail address for submission of the encrypted lists and the password.

18. No Title IV Funds for New Enrollees. The Institution shall not be eligible to receive any funds through Title IV, HEA Programs, for any students who enroll on any date that is 180 calendar days after the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency.

19. Surety Requirements. The Institution shall post a letter of credit, or guarantee by other means acceptable to the Department, in an amount to be set by the Department. The letter of credit, or acceptable alternative, shall be posted within 45 calendar days of the Department's notification that requires the letter of credit.

20. No Accrediting Agency Site Visit Within 300 Calendar Days. If the Institution has an In Process Application with an accrediting agency, but a site visit has not occurred within 300 calendar days after the Secretary's final decision withdrawing the Institution's accrediting agency's recognition, all of the foregoing conditions will apply, even though the Institution had an In Process Application within the 90 day or 180 day periods set forth above. In the event that the site visit has not occurred within such 300 day period, all deadlines set forth in these provisions are immediately triggered, and must be complied with by the date that is one year following the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency.

On behalf of the institution, I accept the additional terms and conditions set forth in this Addendum during the term of institution's provisional participation resulting from the loss of recognition of its accrediting agency.

Signature of Authorized Representative: _____ Date: _____

Print Name and Title: _____

For the Secretary: _____ Date: _____
United States Department of Education

August 30, 2017

[redacted]
Consolidated School of Business
1605 Clugston Road
York, PA 17404-1779

Re: Revision of PPA Addendum
OPE ID: 02289600

Dear [redacted]

As you are aware, Consolidated School of Business accepted the terms and conditions set forth set forth in a Provisional Program Participation Agreement ("PPPA") and an Addendum ("Addendum") thereto that were issued by the U.S. Department of Education ("Department") as a result of the withdrawal of federal recognition of the Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools ("ACICS") on December 12, 2016. According to our records, Consolidated School of Business was placed on a provisional certification on December 30, 2016 as a result of ACICS's loss of recognition.

This letter is to advise you of the Department's decision to provide further flexibility to institutions with regard to Addendum Condition #20 (No Accrediting Site Visit), to fully or partially relieve institutions from having to comply with certain conditions, and to provide guidance as to other conditions.

Addendum Condition #20 (No Site Visit by December 31, 2017). Currently all institutions are required to have their accrediting agency site visit no later than December 31, 2017, as a result of the Department's May 2017 modification of the original 300 day deadline contained in Condition #20. As the Department continues to monitor the schedule for accrediting agency site visits and council meetings, it appears that complying with the December 31st deadline may still be a challenge for some agencies and institutions. As noted in the Department's prior communication, the 18 month deadline for obtaining new federally-recognized accreditation is statutory and the Department has no authority to extend it. The Department has nevertheless determined that it would be appropriate to further relax the site visit deadline. Accordingly, the site visit deadline set forth in Addendum Condition #20 is extended to **February 28, 2018.**

In the event that any institution is notified by its new agency that a site visit cannot be completed by February 28, 2018, it must notify the Department within ten (10) business days of the notification from the accrediting agency. In that circumstance the Department may, but is not required to, allow for a further extension of the deadline so as not to trigger the Addendum

Conditions that must be complied with for failing to meet the requirements of Condition #20. Please be advised that the Department will only consider approving a further extension of the site visit deadline if it receives written confirmation from the new accrediting agency (at the time of the institution's notification) that a site visit is scheduled, and that a decision on the institution's application can be made before June 12, 2018.

In the event that the site visit has not occurred by February 28, 2018 (and the institution has not timely requested the Department's approval of a further extension) Conditions #12, #15, #16, and #17 (as set forth in the Addendum), as well as Conditions #18 and #19 (as modified by this letter) will immediately be triggered, and must be complied with by March 31, 2018. If the Department denies the request for further extension, those conditions must be complied with within fifteen (15) business days of the date the Department's denial is transmitted to the institution.

Notwithstanding this extension of the site visit deadline to February 28, 2018, the Department encourages all institutions to proceed with diligence in obtaining new federally recognized accreditation.

Addendum Conditions #9 and #10 – Full or Partial Relief from Compliance

Addendum Condition #9 (Reports of Student Complaints and Investigations) – The Department has determined that it would be appropriate to relieve all institutions from further compliance with Addendum Condition #9.

Addendum Condition #10 (Compliance Audit Expanded Reporting) - The Department has determined that it would be appropriate to relieve all institutions from further compliance with items (a), (b), and (c) of Condition #10, to the extent that the requirements of those items are broader than the financial and administrative information that is currently required under the regulations governing compliance audits. All institutions must continue to comply with item (d) of Condition #10, which requires the auditor to confirm that the institution has posted a notice to its public-facing website about its loss of recognized accreditation. The minimum requirements to be included in that notice are described in Addendum Condition #10(d).

Other Conditions – Compliance Guidance

Addendum Condition #5 (Special Requirements for Major Changes). All institutions are required to comply with Addendum Condition #5, which requires an institution to seek the Department's approval before receiving or disbursing Title IV, HEA funds based on a Major Change. Some institutions have sought approval from the Department for such changes, and the Department wants to provide further guidance on this issue. Each requested change is considered on a case by case basis. Some of the issues reviewed by the Department in considering a Major Change request include whether the change is required by the institution's potential new federally recognized accrediting agency or is required to meet the standards of that agency. For changes that have been approved by ACICS, the Department considers whether the change was approved by ACICS before or after its loss of federal recognition, depending on the nature of the change requested. Please be advised that depending on the circumstances, the Department may impose further conditions on approval of a Major Change, including direct disclosures to students, limitations on enrollment as a result of the change, or requiring the

institution to post a letter of credit ("LOC") or increase an existing LOC. If the Department determines that an LOC (or an increased LOC) is required, the institution will be provided the amount of the LOC and additional details at that time.

Institutions should continue to submit requests for Major Changes with detailed information in support of the change to their School Participation Division ("SPD"). In addition to any other relevant details, an institution requesting a Major Change should address the following questions when submitting its request:

1. What is the reason the institution needs to make the change at this time?

2. Did ACICS previously approve the change? If so, was it approved before or after December 12, 2016?

3. Has the institution discussed the change with its new accreditor? If so, what feedback, if any, has the institution received from the new accreditor?

4. Does the change require state approval, and has that approval been requested and/or obtained?

5. For new program(s), how is each program the same or different from prior or current offerings?

The Department agrees to inform the Institution of its decision to approve or disapprove a Major Change within 30 days of the date of submission of the Major Change to the SPD.

PLEASE NOTE: Unless and until the Department grants an institution's request for a Major Change, the institution may not disburse Title IV funds relating to the Major Change.

Addendum Condition #18 (No Title IV Funds for New Enrollees) – Institutions that failed to have an "In Process Application" by June 12, 2017 (180 days after the Secretary's decision withdrawing ACICS's federal recognition) are not eligible to receive or disburse any Title IV funds for students who enroll after that date. Institutions that do not meet the February 28, 2018 site visit deadline (or obtain a further extension) and institutions that are notified by their potential new accrediting agency that the agency will no longer consider their application will also trigger Condition #18 at that time.

Those institutions that have already, or in the future trigger Condition #18 may request relief from Condition #18 by submitting their request to the SPD along with detailed support for the request. Depending on the circumstances, the Department may allow Title IV funds for new enrollees, but will likely impose additional conditions, including specific direct disclosures to the newly-enrolled students that they must affirmatively sign or acknowledge, and requiring the institution to post (or increase) an LOC in an amount to be determined by the Department. If the Department determines that an LOC (or an increased LOC) is required, the institution will be provided the amount of the LOC and additional details at that time.

Unless and until the Department grants an institution's request to continue enrollments, students enrolling on any date after the trigger date are not eligible to receive Title IV funds.

Addendum Condition #19 (Surety Requirements) – Institutions that do not have an "In Process Application" as of the date of this letter have triggered Condition #19. In addition, institutions that do not meet the February 28, 2018 site visit deadline (or obtain a further extension), and institutions that are notified by their potential new accrediting agency that the agency will no longer consider their application will also trigger Condition #19 at that time. If Condition #19 is triggered, the Department may impose a letter of credit or increase an existing letter of credit, or require a guarantee by other means acceptable to the Department. Please be advised that if the Department determines that an LOC or other financial guarantee is appropriate as a result of an institution's trigger of Condition #19, the LOC or other financial guarantee will be no less than 10% of the institution's prior completed award year Title IV volume. If the Department determines that an LOC (or an increased LOC) is required, the institution will be provided the amount of the LOC and additional details at that time.

PLEASE NOTE: Except as specifically modified in this letter, the PPPA and the Addendum continue to govern Consolidated School of Business's provisional participation. Because the above modifications ease rather than tighten Addendum Conditions #5, #9, #10, #18, #19 and #20, Consolidated School of Business is not required to return an executed copy of this modification and it is automatically incorporated into your PPPA. However, all institutions should maintain a copy of this letter with their eligibility documents.

IF CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL OF BUSINESS OBTAINS NEW FEDERALLY RECOGNIZED ACCREDITATION, PLEASE CONTACT THE SPD PROMPTLY FOR PROCESSING OF CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL OF BUSINESS'S NEW ELIGIBILITY APPLICATION.

Note to Institutions that do not have an In-Process Application as of the date of this letter: Conditions #12, #15, #16, and #17 (as set forth in the Addendum), as well as Conditions #18 and #19 (as modified by this letter) have been triggered, and if the institution has not already complied with those conditions, the institution must submit evidence of compliance to the SPD no later than September 15, 2017.

Should you have any questions regarding the above request, please contact Sherrie Bell at (202) 377-3349 or by email at Sherrie.Bell@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

Ron Bennett, Director
School Eligibility Service Group

cc: PA State Board of Private Licensed Schools

April 4, 2018

[redacted]
Virginia International University
4401 Village Drive
Fairfax, VA 22030-0000

Re: Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools Recognition Status Update
OPE ID: 04144000

Dear [redacted]

Virginia International University accepted the terms and conditions set forth in a Provisional Program Participation Agreement ("PPPA") and an Addendum ("Addendum") thereto that were issued by the U.S. Department of Education ("Department") as a result of Secretary King's decision to withdraw the federal recognition of the Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools ("ACICS") on December 12, 2016 ("December 2016 Decision"). According to our records, Virginia International University was placed on a provisional certification on December 30, 2016 as a result of ACICS's loss of recognition.

On March 23, 2018, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia issued a Memorandum Opinion in *Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools v. DeVos,* Civil Action No. 16-2448 (RBW). In its Memorandum Opinion, the district court remanded the December 2016 Decision to the Secretary of Education for further proceedings.

As a result of the district court's remand, there is currently no final decision on the recognition petition that ACICS submitted to the Department in January 2016. Accordingly, ACICS's status as a federally recognized accrediting agency is restored and effective as of December 12, 2016. Pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 602.37(h), ACICS will remain in that status until the Secretary issues a final decision on ACICS's recognition petition.

Your institution's existing PPPA will expire on June 12, 2018, and either ACICS or new federally recognized accreditation must be in place by that date for your institution to continue participation in Title IV programs. Many schools have already submitted their re-certification applications in anticipation of the June 12, 2018 expiration date. A school that was fully certified *prior to* the December 2016 Decision, and for which the period of certification would not have expired between December 12, 2016 and June 12, 2018, is now in fully certified status until the original period of certification expires, so long as the institution is currently accredited by ACICS or another recognized accreditor. This return to certified status is subject to the

Department's usual rights to monitor the school under the Department's regulations. A school that was fully certified or provisionally certified (including on a month-to-month basis) prior to December 12, 2016, and for which the prior status would have expired between December 12, 2016 and June 12, 2018, must submit a new application for certification within 30 days of the date of this letter, including demonstrating accreditation by ACICS or another recognized accreditor. If your institution has already submitted its application for re-certification, it should not submit another application, but it must provide prompt updates of its accreditation status if it decides to maintain ACICS accreditation or obtains new federally recognized accreditation.

Schools are no longer required to comply with the Addendum Conditions, including those that have been triggered by failing to have an in-process application or a site visit by the February 28, 2018 deadline; however, in the course of its normal re-certification evaluation, the Department may determine that conditions or limitations are appropriate for schools if they are re-certified on a provisional basis.

Following her review in the remand proceedings, the Secretary may ultimately decide to grant ACICS full recognition for a period up to five years (in this case, December 2021), require ACICS to submit a compliance report within 12 months, withdraw recognition, or limit recognition. If the Secretary decides to withdraw recognition, the 18-month period for schools to obtain new federally recognized accreditation would begin on the date of any such withdrawal.

Institutions may continue to pursue other federally recognized accreditation or may choose to retain their ACICS accreditation. The Department will undertake a review of the status of individual institutions over the next several weeks, and schools should advise the Department how they intend to proceed with regard to accreditation if they have not already done so. We understand that ACICS's now-recognized status may raise questions related to the individual circumstances of some schools. Please contact your School Participation Division analyst Sherrie Bell at (202) 377-3349 or by email at Sherrie.Bell@ed.gov with any questions that you may have.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

Ron Bennett, Director
School Eligibility Service Group

cc: [redacted]

a. Column L of attachment #1 provides the date of the institution's site visit by a prospective accreditor (as applicable) as of April 2, 2018. Column L of attachment #2 provides the date of the institution's site visit by a prospective accreditor (as applicable) as of June 12, 2018.

b. Column J of attachment #1 provides the date of the institution's application to a prospective accreditor was denied (as applicable) as of April 2, 2018. Column J of attachment #2 provides the date the institution's application to a prospective accreditor was denied (as applicable) as of June 12, 2018.

c. Column K of attachment #1 provides the date of the institution's application to a prospective accreditor was denied (as applicable) as of April 2, 2018. Column K of attachment #2 provides the date the institution's application to a prospective accreditor was denied (as applicable) as of June 12, 2018.

d. Column G of attachment #1 provides the PPPA compliance status of each of the 269 institutions originally impacted by the December 2016 decision to rescind ACICS's status as a federally recognized accreditor as of April 2, 2018

e. Attachment #3 provides the status of the 17 institutions deemed to be out of compliance with the then-current PPA terms and conditions as of April 2, 2018, and their accreditation and eligibility status as of June 13, 2018. Attachment #4 is the original PPPA addendum which outlines the original terms and conditions governing participation while Attachment #5 contains the August 2017 letter modifying select terms and conditions of the December 2016 PPPA addendum. Taken together, these better explain the triggered conditions for each of the institutions deemed non-compliant as of April 2, 2018.

f. As noted in attachment #4, condition 6, entitled, Teach Out Plans, instructed all institutions to submit a teach-out plan to the Department within 30 calendar days of the Secretary's final decision withdrawing recognition of the Institution's accrediting agency. Extensions could be granted by the Secretary, in the Secretary's sole discretion, for good cause shown. That said, the Department has teach-out plans on file for nearly all participating institutions that signed their PPPA in December 2016. We will ask for clarification from the Senator's staff on which plans she may like to receive and we will provide them to her electronically.

g. Attachment #4 is the original PPPA addendum which outlines the original terms and conditions governing participation while attachment #5 contains the August 2017 letter modifying select terms and conditions of the December 2016 PPPA addendum. Attachment #6 is correspondence which describes the March 2018 United States District Court for the District of Columbia's Memorandum Opinion in Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools v. DeVos; its impact on the recognition petition that ACICS submitted to the Department in January 2016; and the disposition of the Addendum Conditions governing the participation of institutions.

h. The 122 institutions with a coded status of "Compliant with PPPA terms," "Non-Compliant with PPPA terms" or "Intending to Close" in column "'G" Current Status of the attachment #1 serves as comprehensive listing of institutions which were subject to the June 12, 2018, deadline as of April 2, 2018.

i. Attachment #2 provides the status of each of the 269 institutions originally impacted by the December 2016 decision as of June 12, 2018. The June 12, 2018, deadline required all institutions listed to be accredited (or, if applicable, pre-accredited) by a recognized accreditor as of that date.

EVIDENCE CONSIDERED IN ACICS RECOGNITION

Question. You've indicated in response to other questions for the record from Representative Rosa L. DeLauro that the Department "will not consider the application for initial recognition filed by ACICS as part of its review of the 2016 final agency decision, including evidence submitted as part of that application." Can you please clarify:

a. What is the legal authority that allows the Department of Education to not consider this additional evidence without making the decision subject to being arbitrary and capricious?

b. If ACICS submits any evidence or documents that are the same as ones submitted for the draft staff analysis, will the Department consider the staff's analysis of those exhibits?

c. Will the Department of Education be consulting career staff at all around the forthcoming decision with ACICS?

Answer. a. An agency that is already recognized need not submit an application for initial recognition, so the application for initial recognition submitted by ACICS in 2017 was withdrawn when the agency's recognition status was restored pending the review of the Part II submission.

It would be inappropriate to consider a staff analysis that is no more than an incomplete draft, that consequently does not incorporate corrections to possible errors of fact from the Agency, and that uses a methodology that applies to petitions for initial recognition and not petitions for continued recognition. Under the "focused review" methodology developed by the prior Administration, petitions for continued recognition can include attestations rather than narrative and documentation for certain criteria for recognition, unlike petitions for initial recognition. In addition, the Department has always required full compliance of agencies seeking initial recognition, whereas agencies seeking continued recognition may be given up to 12 months to rectify areas of non-compliance. As a result of these factors, it would be inappropriate to use the staff analysis of the petition for initial recognition for the purpose of considering ACICS' petition for continued recognition. In addition, because that petition was withdrawn before ACICS had the chance to respond to the draft staff analysis, the draft staff analysis potentially contains errors and an incomplete understanding of certain recognition criteria that the agency would typically be permitted to correct and clarify in its response to the draft staff analysis. The full and final staff analysis of the petition for initial recognition was never completed.

In addition, because the 2016 decision was based on a specific set of negative findings, our current review is limited to those findings. Our responsibility is to review the Part II submission and consider it in determining whether or not ACICS had sufficiently addressed the deficiencies noted in 2016. Because so much time has passed since the 2016 decision, ACICS was permitted to submit additional evidence to show its more recent performance in areas relevant to the 2016 negative findings. As a result, although we will not consider the application for initial recognition in our review of evidence regarding the 2016 findings, it is likely that at least a portion of the additional evidence provided by ACICS in response to the 2016 findings may include evidence that was also provided in the agency's petition for initial recognition in 2017.

b. As stated above, the draft staff analysis performed for a petition of initial recognition is very different from the analysis performed for a petition of continuing recognition. Therefore, the Department will not consider the draft staffs analysis, which was not final and which adhered to the "full compliance" standard required for petitions for initial recognition.

c. No. The final decision on remand remains with the Secretary, who will consider the response submitted by ACICS on May 30, 2018, and the response of the Senior Department Official to be submitted on July 30, 2018.

TITLE IV ELIGIBILITY FOR SCHOOLS NO LONGER ACCREDITED BY ACICS

Question. There are currently 18 colleges that are no longer accredited by ACICS. They either voluntarily withdrew their accreditation or had their accreditation revoked or expired. Therefore, despite the Secretary's restoration of ACICS as a federally-recognized accrediting agency, these 18 colleges are still without accreditation and should not receive access to Title IV aid. The 18 colleges are: Ambria College of Nursing (IL), Camelot College (LA), Colegio Technologico y Comercial de Puerto Rico (PR), Detroit Business Institute—Downriver (MI), Dewey University (PR), Global Health College (VA), Key College (FL), MDT College of Health Sciences (OH), Northwest Suburban College (IL), Pacific Institute of Technology (GA), Pacific States University (CA), Pioneer Pacific College (OR), PPG Technical College (PR), SAE Institute of Technology—New York (NY), Seattle Film Institute (WA), South Coast College (CA), Southern California Health Institute (CA), and The Recording Conservatory of Austin (TX). Can you confirm the Title IV eligibility status for those 18 colleges?

Answer. Please see the attached Excel file for current eligibility status. Note that pursuant to 20 U.S.C. § 1099c(h)(2), "[W]henever the Secretary withdraws the recognition of any accrediting agency, an institution of higher education which meets the requirements of accreditation, eligibility, and certification of the day prior to such withdrawal, the Secretary may, notwithstanding the withdrawal, continue the eligibility of the institution to participate in the programs authorized by this title for a period not to exceed 18 months from the date of the withdrawal of recognition." Under this provision, the Secretary is authorized to permit institutions to participate in Title IV, without recognized accreditation, for a period of 18 months following a Departmental decision to withdraw those institutions' accrediting agency's recognition. The Secretary exercised that authority in this case with respect to ACICS-accredited institutions, and the 18 month period did not expire until June 12, 2018.

[The information follows:]

School Information								Status as of 06/13/18		
SPD	Common Owner/School Group	OPEID6	School Name	City	ST	Institutional Structure	Status as of 05/07/18	Status	Name of the New Accreditor Obtained	Loss of Eligibility/ Closure Date
ATL		023251	Key College	Fort Lauderdale	FL	Proprietary	Compliant with PPPA terms	Title IV Ineligible		06/13/18
ATL		042452	Pacific Institute of Technology	Morrow	GA	Proprietary	Title IV Ineligible	Title IV Ineligible		03/20/17
CHI-DEN		041247	Ambria College of Nursing	Hoffman Estates	IL	Proprietary	Compliant with PPPA terms	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	
CHI-DEN		030057	Detroit Business Institute - Downriver	Riverview	MI	Proprietary	New Accreditor Obtained	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	
CHI-DEN		034685	MDT College of Health Sciences	Highland Heights	OH	Proprietary	Compliant with PPPA terms	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	
CHI-DEN		042450	Northwest Suburban College	Rolling Meadows	IL	Private, Nonprofit	Non-Compliant with PPPA terms	Title IV Ineligible		06/13/18
DAL		030235	Camelot College	Baton Rouge	LA	Proprietary	Compliant with PPPA terms	Currently ACICS Accredited		
DAL		042480	Recording Conservatory of Austin, (The)	Austin	TX	Proprietary	Compliant with PPPA terms	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	
NY-BOS		030619	Colegio Technologico y Comercial de Puerto Rico	Aguada	PR	Proprietary	Compliant with PPPA terms	Title IV Ineligible		06/13/18
NY-BOS		031121	Dewey University	Hato Rey	PR	Private, Nonprofit	Compliant with PPPA terms	New Accreditor Obtained	ABHES	
NY-BOS		042409	PPG Technical College	Caguas	PR	Proprietary	Compliant with PPPA terms	Title IV Ineligible		06/13/18
NY-BOS	Navitas Limited/Navitas USA General Partnership	039883	SAE Institute of Technology, New York*	New York	NY	Proprietary	Compliant with PPPA terms	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	
PHI		041400	Global Health College	Alexandria	VA	Proprietary	Title IV Ineligible	Voluntarily Withdrawn from TIV		12/31/17
SF-SEA		031633	Pacific States University	Los Angeles	CA	Private, Nonprofit	Compliant with PPPA terms	Currently ACICS Accredited		
SF-SEA		023301	Pioneer Pacific College	Wilsonville	OR	Proprietary	Compliant with PPPA terms	Currently ACICS Accredited		
SF-SEA		042580	Seattle Film Institute	Seattle	WA	Proprietary	Compliant with PPPA terms	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	
SF-SEA		022774	South Coast College	Orange	CA	Proprietary	Compliant with PPPA terms	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCSC	
SF-SEA		041812	Southern California Health Institute (SOCHI)	Reseda	CA	Proprietary	Compliant with PPPA terms	New Accreditor Obtained	ACCET	

Notes:

*On June 12, 2018, SAE Institute of Technology, New York (OPEID# 039883) became a new additional location of SAE Institute of Technology (OPEID# 038303) and, therefore, obtained ACCSC as a new accreditor.

LIST OF ADVERSE ACTIONS TAKEN AGAINST TITLE IV AND HEA PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Question. Please provide a list of all recertification denials, emergency actions, fine actions, suspension actions, termination actions, or limitation actions taken, released, or initiated by ED since January 20, 2017, relating to any participant in the Title IV, HEA programs (including, without limitation, institutions of higher education, loan servicers, and other third-party servicers).

Answer. The list of adverse actions is attached.

[The information follows:]

OPEID	School Name	City	State	School Type	Reason for referral	Action Initiated	Fine Initiated	Date Initiated	Action Imposed	Fine Imposed	Date of Final Outcome	Notes
4227900	Northland College	West Frankfort	IL	Priv	Fraud	Emergency Action/Termination/Fine	$2,016,789	8/21/2017	Closed		6/4/2018	Matter dismissed from OHA on June 4, 2018 as a result of school's program participation agreement expiration on 3/31/2018 and its impending closure on July 31, 2018.
2526000	Infinity Career College	Carthage	MS	Prop	Loss of Accreditation	Denial - Recertification		1/24/2017	Denial - Recertification		2/10/2017	
3445500	Fayette Beauty Academy	Fayetteville	GA	Prop	LOC Nonsubmission	Denial - Recertification		5/16/2017	Denial - Recertification		6/7/2017	
4241700	Saint Joseph's School of Nursing	Lancaster	CA	Prop	Loss of Accreditation	Denial - Recertification		6/7/2017	Denial - Recertification		6/23/2017	
2293600	Advanced Technical Centers	Miami Springs	FL	Priv	Bankruptcy	Denial - Recertification		6/27/2017	Denial - Recertification		7/14/2017	
3067000	Antonelli Medical & Professional Institute	Pottstown	PA	Prop	Past Performance	Denial - Recertification		8/23/2017	Withdrawn		8/29/2017	Withdrawn because institution had not received copies of the final action determination and final program review determination that documented past performance violation and served as grounds for the recertification denial.
3627400	Jacksonville Beauty Institute	Jacksonville	FL	Prop	Bankruptcy	Denial - Recertification		9/25/2017	Denial - Recertification		10/7/2017	
3459300	Southeastern School of Cosmetology	Birmingham	AL	Priv	Loss of Accreditation	Denial - Recertification		10/27/2017	Denial - Recertification		11/15/2017	
4112600	Cosmir School of Makeup Artistry	Oakland Park	FL	Prop	Ineligible Institution	Denial - Recertification		5/28/2017	Denial - Recertification		11/28/2017	
1077500	World Medicine Institute	Honolulu	HI	Priv	Fraud	Denial - Recertification		10/26/2017	Denial - Recertification		1/10/2018	
1398500	Hair California Beauty Academy	Orange	CA	Prop	Program Review - Severe Findings	Denial - Recertification		11/14/2017	Denial - Recertification		3/5/2018	
2520000	International School of Skin and Nailcare	Atlanta	GA	Prop	Loss of Accreditation	Denial - Recertification		3/6/2018	Withdrawn		3/12/2018	Withdrawn after accreditor (COE) rescinded its loss of accreditation decision
2100300	Med-Assist School of Hawaii	Honolulu	HI	Prop	Loss of Accreditation	Denial - Recertification		3/20/2018	Denial - Recertification		3/30/2018	
4152300	Georgia Beauty Academy	Dalton	GA	Prop	Administrative Capability	Denial - Recertification		2/1/2018	Denial - Recertification		4/10/2018	
4127900	Hair Academy (The)	Montgomery	AL	Prop	Audit - Late/Missing	Denial - Recertification		4/6/2018	Denial - Recertification		5/1/2018	
3738300	London School of Theology	Northwood		Fgn Priv	Audit - Late/Missing	Denial - Recertification		2/1/2018	Denial - Recertification		5/17/2018	
893800	Graham Hospital School of Nursing	Canton	IL	Priv	Campus Security	Fine	$20,000	3/4/2016	Fine	$20,000	1/31/2017	
137800	Central Connecticut State University	New Britain	CT	Pub	Campus Security	Fine	$32,500	6/13/2017	Fine	$32,500	6/28/2017	
376400	Virginia State University	Petersburg	VA	Pub	Part 86	Fine	$35,000	6/13/2017	Fine	$35,000	6/28/2017	
245800	Cottey College	Nevada	MO	Priv	Campus Security	Fine	$30,000	6/13/2017	Fine	$30,000	8/2/2017	
3180400	Pennsylvania Highlands Community College	Johnstown	PA	Pub	Part 86	Fine	$27,500	6/27/2017	Fine	$27,500	8/30/2017	
4189400	Shear Learning Academy of Cosmetology.	Decatur	IL	Prop	IPEDS Nonsubmission	Fine	$1,500	8/16/2017	Fine	$1,500	9/12/2017	
4087300	Selma University	Selma	AL	Priv	IPEDS Nonsubmission	Fine	$31,500	8/23/2017	Fine	$31,500	10/19/2017	
2556700	Seminar L'Moras Bais Yaakov	Brooklyn	NY	Priv	IPEDS Nonsubmission	Fine	$1,750	8/16/2017	Fine	$1,750	10/19/2017	
4137500	Tritool University of Beauty Culture	Chicago	IL	Prop	Campus Security-Part 86	Fine	$28,000	8/28/2017	Fine	$28,000	10/19/2017	
124600	Occidental College	Los Angeles	CA	Priv	Campus Security-Part 86	Fine	$53,000	9/27/2017	Fine	$53,000	10/26/2017	
344600	South Carolina State University	Orangeburg	SC	Pub	Campus Security-Part 86	Fine	$57,500	9/27/2017	Fine	$57,500	10/26/2017	
4179900	Tomorrow's Image Barber Academy of Virginia	Newport News	VA	Prop	IPEDS Nonsubmission	Fine	$6,000	8/16/2017	Fine	$6,000	11/1/2017	
2491100	Beckfield College	Florence	KY	Prop	IPEDS Nonsubmission	Fine	$11,250	8/16/2017	Fine	$11,250	11/17/2017	
4168900	Holistic Massage Training Institute	Baltimore	MD	Prop	IPEDS Nonsubmission	Fine	$9,000	8/16/2017	Fine	$9,000	11/17/2017	
4218200	Paul Mitchell The School - Jersey Shore	Brick	NJ	Prop	IPEDS Nonsubmission	Fine	$14,000	8/16/2017	Fine	$14,000	11/17/2017	
441500	Delgado Community College	New Orleans	LA	Pub	Campus Security-Part 86	Fine	$125,750	9/27/2017	Fine	$125,750	12/7/2017	
122000	Master's University and Seminary (The)	Santa Clarita	CA	Priv	campus security-Part 86	Fine	$28,000	9/27/2017	Fine	$28,000	12/7/2017	
393000	Northern Wyoming Community College District	Sheridan	WY	Pub	Campus Security	Fine	$27,000	9/27/2017	Fine	$27,000	12/7/2017	
2397600	Nebraska Christian College	Papillion	NE	Priv	Campus Security	Fine	$55,000	9/27/2017	Fine	$55,000	5/2/2018	
2581200	CC's Cosmetology College	Tulsa	OK	Prop	Loss of Accreditation	Revocation - PPPA		11/1/2016	Revocation - PPPA		1/24/2017	
4230800	Cosmetology Training Center	Stone Park	IL	Prop	Loss of Accreditation	Revocation - PPPA		1/17/2017	Revocation - PPPA		2/7/2017	
3683300	International Barber & Style College	Nashville	TN	Prop	LOC Nonsubmission	Revocation - PPPA		7/7/2017	Revocation - PPPA		7/31/2017	
4225600	Ruby's Academy for Health Occupations	Plantation	FL	Prop	Loss of Accreditation	Revocation - PPPA		6/15/2017	Revocation - PPPA		9/12/2017	
4103300	Shepherd University	Los Angeles	CA	Priv	Bankruptcy	Revocation - PPPA		8/29/2017	Revocation - PPPA		9/26/2017	
4168200	European University at St. Petersburg	Saint Petersburg		Fgn Priv	Loss of State Authorization	Revocation - PPPA		1/25/2018	Revocation - PPPA		2/16/2018	
2506800	Beauty Academy	Wenatchee	WA	Prop	Loss of Accreditation	Revocation - PPPA		4/13/2018	Revocation - PPPA		5/7/2018	
4231500	BCI	Brookline	MA	Priv	Loss of Accreditation	Revocation - PPPA		3/6/2018	Revocation - PPPA		6/8/2018	
2118700	Florida Technical College	Orlando	FL	Prop	Qui Tam	Settlement Agreement		1/24/2018	Settlement Agreement		1/24/2018	
250400	Saint Louis College of Pharmacy	Saint Louis	MO	Priv	Campus Security	Fine	$70,000	6/27/2017	Settlement Agreement/Fine	$45,000	10/10/2017	
1052900	Memphis Theological Seminary	Memphis	TN	Priv	Campus Security-Part 86	Fine	$82,500	6/27/2017	Settlement Agreement/Fine	$37,500	10/18/2017	
338400	University of Scranton	Scranton	PA	Priv	Campus Security	Fine	$70,000	6/13/2017	Settlement Agreement/Fine	$35,000	10/31/2017	
840300	Indian Hills Community College	Ottumwa	IA	Pub	Campus Security-Part 86	Fine	$65,000	6/13/2017	Settlement Agreement/Fine	$40,000	11/6/2017	
2518500	Hair Dynamics Education Center	Fort Collins	CO	Prop	Unreported CIO	Settlement Agreement		11/7/2017	Settlement Agreement/Fine	$10,000	12/12/2017	
1258000	Saint Louis Christian College	Florissant	MO	Priv	Campus Security-Part 86	Fine	$45,000	6/13/2017	Settlement Agreement/Fine	$22,500	12/15/2017	
653400	Citizens School of Nursing	New Kensington	PA	Priv	Unreported CIO	Settlement Agreement		2/14/2018	Settlement Agreement/Fine	$10,000	2/14/2018	
299000	University of Jamestown	Jamestown	ND	Priv	Campus Security-Part 86	Fine	$310,000	9/27/2017	Settlement Agreement/Fine	$147,000	3/7/2018	
261000	Felician University	Lodi	NJ	Priv	Campus Security-Part 86	Fine	$130,000	9/27/2017	Settlement Agreement/Fine	$65,000	3/12/2018	
365400	University of Saint Thomas	Houston	TX	Priv	Campus Security-Part 86	Fine	$172,000	9/27/2017	Settlement Agreement/Fine	$86,000	3/27/2018	
4175800	Aimree College	Elgin	IL	Prop	Loss of Accreditation	Emergency Action/Termination		8/18/2017	Termination		9/8/2017	
2197300	Hollywood Cosmetology Center	Norman	OK	Prop	Loss of Accreditation	Emergency Action/Termination		10/12/2017	Termination		11/15/2017	
3329400	Pryor Beauty College	Pryor	OK	Prop	LOC Nonsubmission	Termination		3/30/2018	Termination		4/26/2018	
4210600	Advanced Computing Institute	Los Angeles	CA	Prop	Loss of Accreditation	Emergency Action/Termination		4/26/2018	Termination		5/22/2018	
	National Student Aid Services, Inc.	Poteau	OK	TPS	Program Review - Severe Findings	Emergency Action/Termination		10/20/2017				Awaiting final decision
2108800	Wards Corner Beauty Academy	Norfolk	VA	Prop	Loss of Accreditation	Emergency Action/Termination		11/1/2016				Awaiting final decision

PROPOSED FUNDING, STAFFING AND INVESTIGATION WORKLOAD IN FSA'S ENFORCEMENT UNIT

Question. The Office of Inspector General in its most recent management challenges report stated that "The Department must provide effective oversight and monitoring of participants in the SFA programs under the HEA to ensure that the programs are not subject to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement." During the hearing, you stated that "the enforcement unit, part of Federal student aid, is very robust and functioning very well." Please provide the funding level, number of unduplicated full time equivalent staff, disaggregated by each of the four staff groups, and managerial and non-managerial employees, for the current fiscal year and the budget request. Additionally, please indicate the number of unduplicated, non-managerial employees of the Investigations Group who have been assigned to primarily conduct investigations work.

Answer. For fiscal year 2018 and the fiscal year 2019 request, the budget for the Enforcement Unit is approximately $7.3 million, which includes personnel compensation and benefits, travel, and operational funds. In terms of staff disaggregated by group, please see the attachment.

[The information follows:]

Enforcement Office Employees

June 2018

Job Title	Duties	No. of Staff
Administrative Actions and Appeals Specialist (AAASG)	Provides support in administering fine, limitation, suspension, termination, emergency, and other administrative actions with regard to Title IV program participants.	5
Attorney/Advisor (Borrower Defense)	Provides legal analysis and review of Title IV borrowers' claims of discharge eligibility pursuant to the Borrower Defense regulation.	6 full-time 1 part-time
Campus Crime Compliance Specialist (CLERY)	Conducts technical assistance and campus crime program reviews at participating postsecondary institutions to determine compliance with Federal statutory and regulatory provisions governing campus crime and drug and alcohol abuse prevention.	11
Chief of Staff	Provides leadership and advisement on projects and administrative matters.	1
Directors Director of Clery Director, Borrower Defense Director, Administrative Actions and Appeals Service Group	Provides supervision/management of CLERY, Borrower Defense, Administrative Actions and Appeals Service Group and Investigations.	3
Data/Systems Integrity Coordinator (CLERY)	Assists management with data integrity and information management.	1
General Attorney (Investigations)	Identifies and coordinates the investigation of, and response to, indicators of potential misconduct or high-risk conduct on the part of institutions of higher education.	2
Institutional Review Specialist (CLERY)	Provides technical assistance and conducts program reviews of the Title IV programs at postsecondary schools.	4
Investigator (Investigations)	Identifies and coordinates the investigation of, and response to, indicators of potential misconduct or high-risk conduct on the part of institutions of higher education.	2
Management and Program Analyst (AAASG)	Provides project support and technical assistance.	2
Paralegal Specialist (2 AAASG and 1 CLERY)	Prepares legal notices and coordinates administrative actions.	4
Program Assistant (AAASG)	Provides a variety of administrative, programmatic and technical support.	1
Senior Advisor (CLERY)	Serves as the subject matter expert providing guidance and review of CLERY matters.	2

COMPLIANCE WITH GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS

Question. What actions is the Department taking to ensure that Gainful Employment disclosures required by the regulations are being appropriately posted and are current for each program?

Answer. As part of its oversight authority, Federal Student Aid manages various actions such as program reviews, recertification, new program and new location additions, and annual audits to determine whether Title IV participating schools are meeting the requirements for institutional eligibility, financial responsibility, and administrative capability. The gainful employment disclosure templates are checked as part of these other actions.

TRANSPARENCY AND DOCUMENTATION FOR ESSA WAIVERS

Question. To date, you have approved 41 waivers of the Every Student Succeed Act (ESSA) with very little transparency to members of Congress or the public. Will you commit to posting not only the final letters approving or denying waivers of the law, but also the initial waiver request from States (or school districts as applicable), any supporting documentation required by statute in order to request a waiver, and if any waiver requests or waivers granted are amended, the amendment requests and approvals. If not, why not?

Answer. States waiver requests are publicly available through the State in accordance with section 8401 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act. States are required to provide the public, and any interested local educational agencies within the State, with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment in a manner the agency customarily provides such notice. States are also required to submit any such comments and input as part of its waiver request to the Department, including a description of how the State addressed the comments and input. In practice this occurs through the posting of such waiver requests on States websites. In accordance with long standing historical procedures the Department will continue to post final approval and denial of such waivers.

BIPARTISAN ESSA IMPLEMENTATION BRIEFINGS

Question. Both Ranking Member Bobby Scott and I have requested numerous times that your staff conduct regular bipartisan implementation briefings on ESSA implementation as the Obama Administration did on a routine basis in 2016. Yet to date, you and your staff have failed to hold these regular briefings. Will you commit to beginning these bipartisan briefings on a biweekly basis and if not, why not?

Answer. We appreciate the significant interest from our committees of jurisdiction in the implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act. The Office for Legislation and Congressional Affairs (OLCA) will continue to be responsive to all committee inquiries in a timely fashion and proactively convene bipartisan calls and meetings as necessary to ensure questions related to implementation are addressed. We believe this longstanding practice is the most responsive and efficient method in responding to inquiries and keeping Congress informed of activities. We look forward to continuing to work with Congress to ensure the successful implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act.

MONITORING PROTOCOLS AND TITLE I COMPLIANCE UNDER ESSA

Question. Please provide an update on the development of the Department's monitoring protocols for ESSA, particularly for Title I of the law, and the Department's monitoring plans for ensuring State and school district compliance of Title I requirements.

Answer. The Office of State Support (OSS) administers programs of financial assistance to State and local educational agencies, including Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; and Title III, Part A of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. OSS is organized specifically to provide high quality performance management and support to SEAs in administering and leveraging grant programs, focusing on SEA quality of implementation while continually reducing the burden of the Department's necessary stewardship and compliance responsibilities. The overall monitoring framework, referred to as the performance review system, ensures that grantees meet performance standards and grant requirements, identifies potential areas of concern through implementation of an annual risk assessment, documents and closes out instances of noncompliance through written correspondence with grantees, and regularly evaluates and updates the efficiency and effectiveness of monitoring practices, procedures, and controls. The system includes quarterly Progress Check conference calls to discuss implementation and transition issues re-

lated to OSS administered programs, along with regular desk and on-site monitoring of fiscal and administrative requirements.

Since the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), OSS is focused on monitoring the implementation of Title I, Part A; Title II, Part A; Title III, Part A; and School Improvement Grant programs to ensure SEA administration is consistent with the fiscal and administrative requirements contained in the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements, 2 CFR Part 200, and the Education Department General Administrative Requirements (EDGAR). OSS focused on those fiscal requirements applicable to the covered programs under both the ESEA, as amended by NCLB and the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA. As a result, OSS developed its protocols in sections—piloting new sections each year, revising them after receiving State and OSS staff feedback, and then submitting the protocols for public comment through the Paperwork Reduction Act process.

In fiscal year 2016 and 2017, OSS piloted a fiscal review protocol, which was finalized in 2018; the protocol is available for comment in the Federal Register. In fiscal year 2017, OSS added a data integrity protocol section that covers State internal controls related to data quality and reporting, and in fiscal year 2018, OSS is piloting an accountability section that assesses the fidelity of State accountability system implementation. As a result, fiscal year 2018 performance reviews for selected States cover:

—Fiscal requirements contained in Uniform Guidance, EDGAR, and ESEA, as amended by NCLB, where applicable, and ESSA (piloted in fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2016)

—Data Reporting and Quality requirements (for continued pilot)

—Accountability requirements (for initial pilot)

Throughout the ESSA transition, OSS has also tracked, compiled, and assessed performance of State administration of OSS formula programs based on data collected through the annual Consolidated State Performance Report. This process includes regular data definition reviews, data quality checks, and publication of demographic and performance data submitted by States via EDFacts. OSS has also continued to conduct quarterly progress checks with each State, which helps us understand implementation successes and challenges and informs our technical assistance plans. OSS recently shared an updated progress check protocol for public comment, adopting to improve the quality and utility of information collected during quarterly progress checks.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVIDENCE STANDARDS FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS

Question. Please provide an update on the Department's effort to ensure compliance with the evidence-based requirements in section 1111(d)(1)(B)(ii), 1111(d)(2)(B)(ii), namely how the Department will ensure that school districts and States are ensuring that the interventions provided in comprehensive support and improvement schools and targeted support and improvement schools are evidence-based.

Answer. Our Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) annually monitors a select number of State educational agencies to ensure they meet the ESEA requirements. As part of the monitoring process, OESE meets with two local educational agencies to examine the supports and guidance they are receiving from the State. A key focus of monitoring for 2019 will be the support and oversight that each State provides for its local educational agencies with schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement. In preparation for this effort, OESE is piloting a monitoring protocol in 2018 that includes questions on local school improvement plans and the implementation of school improvement requirements under section 1003(a).

RATIONALE FOR REQUESTED CUT TO IMPACT AID

Question. Your budget proposed cutting more than $500 million from Impact Aid Basic Support Payments that fund 1,000 school districts serving military families, Native American students, and other federally-connected children. This program is critical for school districts like Central Kitsap School District in my home State of Washington, where educating a high-percentage of military-connected children makes it difficult to raise local tax revenue. Fortunately, our budget agreement allowed you to restore these critical funds. Please explain your rationale for these cuts, given the historic Federal role in supporting school districts that educate federally-connected children. How would you explain to communities like those served by Central Kitsap School District, where so many families are valiantly serving their

country, why you want to cut funding for a program that offsets the revenue challenges they face through no fault of their own?

Answer. As acknowledged in your question, our initial request for Impact Aid Basic Support Payments was developed prior to the completion of the Bipartisan Budget Agreement of 2018 (BBA), and reflected the tough decisions required to meet the President's overall goal of increasing support for national security and public safety without adding to the Federal budget deficit under the spending caps in effect prior to the BBA. We were pleased to be able to restore this funding, and we understand how important it is for districts that participate in the program.

NEEDS ASSESSMENTS FOR STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT GRANTS

Question. In fiscal year 2018, Congress appropriated $1.1 billion for the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants program under Title IV–A of the Every Student Succeeds Act and rejected your proposal to eliminate funding for the program. These grants have the potential to assist States, school districts, and schools to address many of their most pressing challenges. In order to ensure Title IV–A funds are used to do so, Congress required school districts to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment. How will you ensure school districts conduct this needs assessment with fidelity?

Answer. We agree that conducting a comprehensive needs assessment can be a critical requirement to ensuring the effective use of Title IV–A funds by school districts. In addition to previously issued guidance on strengthening investments across ESEA programs by conducting needs assessments and identifying evidence-based responses (see https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/guidanceusesein vestment.pdf), the Department, through the National Center on Safe and Supportive Learning Environments, has developed an instrument to assist school districts in conducting needs assessments under Title IV–A. We are also developing a protocol for monitoring State administration of the Title VI–A program that will examine how States are ensuring school districts comply with comprehensive needs assessment requirements. It also is important to note that because the comprehensive needs assessment requirements apply only to school districts receiving $30,000 or more in Title IV–A funds, we estimate that less than one-third of districts will be subject to these requirements in fiscal year 2018.

PROPOSED ELIMINATION OF 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS

Question. Keeping young people safe in their schools and communities is one of the most important priorities for all of us. Striving To Reduce Youth Violence Everywhere (STRYVE)—which is the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's national initiative to prevent youth violence—sites a host of key recommendations and evidence based strategies that can protect our children. One of those effective community level strategies recommended is providing youth with more structured and supervised afterschool opportunities in order to increase monitoring and healthy skills development. Yet the proposed elimination of the bipartisan-supported and authorized 21st Century Communities Learning Centers program directly contradicts this recommendation. Please explain why the Department does not support afterschool as part of a comprehensive solution to keep young people safe?

Answer. We recognize that the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program often supports safe places for children to participate in a range of activities outside of the school day. However, we believe that afterschool activities are primarily the responsibility of families and communities, and not the Federal Government, and that limited Federal education resources should be dedicated to programs with a stronger emphasis and track record in improving student educational outcomes. And to the extent that local school districts seek to prioritize afterschool activities in meeting the educational needs of students and families, other Federal funds are available for this purpose, including the $15.8 billion Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program.

ENFORCEMENT OF ESSA PROTECTIONS FOR CHILDREN IN FOSTER CARE

Question. I remain concerned about compliance with ESSA's educational stability requirements for children in foster care. These requirements, which ensure children in foster care are able to stay in their original school when they move foster care placements, have been in effect since December 10, 2016—over a year and a half. During that time, what have you done to monitor States and local educational agencies' compliance with the new requirements; and collaborate with HHS to ensure child welfare agencies are implementing these requirements with fidelity?

Answer. Although the Department has not yet formally monitored State implementation of ESSA's new Title I, Part A educational stability requirements; the De-

partment is currently developing a monitoring protocol that includes Title I, Part A provisions, and the protocol will include the educational stability requirements. In the absence of formal monitoring, the Department has engaged with SEAs and LEAs to provide technical assistance to support the implementation of these new provisions. Through this technical assistance, the Department has identified early implementation challenges and has worked with SEAs and LEAs to help them meet the requirements of the law.

Since the passage of ESSA, the Department has closely collaborated with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to support SEA and LEA implementation of the Title I, Part A educational stability requirements. Immediately following the passage of ESSA, for example, the Department and HHS collaborated on a number of projects to support the field. For instance, in June 2016, the Department and HHS jointly released non-regulatory guidance to help stakeholders both understand the law's new educational stability provisions and spotlight promising practices from across the Nation. Following the release of this joint guidance, the Department and HHS also jointly held a five-part webinar series to further discuss the non-regulatory guidance. Each webinar in the series featured speakers from the Department and HHS, who discussed the Title I, Part A requirements and the related provisions of the non-regulatory guidance; in addition, each webinar spotlighted State and local practitioners implementing promising practices aligned with the requirements. Recordings and materials from these webinars are available on the Department's website.

The Department and HHS have also collaborated on other projects, in addition to the joint non-regulatory guidance and related technical assistance, to support State and local implementation of the educational stability requirements. For example, the Department's Office of State Support (OSS) hosted a webinar for SEA foster care points of contact in September 2017; representatives from HHS' Administration on Children, Youth, and Families (ACYF) participated in this webinar for education agency stakeholders. Similarly, OSS will hold a four-part series of technical assistance webinars for SEA foster care points of contact in July and August 2018, and representatives from ACYF will participate in those webinars and provide subject matter expertise on child welfare agencies. Finally, as States have reached out to OSS with questions about the implementation of the Title I, Part A educational stability requirements, OSS has at times worked with ACYF colleagues to provide responsive support to the field.

EFFECT OF PROVISIONS LIMITING USE OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR DESEGREGATION-RELATED TRANSPORTATION ON ESSA ACTIVITIES

Question. Why does the budget propose to continue applicability of sections 301 and 302 to Federal funds available in the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act? How is section 301 different from language in section 426 of the General Education Provisions Act? Does section 302 limit the use of Federal funds provided in the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for any activity authorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act? If so, please describe the conflict.

Answer. The Department engaged in extensive consultation with staff from Congressional authorizing and appropriations committees during the fiscal year 2018 appropriations process regarding these longstanding prohibitions in appropriations acts funding the Department's programs and activities. Congress addressed potential conflicts between these provisions and authorities in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act, through additional bill language in the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2018. The House and Senate fiscal year 2019 appropriations bills funding Department programs that now are moving through Congress no longer include sections 301 or 302, effectively eliminating those potential conflicts.

PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION INTO OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Question. The Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) provides invaluable resources to the education community in order to facilitate stronger instruction for our Nation's five million English learner students. As part of the Education Department's reorganization plan, you have proposed consolidating OELA into the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, preventing the director of OELA from reporting directly to the Secretary and threatening the office's critical independence. What evidence do you have that making this change will improve outcomes for our Nation's English learners?

Answer. The Department of Education recognizes the importance of ensuring that English learners are afforded equal access to education and the valuable role that the Director's position and OELA contribute to meeting that goal. The Department notes that the amendments made by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) places a heightened emphasis on English learners. ESSA moved the accountability provisions relating to English learner progress from Title III to Title I. Thus, the statute requires State ESEA plans to address long-term goals for English learner progress, including an English learner indicator, as an integral part of State school accountability systems. Just as States are adjusting to this change by breaking down silos between Title I and Title III State-level offices, so too is the Department. The proposed reorganization will allow the Department to provide States with the technical assistance needed across programs. If implemented, the Department expects that its proposed changes will enhance Department operations and leverage resources to better serve English learner students and their families. The Department of Education is proposing to integrate the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) into the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE), not eliminate it or its functions. The Department is committed to maintaining an effective OELA that continues to support and helps to facilitate compliance by States and local educational agencies in their efforts to provide a high-quality education to English learners.

REORGANIZATION PLANS FOR DEPARTMENT'S BUDGET SERVICE

Question. The Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2018 and accompanying explanatory statement state clearly the intention that funds available in the Act not be used for the purpose of reorganizing or decentralizing the Department's budget service. In fiscal year 2019, does the Department plan to implement a reorganization that decentralizes, reduces the staffing level, or alters the responsibilities, structure, authority, or functionality of the Budget Service of the Department of Education, relative to the organization and operation of the Budget Service as in effect on January 1, 2018? If yes, please describe the changes and timeline for implementation.

Answer. No. The Department of Education does not plan to decentralize, reduce staffing levels, or alter responsibilities, structure authority or functionality of Budget Service in fiscal year 2019. Pursuant to the Department's reorganization, Budget Service will move intact to the new Office of Finance and Operations.

OVERSIGHT EFFORTS FOR DISASTER-RELATED EMERGENCY EDUCATION FUNDING

Question. Last year, Hurricanes Maria and Irma devastated the island of Puerto Rico and its students, teachers, and families. Save the Children estimates that 6 months after the hurricanes, school-age children had collectively missed out on more than 13 million full days of school. In addition, many children are struggling with trauma and desperately need both educational and psychological supports. In response to these challenges and those affected by those Hurricanes and California wildfires, Congress provided nearly $2 billion for restart of operations of elementary and secondary schools, of which Puerto Rico has received an initial allocation of $589 million. How will the Department conduct oversight and ensure that these resources are used effectively to rebuild schools and support students?

Answer. The Puerto Rico Department of Education (PRDE) has primary responsibility for developing and implementing a comprehensive plan for restarting schools and restoring the learning environment following Hurricanes Irma and Maria. We are providing regular technical assistance and other support to PRDE, including information on allowable uses of funds and reporting requirements designed to maintain strong accountability for the effective use of Federal resources.

FEDERAL COMMISSION ON SCHOOL SAFETY AND PROPOSALS REQUIRING CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Question. I have written you two letters about the Federal Commission on School Safety (FCSS), which I believe you are using to shift the Nation's focus away from meaningful gun safety reforms that will save lives. I expect full responses to these letters and the questions I have posed concerning the scope of the FCSS's work and the NRA's involvement in setting its agenda. Do you believe there are any reforms Congress can make concerning gun safety that could reduce school shootings? Please list those reforms.

Answer. President Trump launched the Federal Commission on School Safety (FCSS) on March 12, 2018, as part of a comprehensive plan to secure our schools in response to the mass shooting at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida. The March 12 announcement noted that as a part of the imme-

diate actions of President Trump to secure our Nation's schools, Department of Justice (DOJ) assistance programs will be leveraged to enable schools to partner with State and local law enforcement to provide firearms training for school personnel. The President also called upon States to adopt Extreme Risk Protection Orders, which will allow law enforcement, with approval from a court, to remove firearms from certain individuals who are a threat to themselves or others.

As a part of the President's charge to the FCSS, he requested the FCSS to study and make recommendations on, among other things, age restrictions for certain firearm purchases. To carry out the President's charge, the Commission has held formal meetings, field visits, and listening sessions to hear from the public and others. DOJ will provide key direction to the FCSS on this aspect of the Commission's work.

Given the information gathering of the Commission is ongoing, no specific recommendations of the Commission have been proposed or adopted at this time.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE UNDER DC OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Question. The most recent evaluation of the Washington D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program showed math scores for students who accepted a voucher were 10 percentile points lower than students who applied but were not selected by lottery. This rigorous evaluation shows us what parents, teachers, students, and community members have been saying all along: vouchers do not work. In light of this evaluation, how will you change your position to better reflect current research on the effectiveness of private school voucher programs?

Answer. While the treatment group did not score as high in mathematics as the control group in the second year of the evaluation, it is important to note that students in both the treatment and the control groups scored higher after 2 years than they did at the time of application; achievement for the treatment group has not decreased. We know from other research, including studies of charter schools, that the impact of new choice options on student achievement may increase over time. Consequently, we are eager to see the third and final impact report of the current evaluation expected during fiscal year 2019.

IMPLEMENTING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT WITHOUT UNION NEGOTIATION

Question. AFGE has been in negotiations with the Department for a new collective bargaining agreement, but earlier this year, the agency ended those negotiations and imposed its opening proposal on over 4,000 Dept. of Education staff represented by AFGE. Please explain why you eliminated all but 8 of 44 contract articles without negotiating with the Union on the substance of your proposals?

Answer. The Department of Education commenced its effort concerning a new national collective bargaining agreement (CBA) in October 2016. The new 2018 CBA is a streamlined contract that covers in eight articles everything that the 2013 CBA and 2017 Past Practice Document covered in 44 articles. This CBA came into effect only after months of good faith attempts by the Department to engage the Union in interest-based bargaining. The current CBA (implemented in March 2018) is shorter but covers the same issues.

Unfortunately, the Union refused to negotiate with the Department. The Department employed multiple methods to support the parties in the renegotiation. The Union's unprecedented resistance to negotiations, mediation support, and training disallowed any progress. With its eight articles, the current CBA was implemented only after the Union ignored the many opportunities provided by the Department to negotiate, to issue a proper and timely demand to bargain, and to make a counter-proposal to the current CBA; the Union repeatedly failed to do so in a timely manner.

Department employees retain all of the benefits and rights not dependent on the collective bargaining agreement. The Department does not know why the Union abandoned mediation and assistance from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the Federal Service Impasses Panel or why it failed to file a proper and timely demand to bargain through its designated chief negotiator.

DEADLINES, STATUTE AND GOOD FAITH IN UNION NEGOTIATIONS

Question. My understanding is that at the time your management team curtailed these negotiations, there were additional days of negotiations already scheduled for January, February and March. Why would the Department not move forward with negotiations on those agreed-upon dates when the substantive provisions of the entire contract remained to be negotiated?

You have said the Union missed a deadline in the negotiations. Are you referring to a statutorily set deadline?

If you are not referring to a statutorily set deadline, will you commit to restoring the status quo contract, return to the bargaining table, and negotiate in good faith for a successor contract?

Answer. The Department of Education set additional dates for negotiation; however, despite multiple requests from the Department to negotiate the Agency's last and best offer on ground rules, as well as outreach to the Union by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Services (FMCS), the Union declined to proceed with the negotiating sessions and failed to preserve its right to bargain ground rules. As a result, the Department moved forward with notice of the proposed collective bargaining agreement (CBA).

The statute does not contain specifically prescribed timeframes; rather, it prescribes the framework for conducting labor-management relations. The Federal Labor Relations Authority (FLRA) has the authority to interpret and oversee the functions of the statute, and this includes issuing precedential case law decisions to guide the parties. The dates set by the Department were based upon well-established FLRA case law. Despite multiple requests from the Department to negotiate the Agency's last and best offer on ground rules, as well as outreach to the Union by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Services (FMCS), the Union declined to proceed with negotiating sessions.

Litigation regarding the 2018 CBA is pending with the FLRA, which provide direction to the parties.

OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS JURISDICTION OVER SEXUAL DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT

Question. In order for the Committee to understand how changes in the Department's views of the jurisdiction of the Office for Civil Rights and in the procedures used to review and resolve complaints, please provide the Committee with a complete list of all complaints involving sexual discrimination and harassment open for investigation as of today disaggregated by docket number, whether the recipient is an elementary or secondary school, the issue code, and an issue description.

Answer. Please see the attachment that follows.

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
01141042	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
01141275	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01141275	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01141281	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
01151078	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01151097	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01151097	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01151117	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01151117	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01151149	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01151149	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
01151229	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
01151241	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01161037	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01161037	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
01161186	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01161187	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01161204	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01161227	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01161229	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01161229	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01161257	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01161257	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
01161257	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
01161257	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
01161257	ESE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
01161257	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
01161257	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
01161257	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
01161257	ESE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
01161257	ESE	106.41c10	Publicity
01161318	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01161318	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01161318	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01161340	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01161340	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01161340	ESE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01161340	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01161340	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01161340	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01161347	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01171039	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01171060	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
01171065	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01171065	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01171065	ESE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01171065	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01171112	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01171112	ESE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01171112	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01171171	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
01171171	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01171201	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
01171214	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
01171237	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
01171237	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01171302	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
01171321	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01171321	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01171321	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01171321	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01171322	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01171322	ESE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01171322	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01181009	ESE	106.40b	Pregnancy, Childbirth or termination of Pregnancy
01181074	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01181089	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01181113	ESE	106.41c	Equal opportunity
01181113	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
01181113	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
01181113	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
01181113	ESE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
01181113	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
01181113	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
01181154	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01181164	ESE	106.41a	Athletics – General
01181164	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
01181164	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
01181164	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
01181164	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
01181164	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
01181175	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01181189	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01181189	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01181203	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01181203	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01181234	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01181266	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02111058	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
02141048	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
02141048	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
02141078	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
02141211	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
02141281	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
02141346	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
02141394	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
02141469	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
02141469	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
02141503	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
02151120	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
02151120	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
02151120	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
02151280	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02151280	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02151337	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
02151366	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
02151390	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02161067	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02161067	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02161185	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
02161231	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02161362	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02161362	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02161378	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02161390	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02161406	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
02161406	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02161406	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02161414	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02161437	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02161437	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02171034	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02171050	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
02171050	ESE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
02171104	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
02171104	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
02171104	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
02171104	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02171155	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02171162	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
02171162	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
02171186	ESE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
02171186	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02171240	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02171288	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02171302	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
02171420	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02171422	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
02171505	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
02171505	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02171505	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02171505	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02181137	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02181163	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
02181198	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
02181225	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
02181258	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
02181287	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03151032	ESE	106.31-3	Grading
03151032	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
03151032	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03151032	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03151276	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03151276	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03161179	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03161227	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
03161227	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
03161272	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
03161272	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
03161299	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
03161314	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03161882	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
03161882	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03161882	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
03171080	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03171225	ESE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
03171225	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03171233	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
03171233	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
03171233	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
03171233	ESE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
03171256	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
03171333	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
03181021	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
03181031	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
03181031	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03181031	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03181094	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
03181121	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
03181161	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03181175	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
03181175	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
03181175	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
03181175	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
03181175	ESE	106.41c10	Publicity
04141513	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04141513	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04141580	ESE	106.34-1	Single sex (course offerings)
04141613	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
04141613	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04141673	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04141737	ESE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
04141737	ESE	106.34-1	Single sex (course offerings)
04141739	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04151061	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04151066	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04151191	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04151191	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
04151191	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04151200	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04151214	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04151221	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04151350	ESE	106.41a	Athletics – General
04151373	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
04151449	ESE	106.41a	Athletics – General
04151466	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04151466	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04151476	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04151476	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04151492	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04151506	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04151512	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
04151512	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04161006	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
04161006	ESE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
04161028	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04161034	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
04161034	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04161041	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04161110	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04161114	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04161131	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
04161149	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04161179	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04161185	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04161196	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
04161204	ESE	106.21b1	Specific –Individuals
04161204	ESE	106.34-1	Single sex (course offerings)
04161296	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04161323	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04161323	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04161323	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04161352	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04161376	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
04161377	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
04161377	ESE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
04161377	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04161436	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
04161463	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
04161492	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
04161492	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04161539	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
04161559	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04161559	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04161576	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04161576	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04161579	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
04161622	ESE	106.41a	Athletics – General
04167070	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
04167070	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04167070	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04167104	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04171026	ESE	106.999	Service Issue Not Related to Education
04171027	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04171069	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04171071	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04171155	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04171177	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
04171203	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
04171254	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04171265	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
04171373	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04171386	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
04171386	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
04171386	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
04171386	ESE	106.41c10	Publicity
04171447	ESE	106.41a	Athletics – General
04171447	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04171473	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04171474	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
04171474	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04171489	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
04171489	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
04171513	ESE	106.31-8	Career & Technical Education
04171522	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04171533	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
04171570	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04171618	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
04171618	ESE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
04172360	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
04181002	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04181064	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04181064	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04181153	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
04181158	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
04181158	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04181326	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04181330	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04181361	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04181413	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04181442	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
04181442	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
05141079	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
05141308	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
05151160	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
05151166	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05151178	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05151283	ESE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
05151283	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
05151321	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05151344	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05151344	ESE	106.41c	Equal opportunity
05151344	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
05151345	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05151345	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
05161028	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05161067	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05161067	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
05161089	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
05161089	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
05161089	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05161092	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
05161111	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
05161235	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
05161268	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05161283	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05161283	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05161283	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
05161298	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
05161325	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
05161397	ESE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
05161397	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
05161453	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
05161453	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
05161453	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
05161453	ESE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
05161453	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
05161453	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
05167011	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05167011	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05167011	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05171062	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05171083	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
05171150	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
05171174	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
05171174	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
05171259	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05171259	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05171335	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05171335	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
05171336	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
05171365	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05171365	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
05171404	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
05171404	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05171450	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
05181026	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05181154	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05181199	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
05181200	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05181202	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05181208	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05181221	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05181227	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
05181249	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05181276	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05181283	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05181315	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06131362	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06131597	ESE	106.21b1	Specific –Individuals
06141411	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
06141411	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
06141411	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
06141534	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06141555	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
06141555	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
06141555	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
06141555	ESE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
06141555	ESE	106.42	Textbooks and Curricular Material
06141568	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06141614	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
06141614	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06141620	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06141635	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
06141654	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06151002	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
06151062	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06151150	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06151156	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06151176	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
06151244	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06151296	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06151360	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06151408	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06151438	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06151438	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06151477	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
06151485	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06151512	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
06151512	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
06151512	ESE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
06151512	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
06151512	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
06151520	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
06151538	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
06151600	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06151600	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06151608	ESE	106.41a	Athletics – General
06151608	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
06151608	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
06151608	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
06151624	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06151624	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06151624	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06151723	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06161008	ESE	106.41a	Athletics – General
06161008	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06161066	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06161142	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06161246	ESE	106.21	Admissions
06161246	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06161255	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06161255	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06161255	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06161259	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06161259	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06161281	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06161308	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06161330	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
06161373	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
06161373	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
06161373	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
06161373	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
06161373	ESE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
06161373	ESE	106.41c10	Publicity
06161378	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06161399	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06161456	ESE	106.41a	Athletics – General
06161461	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06161467	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
06161523	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06161523	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06161552	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
06161552	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06161577	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
06161577	ESE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
06161577	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06161577	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06161609	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06161676	ESE	106.41a	Athletics – General
06161764	ESE	106.31-8	Career & Technical Education
06161764	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06161764	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06161835	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
06161835	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
06161835	ESE	106.51	Employment (all Subpart E)
06161835	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06161868	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06171017	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06171059	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06171059	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06171059	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06171098	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
06171098	ESE	106.41c10	Publicity
06171107	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
06171107	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06171131	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06171131	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06171148	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
06171157	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06171174	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
06171174	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06171217	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06171271	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
06171352	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06171354	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06171354	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06171397	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
06171400	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06171400	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06171433	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06171433	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06171448	ESE	106.41c	Equal opportunity
06171469	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
06171503	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06171503	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06171535	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
06171538	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
06171602	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06171711	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06171711	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06171732	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06171787	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06171835	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
06171874	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06171874	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06171945	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06171973	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
06171973	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
06171973	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06171998	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06181001	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06181027	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06181069	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
06181069	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06181100	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06181104	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
06181104	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06181181	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
06181181	ESE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
06181181	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06181206	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06181262	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06181262	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06181375	ESE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
06181442	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
06181442	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
06181448	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
06181448	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
06181451	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
06181451	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
06181451	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
06181499	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
07081016	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
07081016	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
07081016	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
07081016	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
07141119	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
07141119	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07141152	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
07141152	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
07141152	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
07141152	ESE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
07141152	ESE	106.41c10	Publicity
07141176	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07141195	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
07141195	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
07141195	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
07141195	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
07141195	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
07161045	ESE	106.41c10	Publicity
07161077	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07161133	ESE	106.31-8	Career & Technical Education
07161146	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
07161154	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
07161154	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
07161154	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
07161175	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
07161175	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
07161191	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
07161200	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
07161245	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
07161934	ESE	106.41a	Athletics – General
07171006	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07171015	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
07171036	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
07171036	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
07171103	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
07171216	ESE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
07171224	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07171229	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
07171229	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
07181007	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
07181049	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
07181105	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
07181159	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
07181177	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
08121273	ESE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
08121273	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
08141119	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
08141119	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
08141119	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
08141159	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
08141159	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08151002	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
08151114	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
08151114	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
08151180	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08151287	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08151302	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
08151306	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
08161138	ESE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
08161138	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
08161296	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
08161296	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
08161345	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
08161345	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08161358	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08171001	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08171103	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
08171103	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
08171282	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
08171282	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
08171386	ESE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
08181120	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
08181196	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08181263	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
08181263	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
08181268	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
08181268	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
08181270	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
08181270	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
08181277	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
08181277	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
08181286	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
08181306	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
08181306	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08181308	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
08181308	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
08181308	ESE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
08181308	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
08181319	ESE	106.21c2	Pregnancy, Childbirth or Termination of Pregnancy
08181328	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
09141324	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09141324	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
09141325	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09141353	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09151095	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09151095	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09151304	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09151423	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
09151568	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09161051	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09161051	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09161183	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09161227	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09161227	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
09161227	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
09161227	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
09161318	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
09161379	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
09161466	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
09161466	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
09161494	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
09161494	ESE	106.41c1-3	Interests and abilities (compliance with part 3 of 3-part test)
09161494	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
09161494	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
09161494	ESE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
09161494	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
09161494	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
09161494	ESE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
09161494	ESE	106.41c10	Publicity
09161525	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
09161525	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
09161525	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
09161538	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
09161548	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
09161548	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
09161548	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
09161548	ESE	106.41c10	Publicity
09161555	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09161555	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09167014	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09171071	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
09171071	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
09171117	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
09171137	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09171252	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09171252	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
09171330	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
09171330	ESE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
09171330	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
09171330	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
09171330	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
09171330	ESE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
09171330	ESE	106.41c10	Publicity
09171330	ESE	106.41c12	Support services
09171338	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09171338	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09171338	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
09171401	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09171444	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
09171444	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
09171584	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09171692	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09171692	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09171707	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
09181032	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09181032	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
09181076	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
09181076	ESE	106.41c10	Publicity
09181201	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09181246	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
09181306	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
09181306	ESE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
09181306	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
09181344	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
09181346	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
09181392	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
09181431	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10141325	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
10141325	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10151057	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10151066	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
10151158	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
10151188	ESE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
10151268	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10151268	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10151287	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
10151296	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10151297	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10151302	ESE	106.31-8	Career & Technical Education
10151304	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10161002	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
10161009	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10161022	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
10161022	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
10161022	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
10161022	ESE	106.41c12	Support services
10161026	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10161037	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10161051	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10161051	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10161116	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10161116	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10161116	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
10161137	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10161168	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10161168	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10161188	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10161188	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
10161194	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10161204	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10161225	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10161262	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10161262	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
10161262	ESE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
10161284	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10161284	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10161284	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10161288	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
10161288	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10161606	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10161610	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10161625	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10161625	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10161631	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10161638	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10171006	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
10171019	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
10171036	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
10171036	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10171036	ESE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
10171036	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10171046	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10171051	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10171051	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
10171067	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
10171067	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10171067	ESE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
10171067	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10171069	ESE	106.41a	Athletics – General

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
10171069	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
10171069	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
10171069	ESE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
10171069	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
10171069	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
10171069	ESE	106.41c10	Publicity
10171069	ESE	106.41c12	Support services
10171072	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10171072	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10171102	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10171102	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10171132	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10171146	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10171146	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10171146	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10171153	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10171164	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10171164	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10171189	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10171192	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
10171192	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10171192	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10171192	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10171208	ESE	106.34-1	Single sex (course offerings)
10171329	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10171339	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10171339	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10171339	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10171346	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10171346	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10181016	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
10181016	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10181016	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
10181016	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10181059	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10181059	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10181070	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10181109	ESE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
10181122	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
10181143	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10181143	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
10181165	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11131269	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
11131269	ESE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
11131269	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
11131269	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
11141260	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
11141260	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11151075	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11151080	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11151247	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
11151319	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11161014	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
11161045	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11161045	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11161056	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11161101	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11161101	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11161108	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
11161108	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
11161363	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
11161366	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
11161366	ESE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
11161366	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
11161371	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
11161371	ESE	106.41c10	Publicity
11161371	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11161467	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
11161823	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11161823	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11161841	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11171065	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11171105	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11171126	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11171126	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11171141	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11171186	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11171219	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11171274	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
11171433	ESE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
11171502	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
11171506	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11171506	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11171586	ESE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
11171586	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
11171586	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
11171586	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
11171586	ESE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
11171586	ESE	106.41c10	Publicity
11171595	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11181009	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11181009	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11181146	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11181199	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
11181277	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
11181277	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11181290	ESE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
11181290	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11181307	ESE	106.31-1	Discipline
11181308	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
15141049	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15141049	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15151134	ESE	106.41c	Equal opportunity
15151134	ESE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
15151134	ESE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
15151134	ESE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
15151225	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15151239	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15151239	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
15151257	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
15151257	ESE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
15151257	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15151257	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
15151267	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15151334	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15151334	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
15151337	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
15151362	ESE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
15151362	ESE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
15161117	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15161117	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
15161171	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15161171	ESE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
15161171	ESE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
15161244	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15161298	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
15161349	ESE	106.41a	Athletics – General
15161394	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15161394	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
15161429	ESE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
15161429	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15161429	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15161481	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
15167295	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15171112	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15171129	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15171158	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15171158	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
15171174	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
15171282	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15171283	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15171283	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
15171283	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15171299	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
15171356	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15171356	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15171374	ESE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15171382	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15171387	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15171387	ESE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
15171423	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15181010	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15181010	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
15181010	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15181040	ESE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
15181109	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
15181127	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15181127	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
15181127	ESE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
15181127	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15181224	ESE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
15181224	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15181275	ESE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15181275	ESE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
15181275	ESE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01124015	other	106.41a	Athletics – General
01164021	other	106.71-2	Retaliation
01174002	other	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
04164030	other	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04184024	other	106.40b	Pregnancy, Childbirth or termination of Pregnancy
06164030	other	106.41a	Athletics – General
06171832	other	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
15154008	other	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15154008	other	106.41c	Equal opportunity
01142001	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01142001	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01142001	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01142001	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01142001	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01142007	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01142015	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01142015	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01142015	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01142015	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01142015	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01142158	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01142174	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01142174	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01142174	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01142174	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01142174	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01142182	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01142182	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01142184	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01142184	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01142187	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01142201	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
01152001	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01152006	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01152154	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01152154	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01152154	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01152154	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01152159	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01152159	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01152159	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01152159	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01152168	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01152168	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01152168	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01152168	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01152178	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
01152179	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01152180	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01152180	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01152194	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01152194	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01152194	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01152194	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
01152194	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01152195	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01152195	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01152195	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01152195	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01152198	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01152198	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01152216	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01152222	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01152222	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01152222	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01152222	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01162013	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01162013	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01162020	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01162020	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01162026	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01162036	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
01162036	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01162059	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01162059	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01162059	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01162069	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01162069	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01162069	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01162069	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01162070	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
01162070	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
01162075	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
01162087	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01162087	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
01162099	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01162126	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01162126	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01162126	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01162126	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01162128	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01162145	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01162149	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01162157	PSE	106.41c	Equal opportunity
01172042	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01172070	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01172070	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
01172081	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
01172096	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01172096	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
01172107	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01172107	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01172107	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01172107	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01172226	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01172226	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01172238	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
01172247	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01172247	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01172257	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
01172257	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
01172303	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01172308	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
01172308	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01172317	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
01172317	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
01172317	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
01172317	PSE	106.40a	Marital or Parental Status
01182043	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
01182048	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
01182079	PSE	106.14	Membership Practices
01182105	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
01182134	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
02142085	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02142332	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02142333	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02142343	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02142349	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02142377	PSE	106.31-3	Grading
02142377	PSE	106.40b	Pregnancy, Childbirth or termination of Pregnancy
02142377	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02142438	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02142438	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02142438	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
02142438	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02142439	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02142439	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
02142439	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02142441	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
02152050	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02152087	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02152087	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
02152087	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02152276	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02152292	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02152292	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
02152298	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
02152298	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
02152298	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02152310	PSE	106.31-3	Grading
02152310	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02152314	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02152322	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
02152322	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02152340	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02152341	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02152343	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02152344	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02152344	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02152373	PSE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
02152387	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02152410	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02152415	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02152420	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
02152421	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
02152422	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
02152448	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02162013	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02162013	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
02162013	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02162028	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02162028	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02162060	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02162067	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02162101	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02162101	PSE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
02162101	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02162120	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02162148	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02162156	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02162159	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02162168	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02162176	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
02162178	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02162178	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02162186	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02162197	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
02162197	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02162199	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02162228	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
02162228	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02162232	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
02162235	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02162257	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02162280	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02162283	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02162329	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02162329	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02172020	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
02172020	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02172043	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02172048	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
02172052	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
02172085	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02172090	PSE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
02172090	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
02172091	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02172091	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02172102	PSE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
02172168	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02172186	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02172186	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
02172198	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
02172198	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02172391	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02172396	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02172504	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
02172504	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02172535	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02172550	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02172632	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
02182043	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
02182043	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
02182043	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
02182096	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
02182096	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
02182111	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02182111	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02182115	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
02182154	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02182156	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02182156	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02182167	PSE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
02182181	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02182181	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
02182198	PSE	106.31-1	Discipline
02182198	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
02182213	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
02182231	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
03122067	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
03122067	PSE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
03122067	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
03122067	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
03122067	PSE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
03122067	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
03122067	PSE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
03122067	PSE	106.41c9	Housing and dining
03122067	PSE	106.41c10	Publicity
03122067	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
03122067	PSE	106.41c12	Support services
03122067	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03132075	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
03132075	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03132294	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
03132294	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03132294	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03132311	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03142040	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03142040	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
03142252	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03142285	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03142289	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03142289	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
03142315	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03142324	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03142336	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03142336	PSE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
03142336	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03142383	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03142386	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03142387	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03142405	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03152021	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03152068	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03152069	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03152090	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03152090	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03152091	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
03152091	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03152301	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03162024	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03162024	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03162114	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03162138	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03162170	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
03162170	PSE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
03162170	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
03162170	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
03162170	PSE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
03162170	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
03162170	PSE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
03162170	PSE	106.41c9	Housing and dining
03162170	PSE	106.41c10	Publicity
03162170	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
03162170	PSE	106.41c12	Support services
03162174	PSE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
03162174	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
03162174	PSE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
03162174	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
03162174	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
03162174	PSE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
03162174	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
03162174	PSE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
03162174	PSE	106.41c9	Housing and dining
03162174	PSE	106.41c10	Publicity
03162174	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
03162174	PSE	106.41c12	Support services
03162187	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
03162187	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03162206	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03162221	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03162267	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
03162267	PSE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
03162267	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
03162267	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
03162267	PSE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
03162267	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
03162267	PSE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
03162267	PSE	106.41c9	Housing and dining
03162267	PSE	106.41c10	Publicity
03162267	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
03162267	PSE	106.41c12	Support services
03162270	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03162276	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03172010	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03172040	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03172052	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03172052	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03172068	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
03172068	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03172090	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03172090	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03172128	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03172372	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
03172372	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03172384	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03172396	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
03172428	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
03172476	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03172499	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03182098	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
03182105	PSE	106.36	Counseling and Tutoring
03182123	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
03182135	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
03182152	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
03182152	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
03182152	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
04132542	PSE	106.41c	Equal opportunity
04132542	PSE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
04142310	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04142388	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04142399	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04142399	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04142399	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04142433	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04142433	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04142460	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04142505	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04142505	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04142506	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04142506	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04152045	PSE	106.21b1	Specific –Individuals
04152058	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04152064	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04152064	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
04152124	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04152124	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04152297	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04152326	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04152327	PSE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
04152348	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04152348	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
04152349	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04152363	PSE	106.21c2	Pregnancy, Childbirth or Termination of Pregnancy
04152364	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04152364	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04152368	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04152368	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04152387	PSE	106.31-3	Grading
04152389	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04152389	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04152389	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04152438	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
04152438	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
04152438	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
04152438	PSE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
04152438	PSE	106.41c9	Housing and dining
04152438	PSE	106.41c10	Publicity
04152438	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
04152441	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04152441	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04152443	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04152443	PSE	106.21c2	Pregnancy, Childbirth or Termination of Pregnancy
04152443	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04152457	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04152457	PSE	106.21b1	Specific –Individuals
04152457	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04152457	PSE	106.32	Housing
04152457	PSE	106.33	Comparable Facilities
04152457	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04152462	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04152462	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04152473	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04152474	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04162001	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04162005	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04162005	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04162020	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04162024	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
04162024	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04162047	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
04162047	PSE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
04162047	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
04162047	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
04162047	PSE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
04162047	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
04162047	PSE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
04162047	PSE	106.41c9	Housing and dining

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
04162047	PSE	106.41c10	Publicity
04162047	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
04162047	PSE	106.41c12	Support services
04162066	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04162066	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04162075	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
04162075	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04162077	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04162077	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04162077	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04162127	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04162138	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04162175	PSE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
04162182	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
04162182	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04162182	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04162183	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
04162217	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
04162217	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04162217	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04162226	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04162226	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
04162226	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04162242	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04162262	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04162262	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04162303	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04162306	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04162341	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04162341	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04162345	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
04162345	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04162345	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04162347	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04172038	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04172039	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04172039	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04172042	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04172048	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04172055	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
04172058	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04172107	PSE	106.31-3	Grading
04172114	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04172114	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04172124	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04172148	PSE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
04172148	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04172189	PSE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
04172216	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04172216	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
04172232	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04172244	PSE	106.21	Admissions
04172248	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
04172259	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04172259	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04172316	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
04172327	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04172327	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04172340	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
04172355	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04172370	PSE	106.31-1	Discipline
04172383	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04182003	PSE	106.41a	Athletics – General
04182031	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
04182031	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04182094	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04182128	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04182129	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04182129	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
04182204	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04182223	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
04182223	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05132373	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05132484	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05132484	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
05132484	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05132493	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05132493	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
05132493	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05142047	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05142047	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05142081	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05142504	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05142504	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05142504	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05142506	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05142506	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05142515	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05142530	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05142530	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05152038	PSE	106.37c	Athletic financial assistance
05152038	PSE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
05152038	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
05152038	PSE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
05152038	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
05152038	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
05152038	PSE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
05152038	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
05152038	PSE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
05152038	PSE	106.41c9	Housing and dining
05152038	PSE	106.41c10	Publicity
05152038	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
05152038	PSE	106.41c12	Support services
05152105	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05152122	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05152385	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
05152385	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05152391	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
05152391	PSE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
05152391	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
05152391	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
05152391	PSE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
05152391	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
05152391	PSE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
05152391	PSE	106.41c9	Housing and dining
05152391	PSE	106.41c10	Publicity
05152391	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
05152391	PSE	106.41c12	Support services
05152422	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05152449	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05152463	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05152504	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05152508	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
05152515	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05152524	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05152524	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05152531	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05152549	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05162025	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
05162033	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05162047	PSE	106.41a	Athletics – General
05162047	PSE	106.41c1-1	Interests and abilities (compliance with part 1 of 3-part test)
05162047	PSE	106.41c1-2	Interests and abilities (compliance with part 2 of 3-part test)
05162047	PSE	106.41c1-3	Interests and abilities (compliance with part 3 of 3-part test)
05162047	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
05162047	PSE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
05162047	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
05162047	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
05162047	PSE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
05162047	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
05162047	PSE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
05162047	PSE	106.41c9	Housing and dining
05162047	PSE	106.41c10	Publicity
05162047	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
05162047	PSE	106.41c12	Support services
05162091	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
05162091	PSE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
05162091	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
05162091	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
05162091	PSE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
05162091	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
05162091	PSE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
05162091	PSE	106.41c9	Housing and dining
05162091	PSE	106.41c10	Publicity
05162091	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
05162091	PSE	106.41c12	Support services
05162093	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05162097	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05162109	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
05162134	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05162134	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05162134	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05162180	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05162181	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05162189	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05162189	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
05162208	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05162215	PSE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
05162249	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05162253	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05162253	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05162298	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
05162298	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05162298	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05162307	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05162331	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05162333	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05162333	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
05162333	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05162346	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05172002	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
05172002	PSE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
05172002	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
05172002	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
05172002	PSE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
05172002	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
05172002	PSE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
05172002	PSE	106.41c9	Housing and dining
05172002	PSE	106.41c10	Publicity
05172002	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
05172002	PSE	106.41c12	Support services
05172020	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05172028	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05172045	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05172055	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05172116	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
05172116	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05172123	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05172144	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05182011	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
05182078	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
05182112	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
05182126	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
05182126	PSE	106.31-1	Discipline
05182126	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05182134	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05182142	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
05182144	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
05182150	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
05182163	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
05182211	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06142317	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
06142317	PSE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
06142317	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
06142317	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
06142317	PSE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
06142317	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
06142317	PSE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
06142317	PSE	106.41c9	Housing and dining
06142317	PSE	106.41c10	Publicity
06142317	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
06142317	PSE	106.41c12	Support services
06142340	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06142340	PSE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
06142340	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06142348	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06152009	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06152023	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06152063	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06152316	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
06152316	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
06152316	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06152339	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06152349	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
06152349	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06152359	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06152411	PSE	106.31-3	Grading
06152413	PSE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
06152416	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
06152416	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06152417	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
06152417	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06152527	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
06152527	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
06152527	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
06162022	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06162051	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
06162051	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06162054	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
06162094	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06162100	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06162123	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06162123	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06162152	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06162152	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06162161	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06162185	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06162194	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06162218	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06162218	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06162219	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06162247	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06162249	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06162249	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06162276	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
06162297	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06162306	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06162307	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06162307	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06162308	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
06162308	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
06162316	PSE	106.37	Financial Assistance/Scholarships
06162316	PSE	106.41a	Athletics – General
06162316	PSE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
06162316	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06162331	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06172002	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06172002	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06172012	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06172012	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06172039	PSE	106.21c1	Marital or Parental Status
06172067	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06172086	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06172108	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06172140	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06172146	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06172146	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06172163	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06172181	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
06172181	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06172191	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06172210	PSE	106.21c1	Marital or Parental Status
06172210	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06172217	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06172298	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
06172298	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06172301	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
06172320	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
06182014	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06182074	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06182074	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06182119	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
06182119	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
06182130	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06182181	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
06182181	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
07132064	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
07142192	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07142199	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07142251	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
07142263	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07142269	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
07142276	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
07152003	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
07152003	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07152017	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
07152017	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
07152018	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
07152018	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
07152234	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
07152234	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07152234	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
07152270	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07152270	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
07162021	PSE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
07162021	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
07162030	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07162033	PSE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
07162108	PSE	106.37c	Athletic financial assistance
07162108	PSE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
07162108	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
07162108	PSE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
07162108	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
07162108	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
07162108	PSE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
07162108	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
07162108	PSE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
07162108	PSE	106.41c9	Housing and dining
07162108	PSE	106.41c10	Publicity
07162108	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
07162108	PSE	106.41c12	Support services
07162127	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07172008	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
07172008	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
07172013	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
07172023	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
07172023	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
07172033	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
07172033	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
07172033	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
07172033	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07172040	PSE	106.21	Admissions
07172046	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07172059	PSE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
07172066	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
07172067	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
07172068	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
07172069	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
07172070	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
07172071	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
07172072	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07172257	PSE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
07172269	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
07172269	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
07172282	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
07182004	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
07182015	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
07182050	PSE	106.31-4.4	Sexual Harassment (gender stereotyping)
07182050	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
07182051	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
07182055	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
08122007	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
08122007	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
08122007	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08132141	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
08132141	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08142204	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
08142204	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08162123	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08162168	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08162168	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
08162178	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
08162178	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08162178	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
08162184	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08162196	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
08172024	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08172037	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08172074	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
08172123	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
08172123	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
08172123	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
08172238	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08172238	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
08172253	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
08172263	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
08172263	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
08182064	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09112286	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09142352	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09142352	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09142411	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09152121	PSE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
09152121	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
09152121	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
09152121	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
09152282	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09152282	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09152310	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09152310	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09152346	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09152414	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09152421	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09152494	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09162033	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09162033	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
09162034	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09162034	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09162047	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09162060	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09162060	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09162090	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09162090	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09162209	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
09162429	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09162429	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09162441	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
09162441	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
09162442	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09172118	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
09172409	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09172423	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09172534	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09172534	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
09172556	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
09172574	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09172574	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
09172585	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
09182031	PSE	106.34	Access to Course Offerings
09182031	PSE	106.37	Financial Assistance/Scholarships
09182061	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
09182092	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
09182121	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
09182159	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
09182193	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
09182225	PSE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
09182231	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
09182243	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10122142	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10142193	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10152023	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10152023	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10152058	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10152058	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10152058	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10152129	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10152129	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10152153	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10152153	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10152218	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10152236	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10152236	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10152257	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10152257	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10162028	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10162028	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10162028	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10162053	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10162065	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10162074	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10162082	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10162082	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10162082	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10162098	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10162099	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10162099	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10162099	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
10162099	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10162156	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10162160	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10162180	PSE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
10162180	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10162183	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10162235	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10162237	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10162237	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10172005	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10172005	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10172011	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10172011	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10172030	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10172030	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
10172030	PSE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)
10172082	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10172082	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10172129	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10172142	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10172142	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
10172234	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10172234	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10172276	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10172301	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
10182022	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10182022	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
10182046	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10182046	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
10182066	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10182066	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
10182083	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10182083	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
11132051	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11152014	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
11152052	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11152059	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11152059	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11152076	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
11152210	PSE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
11152210	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
11152210	PSE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
11152210	PSE	106.41c4	Travel and per diem
11152210	PSE	106.41c5	Coaching and tutoring
11152210	PSE	106.41c6	Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors
11152210	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
11152210	PSE	106.41c8	Medical and training facilities and services
11152210	PSE	106.41c9	Housing and dining
11152210	PSE	106.41c10	Publicity
11152210	PSE	106.41c11	Recruitment
11152210	PSE	106.41c12	Support services
11152264	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11152325	PSE	106.31-5	Gender Harassment (not of a sexual nature)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
11162012	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11162026	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
11162097	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11162119	PSE	106.31-1	Discipline
11162119	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11162129	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11162218	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11162234	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11162245	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11162245	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11162250	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11162254	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11162295	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11162325	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
11162325	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11162325	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11172032	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11172050	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11172094	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11172094	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11172130	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11172153	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
11172187	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
11172187	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11172187	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
11172209	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
11172209	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11172214	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
11172214	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11172261	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
11172408	PSE	106.21c2	Pregnancy, Childbirth or Termination of Pregnancy
11172408	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
11172538	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
11182014	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
11182073	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
11182156	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
11182157	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
11182176	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
11182197	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
11182200	PSE	106.41a	Athletics – General
11182200	PSE	106.41c	Equal opportunity
11182200	PSE	106.41c1	Interests and abilities
11182200	PSE	106.41c2	Equipment and supplies
11182200	PSE	106.41c3	Scheduling of games and practice times
11182200	PSE	106.41c7	Provision of locker rooms and practice and competitive facilities
11182217	PSE	106.21c3	Disabilities related to Pregnancy, Childbirth, or Termination of Pregnancy
11182217	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15142111	PSE	106.8a	Designation of Responsible Employee
15142111	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15142111	PSE	106.9	Dissemination of Policy
15142111	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15142239	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15142239	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
15152064	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15152064	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15152064	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15152208	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15152209	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15152209	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15152218	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15152218	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15152238	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15152245	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
15152250	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
15152254	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15162009	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15162009	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15162009	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15162039	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15162039	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15162061	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15162089	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15162102	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15162143	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15162149	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15162149	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15162159	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15162160	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15162164	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15162167	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15162171	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
15162178	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15162200	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15162203	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15162208	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15162216	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15162218	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15172006	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15172006	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15172014	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15172021	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15172021	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15172055	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15172065	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15172066	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15172066	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15172098	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15172122	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15172135	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
15172225	PSE	106.31-4.3	Sexual Harassment (physical harassment or intimidation)
15172225	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15172250	PSE	106.31-3	Grading
15172260	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15172260	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15172260	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15172273	PSE	106.31-1	Discipline

1,141 Title IX Complaints Currently Open for Investigation as of June 18, 2018

Docket #	Institution	Issue Code	Issue Description
15172309	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15172309	PSE	106.31-4.2	Sexual Harassment (sexual violence)
15182019	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15182036	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
15182036	PSE	106.31-4.1	Sexual Harassment (insults, slurs, derogatory expressions, verbal intimidation)
15182036	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15182036	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15182052	PSE	106.71-2	Retaliation
15182064	PSE	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)
15182103	PSE	106.31-4.5	Sexual Harassment (other)
15182116	PSE	106.8b	Grievance Procedures
10173010	Vocational	106.31-99	Different Treatment/Exclusion/Denial of Benefits (other)

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RICHARD J. DURBIN

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGE SECTOR INFLUENCE IN ADMINISTRATION'S APPROACH TO STUDENT AID INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT

Question. Over the last several years nearly every major for-profit college has been investigated or sued by one or more Federal or State agency for some form of deceptive and abusive practices. Some—notably Corinthian, ITT Tech, and Westwood Colleges—have collapsed under the weight of years of abuse and wrongdoing. But the abuse didn't end with these companies. The abuse in this industry is more than a one-off—it's systemic and it continues. Unfortunately, you're taking the cops off the beat at the Department of Education. According to a New York Times article entitled, "Education Department Unwinds Unit Investigating Fraud at For-Profits" you have gutted the Student Aid Enforcement Unit's Investigations Team which was set up in the wake of Corinthian to ensure that fraud would be detected and stopped to avoid a repeat where thousands of students are harmed and hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars are lost. The article notes that what included a dozen or so attorneys and investigators by the end of the Obama Administration has dwindled to just three employees under you because those employees have been "marginalized, reassigned, or instructed to work on other matters." The result is that important investigations into fraud by major for-profit college companies have "ground to a halt." Conveniently, several of the investigations that have been disrupted by gutting the Enforcement Unit's Investigations Team were of companies that formerly employed some of your top officials—including Julian Schmoke, Robert Eitel, Diane Auer Jones, and Carlos Muniz.

a. When these individuals began working at the Department, either as a result of your hiring or presidential appointment, were you aware that they had been employed by for-profit education companies that the Department had or was, at the time, investigating?

b. Your spokesperson has denied the allegation in the New York Times article that the Enforcement Unit's investigatory work has been hampered or "ground to a halt." Does the Enforcement Unit currently have open investigations of DeVry University and Bridgepoint Education? If so, how many dedicated staff are assigned to each investigation?

c. You and I disagree about the Department's responsibilities to students under Borrower Defense when fraud has been committed, but would you agree that preventing the types of fraudulent and illegal activities that lead to large numbers of Borrower Defense claims is the best way to protect students and prevent taxpayers from losing money to student loan discharges?

d. If so, how can you explain gutting the Department's resources, including personnel, dedicated to proactively investigating, identifying, and stopping fraudulent practices by institutions?

e. How many new investigations has the Investigation Team opened in 2018?

Answer. a. Julian Schmoke, Robert Eitel, Diane Auer Jones, and Carlos Muniz were hired for their qualifications, years of experience, and total body of work that spans multiple sectors across higher education. These individuals have spent more years working in Government or in sectors outside of the proprietary sector than years working in the proprietary sector, a fact which is ignored by those who wish to impugn their characters.

b. It is not Department policy to comment on any deliberative, preliminary, or ongoing investigative work.

c. I do not believe that we disagree about the Department's responsibilities to students who have been defrauded in connection with their educational programs and suffered financial harm. The Department has honored its commitment to borrowers of Corinthian Colleges; it continues to process those claims to identify victims of misrepresentation who relied on those misrepresentations to make enrollment decisions and were harmed financially by those decisions. We will continue to review claims and provide appropriate student loan relief; however, we cannot forgive loans where misrepresentations did not occur or did not cause harm to the borrower; the Department also has a duty to the taxpayer. FSA continues to perform its oversight duties to enforce compliance with its rules and requirements.

d. Staff reduction in the Enforcement Unit is due to attrition, not a Department-initiated reduction in force, and FSA is working to hire qualified employees to fill vacancies. That said, oversight is not relegated solely to the Enforcement Unit, which was not established until 2016. We have teams of people across the agency, including in our regional offices and in the Office of the General Counsel, who play critical roles in performing program reviews and evaluating the compliance of institutions with all FSA regulations.

As part of its oversight duties, Federal Student Aid requires the submission of annual compliance and financial audit reports, and it routinely conducts program reviews to confirm that a school meets FSA requirements for institutional eligibility, financial responsibility, and administrative capability. Final Program Review Determinations (FPRD) are screened for any necessary redactions and posted publicly at https://studentaid.ed.gov/sa/about/data-center/school/program-reviews.

In fiscal year 2017 alone, Program Compliance (PC) staff commenced over 200 new program reviews at institutions determined to present a risk to Title IV dollars. Additionally, PC staff issued over 300 FPRDs to institutions and collectively assessed over $75 million in liabilities due the Department via those FPRDs issued in fiscal year 2017.

In addition to program reviews and audits, FSA also reviews financial statements, 90/10 compliance, and cohort default rates as part of our review process and to inform our investigations and related activities. When appropriate, the Department places institutions on heightened cash monitoring (HCM) or collects and maintains Letters of Credit to hold institutions accountable and to reduce risks to students and taxpayers. For example, in Award Year 2015, the Department requested and received 426 LOCs from 396 institutions or main OPEIDs totaling approximately $932 million.

Additionally, all institutions are required to undergo a recertification for continued participation in the Title IV programs at least once every 6 years. This recertification includes a comprehensive review of the institution. In fiscal year 2017, PC staff completed over 1,150 recertification reviews/applications and processed another 2,300 eligibility updates and approval applications.

Finally, in fiscal year 2017, PC staff reviewed and resolved over 6,000 inquiries, concerns, or institutional complaints submitted by students and constituents.

e. There has been one new investigation opened by the Investigations Group in 2018, but there are investigations from 2017 that are still ongoing.

PENDING BORROWER DEFENSE CLAIMS

Question. How many borrower defense claims are currently pending review, decision, or adjudication by any Department official in total and disaggregated by State?

a. How many pending claims are from students who attended Corinthian or ITT, respectively, disaggregated by State?

b. After Corinthian and ITT, what are the next three largest sources of borrower defense claims, disaggregated by institution?

c. How many borrowers who have a pending borrower defense application have had their forbearance expire?

d. How many borrowers who have a pending borrower defense application will have their forbearance expire within the next 6 months?

e. What is the total dollar value of accumulated interest and fees for borrowers whose claims are pending?

Answer. For parts (a) and (b), please refer to Tables (A) and (C) in the following attachment.

May2018

TABLE A - Borrower Defense Claims Not Approved Total & by State				
	Total Not Approved Count	Corinthian, not approved	ITT, not Approved	Non CCI/ITT
Total	**99,335**	**45,675**	**13,175**	**40,485**
AE	25	<10	<10	15
AK	125	55	<10	65
AL	1,025	335	315	375
AP	15	<10	<10	<10
AR	455	185	85	175
AZ	1,825	465	275	1,095
CA	20,545	13,695	1,415	5,435
CO	1,555	615	145	795
CT	375	95	<10	275
DC	215	115	15	95
DE	155	45	<10	95
FC	135	85	<10	45
FL	7,765	3,705	905	3,155
FM	15	<10	<10	<10
GA	4,305	2,155	275	1,875
HI	1,125	1,005	15	105
IA	465	135	65	265
ID	345	115	95	135
IL	5,395	2,695	385	2,315
IN	2,015	595	615	805
KS	485	105	65	315
KY	895	225	255	425
LA	765	265	165	345
MA	1,305	575	175	555
MD	1,515	585	215	715
ME	125	55	<10	65
MI	2,455	1,115	655	685
MN	1,775	475	95	1,205
MO	1,915	705	365	855
MS	725	395	55	265
MT	155	85	15	55
NC	2,655	975	315	1,365
ND	105	35	<10	55
NE	295	75	95	125
NH	155	55	25	85
NJ	1,685	525	65	1,095
NM	385	75	135	175

[Table A continues:]

NV	1,295	585	185	515
NY	2,865	895	305	1,665
OH	3,335	965	755	1,615
OK	565	125	125	325
OR	1,485	945	135	415
PA	2,775	915	375	1,485
PR	25	<10	<10	25
RI	105	35	<10	65
SC	1,065	275	175	615
SD	115	45	<10	65
TN	1,415	275	505	645
TX	7,535	3,355	945	3,235
UT	655	225	185	245
VA	2,325	1,085	425	805
VI	15	<10	<10	<10
VT	55	25	<10	25
WA	3,125	2,015	375	745
WI	1,315	285	355	675
WV	475	285	45	155
WY	115	65	<10	45
All Others	3,425	865	915	1,655

For privacy purposes, counts are rounded and represent the midpoint of a 10-point range (for example, values of 10-19 are coded as 15) and counts of less than 10 have been suppressed using a "<10" value.

Table C - Counts of next 3 schools with highest borrower defense claim volume (after CCI/ITT)	
	Count
DeVry	10,275
EDMC	4,435
Apollo Group, Inc (University of Phoenix)	3,965

For privacy purposes, counts are rounded and represent the midpoint of a 10-point range (for example, values of 10-19 are coded as 15) and counts of less than 10 have been suppressed using a "<10" value.

As of May 1, 2018, there are a total of 99,335 claims are currently pending review, decision or adjudication. State level data is provided in Table A.

a. As of May 1, 2018, there are approximately 45,675 pending claims associated with students who attended Corinthian and 13,175 claims associated with students who attended ITT. State level data is provided in Table A.

b. (May 1, 2018): The next three largest sources of borrower defense claims are associated with DeVry University with approximately 10,275 claims, Education Management Corporation (EDMC) with approximately 4,435 claims, and the Apollo Group (University of Phoenix) with approximately 3,965 claims. Institution level data is provided in Table C.

c. Borrowers who have submitted a substantially complete application have not had their forbearance expire within the last 12 months.

d. The Department has no borrowers with a pending borrower defense application that will have their forbearance expire within the next 6 months.

e. Outstanding interest for borrowers with pending claims total approximately $368.8 million for all loans, including loans unrelated to the Borrower Defense claim. This includes all unpaid interest on all outstanding loans (some of which may have accrued prior to submission of the claims). Previously paid or capitalized interest is not included.

DISAGGREGATED BORROWER DEFENSE CLAIMS BY STATE

Question. How many borrower defense claims has the Department received on or after January 20, 2017, disaggregated by State?

a. How many of those claims received are from students who attended Corinthian or ITT, respectively, disaggregated by State?

Answer. Please refer to Table (B) in the following attachment.

May 2018

Table B - Borrower Defense Claims Rec'd Jan 20 2017 to Apr 23 2018 - Total and by CCI/ITT/Other				
Borrower State of Residence	Total	CCI	ITT	Other
TOTAL	**63,525**	**23,555**	**7,935**	**32,045**
AE	25	<10	<10	15
AK	85	35	<10	45
AL	685	185	195	315
AR	315	115	55	155
AZ	1,285	235	155	905
CA	11,605	6,455	945	4,205
CO	995	275	95	635
CT	255	45	<10	205
DC	135	65	<10	75
DE	115	25	<10	75
FC	95	65	<10	25
FL	4,675	1,575	595	2,505
GA	2,965	1,195	185	1,585
HI	475	395	<10	85
IA	335	75	45	215
ID	215	55	55	105
IL	3,605	1,445	245	1,925
IN	1,275	355	285	635
KS	355	55	35	265
KY	645	125	165	355
LA	545	155	105	285
MA	695	235	105	355
MD	1,015	295	135	585
ME	85	35	<10	45
MI	1,465	525	385	545
MN	1,265	285	65	925
MO	1,345	435	195	715
MS	515	245	35	235
MT	95	45	<10	45
NC	1,905	625	215	1,065
ND	75	25	<10	45
NE	195	35	55	105
NH	105	25	15	75
NJ	1,325	365	45	915
NM	245	35	75	145
NV	805	275	115	415

[Table B continues:]

NY	2,015	535	175	1,305
OH	2,415	605	465	1,345
OK	395	65	65	265
OR	745	375	85	285
PA	1,955	535	245	1,175
PR	15	<10	<10	15
RI	65	15	<10	45
SC	705	105	115	495
SD	85	25	<10	55
TN	925	115	295	515
TX	5,245	2,015	595	2,635
UT	415	105	115	195
VA	1,545	655	255	635
VI	15	<10	<10	<10
VT	25	<10	<10	15
WA	2,085	1,325	215	545
WI	835	95	195	555
WV	305	155	25	125
WY	85	45	<10	35
All Others	1,845	395	425	1,025

For privacy purposes, counts are rounded and represent the midpoint of a 10-point range (for example, values of 10-19 are coded as 15) and counts of less than 10 have been suppressed using a "<10" value.

The Department has received approximately 63,525 borrower defense claims since January 20, 2017. State level data is provided in Table B.

a. As of May 1, 2018, the Department has received 23,555 claims that are associated with students who attended Corinthian; 7,935 are associated with students who attended ITT. State level data is provided in Table B.

APPROVED BORROWER DEFENSE CLAIMS BY STATE

Question. How many total borrower defense applications has the Department approved between January 20, 2017 and today? What is the total dollar amount of relief?

a. How many of any approved borrower defense claims during this time period are from students who attended Corinthian or ITT, respectively, disaggregated by State?

Answer. Please refer to Table (D) in the following attachment.

TABLE D - Borrower Defense Claims Approved Total & by State Jan 20, 2017 to May 1, 2018				
Borrower State Code of Residence	Total Approved Count	Corinthian, approved	ITT, Approved	Non CCI/ITT, approved
TOTAL	**12,385**	**12,385**	**<10**	**<10**
AK	15	15	<10	<10
AL	75	75	<10	<10
AR	85	85	<10	<10
AZ	75	75	<10	<10
CA	3,805	3,805	<10	<10
CO	215	215	<10	<10
CT	45	45	<10	<10
DC	45	45	<10	<10
DE	15	15	<10	<10
FC	35	35	<10	<10
FL	985	985	<10	<10
GA	525	525	<10	<10
HI	185	185	<10	<10
IA	55	55	<10	<10
ID	35	35	<10	<10
IL	565	565	<10	<10
IN	145	145	<10	<10
KS	35	35	<10	<10
KY	35	35	<10	<10
LA	75	75	<10	<10
MA	165	165	<10	<10
MD	135	135	<10	<10
ME	25	25	<10	<10
MI	365	365	<10	<10
MN	275	275	<10	<10
MO	185	185	<10	<10
MS	115	115	<10	<10
MT	15	15	<10	<10
NC	315	315	<10	<10
ND	15	15	<10	<10
NE	25	25	<10	<10
NH	25	25	<10	<10
NJ	125	125	<10	<10
NM	35	35	<10	<10
NV	115	115	<10	<10
NY	285	285	<10	<10
OH	235	235	<10	<10

[Table D continues:]

OK	35	35	<10	<10
OR	195	195	<10	<10
PA	255	255	<10	<10
SC	115	115	<10	<10
SD	15	15	<10	<10
TN	115	115	<10	<10
TX	815	815	<10	<10
UT	45	45	<10	<10
VA	385	385	<10	<10
VT	15	15	<10	<10
WA	705	705	<10	<10
WI	85	85	<10	<10
WV	65	65	<10	<10
WY	35	35	<10	<10
All Others	31	31	<10	<10

For privacy purposes, counts are rounded and represent the midpoint of a 10-point range (for example, values of 10-19 are coded as 15) and counts of less than 10 have been suppressed using a "<10" value.

Between January 20, 2017 and May 1, 2018, 12,385 approved borrower defense to repayment claims were from borrowers who attended Corinthian Colleges, and 10 approved BD claims were from borrowers who attended ITT Tech. The Department has prioritized claims from Corinthian College borrowers, so very few claims from ITT Tech borrowers have been reviewed to date. State level data is provided in Table D.

BORROWER DEFENSE REFUNDS DISCHARGED UNDER TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Question. Of the borrowers whose borrower defense claims were approved (as designated by an email from Federal Student Aid) but who had not yet received a discharge or full refund on or before January 19, 2017, how many have since received a discharge or full refund posted to their accounts?

a. How many attended Corinthian, ITT, or ACI, respectively, disaggregated by State?

b. What is the total dollar value of accumulated interest and fees for these borrowers whose applications have not yet received their previously-approved discharge or refund, if any?

Answer. All borrowers who were notified of the decision on their claim prior to January 20, 2017, have received the appropriate loan discharge, unless the borrower was notified that he or she did not have a qualified loan and needed to first consolidate their loans so that it could be discharged and the borrower has not done so.

a. As of May 1, 2018, approximately 11,715 students who received discharges attended Corinthian, 35 students attended ITT, and 2,705 students attended ACI. State level data is provided in Table E.

[The information follows:]

TABLE E - Borrower Defense Claims, Notified prior to 1/20/2017 Approved Total & by State Jan 20, 2017 to May 1, 2018				
	Total Approved	Corinthian, approved	ITT, Approved	Non CCI/ITT, approved
TOTAL	**14,455**	**11,715**	**35**	**2,705**
AK	15	15	<10	<10
AL	65	65	<10	<10
AR	55	55	<10	<10
AZ	75	75	<10	<10
CA	3,615	3,595	15	<10
CO	215	215	<10	<10
CT	45	15	<10	35
DE	15	15	<10	<10
FL	935	885	<10	35
GA	455	435	<10	15
HI	135	135	<10	<10
IA	35	35	<10	<10
ID	35	35	<10	<10
IL	475	475	<10	<10
IN	175	175	<10	<10
KS	35	35	<10	<10
KY	45	45	<10	<10
LA	55	55	<10	<10
MA	2,575	155	<10	2,425
MD	65	55	<10	<10
ME	15	<10	<10	<10
MI	595	595	<10	<10
MN	195	195	<10	<10
MO	225	225	<10	<10
MS	95	95	<10	<10
MT	15	15	<10	<10
NC	245	235	<10	15
ND	15	15	<10	<10
NE	25	25	<10	<10
NH	45	<10	<10	45
NJ	175	175	<10	<10
NM	25	15	<10	<10
NV	125	115	<10	<10
NY	145	125	<10	15
OH	275	275	<10	<10
OK	35	35	<10	<10
OR	215	215	<10	<10

[Table E continues:]

PA	255	245	<10	15
RI	25	<10	<10	15
SC	105	95	<10	<10
SD	15	15	<10	<10
TN	75	75	<10	<10
TX	1,085	1,065	<10	15
UT	75	65	<10	<10
VA	245	235	<10	<10
WA	845	835	<10	<10
WI	55	45	<10	<10
WV	85	85	<10	<10
WY	15	15	<10	<10
All Others	35	35	<10	<10

For privacy purposes, counts are rounded and represent the midpoint of a 10-point range (for example, values of 10-19 are coded as 15) and counts of less than 10 have been suppressed using a "<10" value.

b. As of May 1, 2018, the outstanding interest for borrowers with pending claims totals approximately $143.2 million. This includes all unpaid interest on all outstanding loans (some of which may have accrued prior to submission of the claims).

INSTITUTIONS AND PROGRAMS WITH STUDENTS GRANTED REFUND OR DISCHARGE UNDER BORROWER DEFENSE

Question. Please indicate which institutions and programs have borrowers with approved claims that are eligible for or have been granted:

—Full refund of amounts paid; or

—Discharge of loan balances outstanding.

Answer. The following institutions and programs have borrowers with approved claims:

Corinthian-Direct Loans, Federal Family Education Loans (FFEL), and Federal Perkins Loan (Perkins); American Career Institute (ACI)—Direct Loans; and ITT-Direct Loans and FFEL.

WAGE GARNISHMENT AND COLLECTIONS AFFECTING FORMER CORINTHIAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Question. How many former students of Corinthian Colleges, Inc. with first enrollment dates between 7/1/2010 and 9/30/2014 are in the Debt Management Collection System (DMCS)? Please also provide the number of those borrowers in wage garnishment or in the Treasury Offset Program (TOP).

Answer. There are 143,318 former Corinthian Colleges, Inc. students who have accounts in the Debt Management Collection System (DMCS). 5,305 of those borrowers are subject to Administrative Wage Garnishment. 59,951 of those borrowers are in the Treasury Offset Program.

QUARTERLY REPORTS ON BORROWER DEFENSE CLAIMS

Question. Per Senate Report 115–150, the Department is directed to issue quarterly reports on borrower defense claims that include the total and median dollar amount of outstanding debt from borrowers prior to discharge, the percentage of the total approved claims receiving partial relief, the median student loan debt remaining as part of claims receiving partial relief, the total number of pending borrower defense claims, total number of approved borrower defense claims, total dollar amount of relief, and total number of denied claims, all disaggregated by State. The Explanatory Statement accompanying the fiscal year 2018 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 115–41) required the Department to include additional information in these reports: the total and median dollar amount of outstanding debt from borrowers prior to discharge, the percentage of total approved claims receiving partial relief, and the median student loan debt remaining as part of claims receiving partial relief.

a. Why has the Department not yet provided these quarterly reports?

b. When will the Department provide the first report?

c. Will the Department post these reports on its website as encouraged by Senate Report 115–150?

Answer. a. FSA had not yet developed metrics that would allow it to provide these reports. Additionally, time was needed to develop, document, and communicate the new processes to the servicers.

b. FSA anticipates the first report will be published on July 31, 2018 for the reporting period ending June 30, 2018.

c. Yes, the Department will post these reports.

RESPONSE TO REPORT RECOMMENDING ACTIONS TO HELP DEFRAUDED STUDENTS

Question. In November 2017, Senator Warren and I published a report entitled, "Insult to Injury: How the DeVos Department of Education is Failing Defrauded Students." The report included nine recommendations. On November 14, 2017, Senator Warren and I, along with 14 of our colleagues, sent you a letter asking for your response to the recommendations. We have yet to receive one. Please respond here to each of the nine recommendations.

Answer. Recommendation #1: Immediately provide full discharges for borrowers with borrower defense claims approved prior to January 20, but who have still not received relief.

The Department has completed nearly all discharges on the claims that were approved by the previous administration prior to January 20, 2017. The few that have not have special circumstances, namely that affirmative action is needed by the borrower to consolidate their Federal Family Education Loan Program (FFELP) Loans in order to receive a discharge. Unfortunately, the previous Administration gave borrowers unrealistic and unnecessary timeframes for them to expect discharge and had not developed the procedures to process the more complex claims.

Recommendation #2: Immediately begin processing pending borrower defense claims.

Processing of pending borrower defense applications has been on-going, and in December 2017, the Department resumed adjudicating claims.

Recommendation #3: Provide full relief for approved borrower defense claims.

The borrower defense regulation gives the Secretary the discretion to fashion relief and a borrower with an approved claim may be "relieved of the obligation to repay all or part of the loan...that the borrower would be otherwise obligated to pay." 34 C.F.R. § 685.206. The Department has determined that relief in the full amount of the loan may not be appropriate in every case.

Recommendation #4: Provide full, automatic discharges to Corinthian students covered by Department of Education findings.

The Department's Corinthian job placement rate findings require a borrower to attest to multiple certain facts in order to be eligible for borrower defense relief, including that the borrower was enrolled in certain programs at certain times and received information from Corinthian on job placement rates and that they enrolled at Corinthian in substantial part on the information received about those rates. Accordingly, the Department requires applications from borrowers in order to determine eligibility.

Recommendation #5: Issue findings of wrongdoing against ITT Tech that will allow the Department to provide full, automatic discharges to covered students.

The Department continues to review borrower defense applications related to various institutions, including ITT. As part of this review the Department is considering whether the allegations in the claim would give rise to a cause of action under applicable State law as required by the Department's regulations. The Department is working to evaluate the merits of these claims, including applicable evidence related to an institution's alleged wrongdoing.

Recommendation #6: Extend forbearance for all borrowers with pending claims.

A borrower who submits a Borrower Defense application and is in repayment with monthly installments due will have their loans placed into forbearance or collections activity will be stopped if the loan is defaulted, unless they opt out. The borrower remains in that status until the claim has been decided.

Recommendation #7: Use evidence and information submitted by state Attorneys General to provide full, group discharges to affected students.

Due to pending litigation the Department is unable to provide a response to this question.

Recommendation #8: Immediately implement the directive in the fiscal year 2018 Senate Labor, HHS, Education Appropriations Subcommittee Report (S. Rept. 115–137) to provide quarterly public reports on the receipt and processing of borrower defense claims.

Quarterly reports on the receipt and processing of borrower defense applications will begin with the period ending June 30, 2018, with the first report released by July 31, 2018.

Recommendation #9: Immediately halt collections activity on defaulted borrowers with pending applications for borrower defense and all defaulted Corinthian borrowers.

Collection activities for defaulted borrowers with pending applications cease unless the borrower opts out of forbearance.

INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT ON LOAN DISCHARGES UNDER BORROWER DEFENSE TO REPAYMENT

Question. On December 8, 2017, the Department's Office of Inspector General (OIG) released a report entitled "Federal Student Aid's Borrower Defense to Repayment Loan Discharge Process."

a. The report indicates that FSA's Borrower Defense Unit (BDU) reduced contractor staffing by more than two-thirds from November 2016 to September 2017. In response to previous questions to the OIG from me, OIG noted that FSA did not provide a specific rationale for the decrease in staff in the BDU. What was the specific rationale for the decrease in contractor staffing for the BDU from November 2016 to September 2017, even as the number of pending claims continued to increase?

b. The OIG also found that, "[a]s of January 20, 2017, BDU had identified additional categories of claims warranting further research." In response to previous questions to the OIG from me, OIG clarified that FSA's BDU had started research and analysis for five additional categories of claims at Corinthian schools. What is the current status of research in these five additional categories, and other potential categories not yet publicized, for Corinthian schools?

c. The OIG report on borrower defense, on page 16, noted that further research into additional categories of borrower defense claims was "placed on hold" during the current Administration. In response to previous questions to the OIG from me, OIG noted that, in early 2017, the Enforcement Unit was instructed not to continue developing new memoranda on additional categories of claims at the direction of then-Acting Under Secretary James Manning and the Review Panel. Why did then-Acting Under Secretary Manning instruct BDU not to continue developing new memoranda on additional categories of evidence for borrower defense claims?

d. The OIG report also found that one category of evidence for borrower defense claims relates to ITT Tech guaranteed employment misrepresentation. In response to previous questions to the OIG from me, OIG noted that FSA "maintained one legal memorandum related to misrepresentations of ITT guaranteed employment. The memorandum applies only to only the California locations but does not indicate the number of potential borrowers." Has the Department continued to process claims from ITT Tech applicants using this specific category of evidence, and has it gathered any additional categories of evidence for ITT Tech of other types or for other States? If not, why not?

Answer. a. As previously announced, the Department put a hold on Borrower Defense (BD) claim processing during the change of Administration while it requested that the Inspector General review the overall BD adjudication process and the new Administration reviewed BD policies.

When new leadership placed a hold on BD claims processing and requested that the IG review the BD adjudication process, there were fewer than 20 contractor staff in place.

At that point in time, career staff was supporting a number of issues including:

—developing a database to manage BD claims and migrating the existing legacy excel-based system into it;

—supporting the IG review (due to its accelerated pace);

—assessing the population of BD claims beyond just those from Corinthian; and

—developing and pilot-testing various review process streams while working with ED leadership and legal counsel to ensure they met policy objectives and legal requirements.

After the Administration announced its new BD policies, FSA began ramping up contractor staff to support BD claim processing under the new policies. While that ramp-up process is ongoing, FSA currently has approximately 16 contractor staff (as of July 9, 2018) in place supporting BD processing.

b. Additional categories of claims warranting further research are still under review at this time.

c. As previously announced, the Department put a hold on certain borrower defense activities in order to conduct a comprehensive review of the program. This review was done by high-level career and political leaders. One of the recommendations based off of the review was a request that the Inspector General review the overall BD adjudication process.

Additionally, the review focused initially on the over 16,000 claims that had been approved in the previous administration but not yet discharged. Given the significant fiscal implications of full discharge of these claims and because there were numerous complexities involved with many of the claims, the Department focused on those claims first to ensure a smooth discharge process for those borrowers.

Once the processes to discharge those loans were finalized, Department leadership decided to prioritize updating its relief methodology and assessing the large number of existing Corinthian claims not yet adjudicated, including how to handle large numbers of claims that the previous administration had flagged for denial but had not developed any processes or procedures to effectuate.

Meanwhile, there were other time sensitive projects that, when completed, would result in long term efficiencies. These projects included:

—developing a database to manage BD claims and migrating the existing legacy excel-based system into it;
—supporting the IG review (due to its accelerated pace);
—assessing the population of BD claims beyond just those from Corinthian; and
—developing and pilot-testing various review process streams while working with ED leadership and legal counsel to ensure they met policy objectives and legal requirements.

Consideration and discussion of other pending claim categories have been ongoing throughout this period.

d. The Department continues to review and make progress on borrower defense applications related to various institutions, including ITT. As part of this review the Department is considering whether the allegations in the claim would give rise to a cause of action under applicable State law. The Department is working to evaluate the merits of these claims including applicable evidence related to an institution's alleged wrongdoing. However, the Department's top priority is to complete the review of Corinthian claims since the Department instructed Corinthian students and graduates to file BD claims. In the case of ITT Tech, the prior administration recommended for qualified students to submit closed school discharge claims. We will review those claims once we complete the review of claims made by Corinthian students.

USE OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION EARNINGS DATA FOR PARTIAL BORROWER DEFENSE RELIEF

Question. On December 20, 2017, the Department announced, via the release entitled Improved Borrower Defense Discharge Process Will Aid Defrauded Borrowers, Protect Taxpayers, that it would use earnings data received from the Social Security Administration (SSA) through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to limit relief to defrauded borrowers. However, the Department, through its legally dubious delay and rewriting of the Gainful Employment Rule, has been unwilling to use the same data for its intended purpose—to hold poor performing Title IV programs accountable.

a. Why does the Department believe that it is appropriate to use earnings data to punish defrauded borrowers be limiting relief, but not to limit Title IV access to poor performing programs—for which the Department's access to the data was legally intended?

b. Why does the Department believe it is appropriate to use a student's earnings to reduce loan relief if the student cannot find a job in the field of study and is working in a field unrelated to their program? How can the program be considered to have had any value to the student?

c. Did the Department consult with SSA about using the Gainful Employment earnings MOU for the purposes of the partial relief scheme prior to its December announcement? If so, did SSA assent to the use of data for purposes of informing limited relief?

d. Please provide any correspondence (prior to or after December 20, 2017) between SSA and the Department related to the latter's use of earnings data obtained through the MOU for purposes of informing limited relief.

e. With the expiration of the MOU on May 24, 2018, has the Department ceased basing partial relief to defrauded borrowers on the earnings data obtained through the MOU? If so, has the Department developed a new basis for providing partial relief?

Answer. a. The Department stands by its commitment to provide relief to borrowers who were harmed by an institution's fraudulent actions. However, borrowers should be eligible for relief from their Federal student loan obligations only to the extent they were harmed by an institution's misrepresentations. For example, when publicly available data reveal that programs associated with successful borrower de-

fense claims perform quite well when compared to their peer programs, the Department's commitment to safeguarding taxpayer dollars and the integrity of Federal student loan programs demand that it consider such information when assessing any relief owed to borrowers.

b–d. Due to pending litigation, the Department is unable to provide detailed information about its use of aggregate earnings data from the SSA.

e. In accordance with the recent ruling in the case of Manriquez v. U.S. Department of Education, No. 17–7106 (N.D. Cal.), the Department is not currently adjudicating any additional borrower defense claims utilizing the improved discharge process.

ALTERNATIVE EARNINGS APPEALS UNDER GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT RULE

Question. On January 9, 2017, the Obama Department of Education released the first round debt-to-earnings rates under the Gainful Employment Rule. The Department under your leadership provided an extension from June 2017 to February 2018 for schools to submit an alternative earnings appeal.

a. To date, how many schools have filed a notice of intent to appeal?

b. To date, how many schools have submitted a viable appeal?

c. To date, how many schools have abandoned their request for an appeal?

d. To date, how many appeals has the Department approved?

e. To date, how many schools submitted incomplete requests for appeals and how many schools did the Department give the opportunity to provide missing information?

f. To date, how many appeals has the Department denied?

g. When does the Department plan to issue the second round of debt-to-earnings rates?

Answer. a. 872 Notices of Intent have been filed.

b. 252 appeal packages have been received.

c. 620 schools have abandoned their request for an appeal.

d. The Department has issued 66 approvals.

e. To date, FSA has followed up with 150 schools to request additional information or clarification. Among these 150 schools were those that submitted materially complete appeals packages; however, as a result of reviewer questions or requests for source materials, some have been asked to provide additional information. The Department has made three attempts, by email and phone calls, to try to gather outstanding information from the schools.

f. The Department has not yet denied any appeals.

g. The Department does not yet know when it will issue the second round of debt-to-earnings ratios because of outstanding litigation regarding the use of IRS or Social Security data, and the need to issue a new Memorandum of Understanding with the IRS or SSA subsequent to the judge's decision.

g. This is to be determined; no confirmed date at this time.

DELIBERATIONS, MEETINGS, EVIDENCE, AND DECISION–MAKING REGARDING REINSTATEMENT OF ACICS

Question. In 2016, then-Secretary King denied the appeal of the Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS) to remain a federally-recognized accreditor after a staff report, the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, and the Senior Department Official (SDO) all concurred that ACICS should lose Federal recognition. In March 2018, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia found that Secretary King erred in not considering ACICS's Part II submission. The Court did not, however, order that ACICS be reinstated as you did in April—erroneously citing the Court's decision as requiring it. This week, the Department was forced to release its draft staff analysis which found that ACICS failed to meet 57 of the 93 criteria required under Federal law.

a. On April 10, 2018, Senators Brown, Warren, Blumenthal, and I wrote to you demanding release of ACICS' Part II submission, which includes the 27-page narrative responding to each of the Department's questions regarding specific recognition criteria and approximately 36,000 additional pages of documentation filed by ACICS. We did not receive a response by the letter's April 17 deadline. Will the Department release this information? If so, when?

b. As stated in your remand, the Department provided ACICS until May 30, 2018, with the opportunity to provide additional supporting data in response to the negative findings in 2016. Please provide a copy of that data and the date it was submitted.

c. Is the Department's review of the additional evidence ACICS provided by May 30, 2018, restricted to the agency's actions and enforcement in 2016, or will it con-

sider additional evidence of the agency's actions and enforcement in 2017 and 2018 as well?

d. Will the Department provide new opportunities for public comment or consider the public comments already submitted for the May 2018 NACIQI meeting at which review of ACICS was scheduled? If a new opportunity for public comment is planned, when can the public expect such a request?

e. The Department has indicated that Diane Auer Jones will serve as the Senior Department Official for reviewing the May 30, 2018, materials submitted by ACICS as well as prior items submitted in 2016. However, 34 CFR 602.3 states that the SDO must be a "senior official in the U.S. Department of Education who reports directly to the Secretary regarding accrediting agency recognition." [Emphasis added.] Ms. Auer Jones's title is senior adviser to the assistant secretary for postsecondary education, a position that does not report directly to the Secretary. Can you clarify how Ms. Auer Jones is legally allowed to be the SDO in the ACICS case while complying with 34 CFR 602.3?

f. Please provide a list of any meetings between yourself, Mr. Robert Eitel, Ms. Diane Auer Jones, Mr. James Manning, Ms. Kathleen Smith, Mr. Frank Brogan, The Honorable Carlos G. MuÑiz, Steven Menashi, and any institution that currently has or on December 12, 2016, had ACICS accreditation and, on that list, please include any institution in question and the complete roster of participants.

Answer. a. With the exception of student transcripts included in that submission, the Department will release the Part II submission as soon as the Agency and the Department have had sufficient time to complete their review of those documents for personally identifiable information, which must be redacted. The Department does not currently have an estimate for when that process will be completed.

b. Those data were submitted by the May 30, 2018, deadline and are currently under review. The Department will release them once it has completed its necessary review and redaction of personally identifiable information.

c. The Department will consider the Part II submission, as well as any additional evidence submitted by May 30, 2018, in response to the negative findings of the 2016 staff analysis and the letter issued by Secretary King. If the Agency submits evidence of its actions and enforcements in 2017 and 2018 and they are relevant to the 2016 findings, those pieces of evidence will be considered in the review process.

d. No. The Department received public comments in 2016 while the Agency's petition for continued recognition was pending before the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Improvement.

e. Recently promoted, Ms. Jones currently serves as Principal Deputy Under Secretary Delegated to Perform the Duties of Under Secretary and Assistant Secretary for the Office of Postsecondary Education. As such, she reports directly to the Secretary as the senior official in the Department concerning accreditation agency recognition.

f. These persons have attended meetings with representatives of a diverse group of institutions of higher education since coming to the Department but have not checked the accreditation affiliation of those institutions in connection with those meetings. To the best of their recollections, this question is answered as follows:

Secretary DeVos. To the recollection of Secretary DeVos and her scheduler, the Secretary has not knowingly participated in any meetings with an institution that has, or on December 12, 2016 had, ACICS accreditation. Secretary DeVos' full schedule can be found through the Department of Education website.

Robert Eitel. On April 11, 2017, Mr. Eitel, Jim Manning, Robin Minor, Josh Venable, and Susan Crim met with Jeanne Herrman of Broadview Education Consortium; John Ladd and Steve Gunderson also attended that meeting. On May 22, 2017, Messrs. Eitel, Manning, Venable, and Justin Riemer met with Stuart Reed and John Carreon of Education Corporation of America; Tonnie Wybensinger also attended that meeting. On May 24, 2017, the U.S. Department of Justice conducted a conference with representatives of the U.S. Department of Education and ACICS. To the best of his recollection, Mr. Eitel recalls that the following attended that conference: Justin Riemer, ED OGC; Jay Urwitz, ED OGC; Roger Williams, ACICS; Michelle Edwards, ACICS; and former U.S. Representative John Klein. DOJ litigation counsel also attended the settlement conference; Mr. Eitel does not remember their names. Other persons from ED and ACICS-accredited institutions attended the settlement conference, but Mr. Eitel does not specifically recall them, and his calendar does not reflect a list of meeting participants.

Diane Auer Jones. Ms. Jones has not knowingly participated in any meetings with an institution that currently has, or on December 12, 2016 had, ACICS accreditation. It is possible that an ACICS accredited institution was present in the audience at one or more events where she delivered remarks, but, to the best of her recollec-

tion and memory, she does not recall meeting with any such institutions. Michelle Edwards, ACICS, introduced herself to Ms. Jones at the May 22, 2018 meeting of the National Advisory Council for Institutional Quality and Improvement, but no conversation took place.

James Manning. On April 11, 2017, Mr. Eitel, Jim Manning, Robin Minor, Josh Venable, and Susan Crim met with Jeanne Herrman of Broadview Education Consortium; John Ladd and Steve Gunderson also attended that meeting. On May 22, 2017, Messrs. Eitel, Manning, Venable, and Justin Riemer met with Stuart Reed and John Carreon of Education Corporation of America; Tonnie Wybensinger also attended that meeting.

Kathleen Smith. In the limited circumstances that Ms. Smith has met with or spoken before institutions. She does not inquire as to accreditors—she has not knowingly participated in any meetings with an institution that currently has, or on December 12, 2016 had ACICS accreditation. It is possible that an ACICS accredited institution was present in the audience at any event at which she has spoken or attended—however she is not aware of any such institution with which she has interacted.

Frank Brogan. Mr. Brogan has not knowingly participated in any meetings with an institution that currently has, or on December 12th 2016 had, ACICS accreditation.

Carlos G. MuÑiz. Mr. Muniz has not knowingly participated in any meetings with an institution that currently has, or on December 12, 2016 had, ACICS accreditation.

Steven Menashi. Please note that Mr. Menashi is no longer at the Department of Education. He is now serving in the White House Counsel's office.

PROPRIETARY INSTITUTIONS CONVERTING TO NOT-FOR-PROFIT STATUS

Question. In recent years, several for-profit colleges have attempted to convert to not-for-profit status in an effort to avoid the stigma associated with the predatory for-profit college industry and to avoid regulations meant to protect students and taxpayers. Please provide a list of all for-profit conversions in the last 10 years including those pending (with current status), previously approved, and denied or withdrawn.

Answer. Please find attached the validated data set of all for-profit conversions applications the Department has received.

[The information follows:]

Proprietary to Non-Profit Conversions
Application Status thru May 15, 2018

Institution Name	Ownership as For Profit	Ownership as Non Profit	Current Status
Herzing University	Herzing Inc.	Herzing Educational Foundation	Change in Ownership and conversion - Approved PPPA issued on 2/13/18
American Academy of Art	American Academy of Art - Richard Otto	Council on Postsecondary Education, Inc.	Change in Ownership has occurred -- Change in Ownership and conversion pending. final review and determination by the Department
Cambridge Junior College	Workforce Training Solutions. Inc.	ASPIRA Inc. of Pennsylvania	Application voluntarily withdrawn by ownership.
Golden State College of Court Reporting & Captioning	Golden State College of Court Reporting & Captioning	Goodwill Industries of the Greater East Bay, Inc.	Institution closed on March 9, 2018.
Pittsburgh Technical Institute	Pittsburgh Technical Institute Employee Stock Ownership Plan	Center for Excellence in Education, Inc.	Change in Ownership and conversion - Approved PPPA issued on 9/27/17.
Community Care College	Dental Directions, Inc.	Community HigherEd Institute	Currently under preacquisition review by the Department.
School of Visual Arts	School of Visual Arts, Inc.	SVA Alumni Association, Inc.	The Department's preliminary preacquisition review completed, but pending further information from the Institution to continue preacquisition review
Sunstate Academy (Clearwater and Ft. Myers)	Sunstate College, Inc.	Compass Rose Foundation, Inc.	Change in Ownership and conversion - Approved PPPAs issued on 10/18/17
The Art Institute of Atlanta	Education Management Corporation	The Dream Center Foundation	Preacquisition review completed and TPPPA issued. Final approval of the change in ownership and conversion is pending.
The Art Institute of Houston	Education Management Corporation	The Dream Center Foundation	Preacquisition review completed and TPPPA issued. Final approval of the change in ownership and conversion is pending.
South University	Education Management Corporation	The Dream Center Foundation	Preacquisition review completed and TPPPA issued. Final approval of the change in ownership and conversion is pending.
The Art Institute of Pittsburgh	Education Management Corporation	The Dream Center Foundation	Preacquisition review completed and TPPPA issued. Final approval of the change in ownership and conversion is pending.
The Art Institute of Philadelphia	Education Management Corporation	The Dream Center Foundation	Preacquisition review completed and TPPPA issued. Final approval of the change in ownership and conversion is pending.
Argosy University	Education Management Corporation	The Dream Center Foundation	Preacquisition review completed and TPPPA issued. Final approval of the change in ownership and conversion is pending.
Miami International University of Art & Design	Education Management Corporation	The Dream Center Foundation	Preacquisition review completed and TPPPA issued. Final approval of the change in ownership and conversion is pending.
The Art Institute of Seattle	Education Management Corporation	The Dream Center Foundation	Preacquisition review completed and TPPPA issued. Final approval of the change in ownership and conversion is pending.
The Art Institute of Portland	Education Management Corporation	The Dream Center Foundation	Preacquisition review completed and TPPPA issued. Final approval of the change in ownership and conversion is pending.
The Art Institute of Fort Lauderdale	Education Management Corporation	The Dream Center Foundation	Preacquisition review completed and TPPPA issued. Final approval of the change in ownership and conversion is pending. (acquisition as an additional location of Argosy University)
The Art Institute of Phoenix	Education Management Corporation	The Dream Center Foundation	Preacquisition review completed and TPPPA issued. Final approval of the change in ownership and conversion is pending. (acquisition as an additional location of Argosy University)
The Illinois Institute of Art	Education Management Corporation	The Dream Center Foundation	Preacquisition review completed and TPPPA issued. Final approval of the change in ownership and conversion is pending.
The Art Institute of Colorado	Education Management Corporation	The Dream Center Foundation	Preacquisition review completed and TPPPA issued. Final approval of the change in ownership and conversion is pending.
Kaplan University	Graham Holdings Company	Purdue University	Preacquisition review completed - Note: conversion to public status. Change in Ownership reported on March 22, 2018. Purdue University Global is new name of institution. TPPPA issued to the institution on April 17, 2018. Final approval of the change in ownership and conversion is pending.
McNally Smith College of Music	McNally Smith, Inc.	MSP College of Music	Institution closed on December 15, 2017.
Bob Jones University	Bob Jones Education Group, Inc.	Bob Jones University, Inc.	Preacquisition review by the Department is pending.
Grand Canyon University	Grand Canyon Education, Inc.	Gazelle University	CIO application and request for preacquisition review submitted in January 2018.
Stevens Henager College	Stevens Henager College	Center for Excellence in Higher Education	Change in Ownership Approved and PPPA issued on 8/31/16 Conversion application denied on 8/11/16. Litigation pending.
CollegeAmerica Denver	CollegeAmerica Denver	Center for Excellence in Higher Education	Change in Ownership Approved and PPPA issued on 8/31/16 Conversion application denied on 8/11/16. Litigation pending.
CollegeAmerica Arizona	CollegeAmerica Arizona	Center for Excellence in Higher Education	Change in Ownership Approved and PPPA issued on 8/31/16 Conversion application denied on 8/11/16. Litigation pending.
California College San Diego	California College San Diego	Center for Excellence in Higher Education	Change in Ownership Approved and PPPA issued on 8/31/16 Conversion application denied on 8/11/16. Litigation pending.
Tribeca Flashpoint College	Sterling Capital Partners	Columbia College Hollywood	Preacquisition review completed. Acquisition of Tribeca as an additional location of Columbia closed on March 20, 2018.
Kendall College	Wengen Alberta, Limited Partnership (Laureate Education)	National Louis University	Change in Ownership application was submitted and is currently under review.

DATA SUPPORTING NEED FOR FSA PREPAID CARD PILOT PROGRAM

Question. What data has FSA collected demonstrating the need for this prepaid card pilot program, including:

a. data regarding the number of students who lack access to an account in which their student financial aid can be deposited;

b. data regarding the effectiveness of the Department's existing cash management regulations and the benefits of those regulations for students; and

c. information about the existing options students have for student aid disbursement under the cash management regulations, including information about current account providers, the number of higher education institutions and students served by each of those account providers, the average fees paid by those students, and any other information about relationships between higher education institutions and account providers or any compensation paid by providers to institutions?

d. Please provide this data.

Answer. a. Please note that this question and many others refer to the Payment Vehicle Account as a prepaid card, which is inaccurate. The Payment Vehicle Account will not be a prepaid card. While the Payment Vehicle Account will have payment utility functions, the physical aspect will be most like a bank debit card. However, the Payment Vehicle Account will also have virtual payment and check payment capabilities, as well as connectivity to an overall student loan information portal.

According to publically available National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) data, about 10 percent of undergraduate students reported not having a checking or savings account. Further, the NPSAS data show that students receive their student aid funds in a variety of ways. In addition to having funds directly deposited to bank accounts for which they often pay a fee, students reported other methods of receiving funds, including by cashing or depositing checks at a bank, or somewhere other than a bank, once again for which they often pay a fee; and receiving funds via a prepaid debit card or student identification card linked to a prepaid or debit cards, again often with fees. Please note that the fees mentioned here are not unique to Title IV funds but are common characteristics of the general fund usage and transaction methods applicable to most types of funds.

The goals of the pilot are such that even those students who currently receive their funds via electronic funds transfer to an existing bank account (about 37 percent of students) could benefit from the Payment Vehicle Account we envision. One of the primary benefits will include no cost to the customer for the Payment Vehicle Account.

b. The Department's existing cash management regulations became effective on July 1, 2016, and benefit students by ensuring they:

—Have convenient access to their Federal student aid funds;

—Do not incur unreasonable and uncommon financial account fees on their Title IV funds; and

—Are not led to believe they must open a particular financial account to receive their Federal student aid.

Already, there is more transparency for students and the public by virtue of institutions now publicly disclosing certain contracts they have entered into with financial account providers. This increased transparency will help ensure accountability and encourage institutional practices that are in the interests of students. The intended actions by FSA regarding the Payment Vehicle Account serve to foster enhanced awareness.

c and d. The following is based on analysis of FSA data. For the 2016–2017 Academic Year, there were 14 Account Providers (Financial Institutions) identified by colleges that have 1.3 million students across 573 schools. The aggregate compensation paid to schools by those Financial Institutions totaled $16.7 Million. Furthermore during this time period, 116 colleges reported they collectively received an average of $36.52 per active account in payout from financial services providers. In contrast, 457 colleges collectively reported they received an average of $11.93 per active account.

The Department's cash management regulations define two different types of arrangements between institutions and financial account providers: "tier one (T1) arrangements" and "tier 2 (T2) arrangements." A T1 arrangement is an arrangement between an institution and a third-party servicer under which the servicer performs one or more of the functions associated with processing direct payments of title IV funds on behalf of the institution, and (2) offers one or more financial accounts under the arrangement or that directly markets the account to students itself or through an intermediary. A T2 arrangement is an arrangement between an institution and a financial institution or entity that offers financial account through a fi-

nancial institution under which financial accounts are offered and marketed directly to students. If no or relatively few students receive Title IV student aid credit balances at an institution, certain requirements do not apply to T2 arrangements.

Under the regulations, institutions that enter into T1 arrangements are required to post their T1 contract(s) to their websites (with certain personal and security information redacted). Institutions with T1 arrangements are also required to post annually the total consideration paid or received by the parties under the contract, the mean and median costs that student account holders incurred, and the number of student account holders for whom these mean and median costs were calculated. Institutions must send the URL for the contract and contract data to the Department for the Department to make publically available. Institutions with T2 arrangements that enroll at least one student who received a Title IV credit balance in each of the three most recent award years also are required to disclose the contract and send the related URL to the Department. Institutions that have a T2 arrangement and average Title IV credit balance recipients in numbers at or above applicable thresholds also will be required to disclose the total consideration paid or received by the parties under the contract, the mean and median costs that student account holders incurred, and the number of student account holders for whom these mean and median costs were calculated; they will also be required to send the related URL to the Department.

To protect student privacy and data validity, institutions at which fewer than 30 students open an account offered under a T1 or T2 arrangement are not required to disclose usage data. The Department, in turn, has provided links to these URLs on FSA's virtual data center, which can be accessed at https://studentaid.ed.gov/sa/about/data-center/school/cash-management-contracts.

DATA SUPPORTING PREPAID CARD PILOT OVER DIRECT DEPOSITS

Question. What data has FSA collected demonstrating that this pilot program will benefit students more than direct deposit of student financial aid into an account selected by the student? Please provide this data.

Answer. This will not be a prepaid card; the Payment Vehicle Account refund method's features and benefits will exceed direct deposit. Moreover, a direct deposit is a simple financial transaction, whereas the Payment Vehicle Account Program will provide a free method for students that provide benefits beyond a simple financial transaction. The Payment Vehicle Account will be an essential part of a larger FSA initiative to improve communication and build meaningful relationships with students throughout the entire student aid lifecycle. The Payment Vehicle Account will allow the student to see real-time account balances, to use refund funds free from fees, and to connect to the FSA Super Portal App, which contains a wealth of additional financial literacy resources. Establishing these early and consistent connections will allow students to gain a better understanding of their rights and obligations, improve repayment outcomes, and work to minimize unnecessary borrowing.

PLANNED RESOURCE ALLOCATION TO SUPPORT PREPAID CARD PILOT IMPLEMENTATION

Question. Please list the staffing and resources that FSA intends to devote to developing and implementing this pilot program. Please also describe how FSA will ensure that the fee information required under the Department's cash management regulations is accurately reported by colleges.

Answer. Regarding staffing and resources, there is a two person core project team and "as needed" team members that participate when necessary. Additional oversight is provided by the Core NexGen project team to ensure alignment of the Payment Vehicle Account with the overarching NextGen project and its successful integration into the new FSA mobile app.

FSA will continue to monitor institutions for reporting activity on cash management regulations.

PUBLIC HEARINGS REGARDING PREPAID CARD PILOT

Question. Will FSA or the Department hold any public hearings to gather input on the appropriate features of any prepaid card pilot program?

Answer. FSA does not plan to conduct public hearings; however, FSA has received instrumental input from multiple sources, including Congress, public interest groups, and the BCFP. For example, all parties approve of; agree that a "no fee" Payment Vehicle Account would be beneficial for students. The Department will ensure the pilot is introduced in a transparent manner.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT DIRECT EXPRESS CARD PROGRAM APPLICABILITY TO FSA PILOT

Question. Will FSA utilize the Treasury Department's Direct Express card program for its pilot program, or is FSA considering a separate program? If a separate program, will the FSA program provide equal or better terms for students as those offered under the Direct Express program?

Answer. FSA will not utilize the Treasury Department Direct Express card program and will pursue a better solution through its New Payment Vehicle Account. FSA did consult with Treasury regarding the possibility of using the Treasury Direct Express card program during the course of creating the initial design for the Payment Vehicle Account and it decided that borrowers would be better served with an alternative product.

CONSULTATION WITH CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU ON PREPAID CARD PILOT

Question. Will FSA consult with experts at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau regarding the pilot program?

Answer. FSA and the BCFB have met several times, and FSA understands that the BCFP is favorable and supportive of the Payment Vehicle Account program.

PREPAID CARD PILOT COMPLIANCE WITH CFPB SAFE STUDENT ACCOUNT SCORECARD

Question. Will prepaid cards issued under the pilot program comport with the CFPB's Safe Student Account Scorecard?

Answer. Although the Payment Vehicle will not be a prepaid card, the Payment Vehicle Account will comport with the BCFP Safe Student Account Scorecard and will assist schools in comparing products in order to make the best choice for student financial products.

FSA PREPAID CARD EFFECT ON SCHOOLS WITH PRE-EXISTING CARD OPTIONS

Question. Does FSA intend that its card would replace existing card options currently offered by schools or function alongside them? If FSA's card would replace existing card options, please describe FSA's authority for doing so and explain why students would benefit from such measures.

Answer. The Payment Vehicle would serve as an alternative for students.

AUTHORITY TO DISBURSE STATE AND INSTITUTIONAL AID THROUGH FSA PREPAID CARD

Question. Does FSA intend to allow State and institutional aid to be disbursed on prepaid cards issued as part of this pilot program? If so, please describe FSA's authority for doing so and explain why students would benefit from such measures.

Answer. Although not a prepaid card, funds would be disbursed onto the Payment Vehicle Account in the same manner, and from the same sources, that funds are disbursed by way of ACH.

TRANSPARENCY AND COMPETITION IN PREPAID CARD IMPLEMENTATION

Question. What steps will FSA take to ensure that any contracting with third parties to implement this pilot program will occur on a transparent and competitive basis?

Answer. The public will be well-informed on the process for selecting any participants in the pilot and on the parameters for administering the pilot.

STUDENT OUTREACH AND INFORMED CHOICE REGARDING PREPAID CARDS VERSUS DIRECT DEPOSIT

Question. Will FSA or the Department take any steps to prevent students from being steered or pushed into this prepaid card option, rather than giving students a clear option to have their funds deposited into the account of their choice?

Answer. Student customers are free to open or close accounts; students will have the option to determine their account of choice for the deposit of funds.

PLANS AND AUTHORITY TO RESTRICT SPENDING PERMITTED WITH PREPAID CARDS

Question. Will FSA allow this pilot program to be used to restrict the ability of students to spend financial aid dollars for certain types of products or at certain types of merchants? If so, please describe FSA's authority for doing so and explain why students would benefit from such measures.

Answer. The pilot will not include purchasing restrictions.

CONSULTATION OVER MERCHANT FEES UNDER PREPAID CARD PILOT

Question. As you know, interchange fees and other card transaction fees that are imposed on merchants result in increased retail prices of consumer goods, such as college textbooks. Will FSA consult with merchants regarding the interchange fees and other fees that might be imposed on merchants that are involved in transactions under this pilot program to ensure that such fees are not unreasonable?

Answer. The Department's plan is that the FSA Payment Vehicle Pilot will include no fees for students or schools.

AUTHORITY TO PERMIT INDUSTRY MARKETING EFFORTS TO PROMOTE USE OF PREPAID CARDS

Question. Will FSA allow industry providers of prepaid card services to engage in marketing or other efforts to encourage students to use FSA prepaid cards under this pilot program? If so, please describe FSA's authority for doing so and explain why students would benefit from such measures.

Answer. This will not be a prepaid card. FSA plans to execute an agreement with one or more "Pilot Implementers" to implement the program. Pilot Implementers will develop and execute a communication campaign for each school participating in the Pilot. The communication campaign will explain the Program Vehicle Account to students.

AUTHORITY TO PERMIT INDUSTRY ACCESS TO PERSONAL AND FINANCIAL DATA UNDER PREPAID CARD PILOT

Question. As part of this pilot program, will FSA allow industry providers of prepaid card services to use students' personal and financial information, including purchasing behavior, to market unrelated services or to sell such information to third parties without the students' knowledge and affirmative opt-in consent? If so, please describe FSA's authority for doing so and explain why students would benefit from such measures.

Answer. FSA will ensure that appropriate safeguards exist to prohibit improper access and use of Payment Vehicle Account data. Any use of detailed Payment Vehicle Account information will be authorized only with an explicit opt-in (on a by-occurrence only basis and not through general blanket opt-in methods) by the student.

PROTECTIVE MEASURES FOR STUDENT PRIVACY AND FINANCIAL HEALTH UNDER CARD PILOT PROGRAM

Question. What steps will FSA take to ensure that the pilot program safeguards students' personal and financial information from fraud, data breach, and misuse?

Answer. FSA will ensure that Pilot Implementers deploy state of the industry fraud protection, adhere to data privacy and security requirements, and comply fully with applicable laws and regulations.

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN CARD PILOT PROGRAM

Question. What steps will FSA take to safeguard against conflicts of interest in the pilot program?

Answer. FSA will ensure that participants in the program comply with Federal requirements concerning conflicts of interest.

INDUSTRY DATA RECEIVED IN DEVELOPING CARD PILOT

Question. In order to provide transparency on any relationships FSA has initiated, or may initiate, with industry providers regarding this pilot program, please provide all data FSA has obtained from industry providers (including, but not limited to, Visa, MasterCard and American Express) regarding this pilot program.

Answer. Industry provider information was shared with FSA on a market research basis, with an understanding of confidentially.

ROLE OF DATA DRAWN FROM PREPAID CARD PILOT IN FSA'S MANAGEMENT OF OTHER PROGRAMS

Question. Does FSA intend to use the data that it gleans from this pilot program to inform changes to other programs it manages, such as student aid funding? If so please identify the programs FSA plans to address using these data.

Answer. FSA currently has no intention to use the data that it obtains the pilot program to inform changes to other programs.

OUTSIDE GROUPS CONSULTED IN FSA PAYMENT CARD DEVELOPMENT

Question. Which outside companies, particularly financial institutions, institutions of higher education, advocacy organizations, or governmental agencies were consulted in drafting the solicitation for the FSA payment card or otherwise had interactions that discussed the proposal?

Answer. To date, FSA has met with a wide variety of groups regarding the Payment Vehicle Account Program including:

—Financial Institutions: Mastercard; Visa; American Express; U.S. Bank, Customers Bank, BankMobile division; Citizens Bank; Fidelity Information Services (FIS); Total Systems (TSYS); and First Data Corporation (FDC)

—Government Agencies: United States Department of the Treasury; the Treasurer of the U.S.; and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection

—Members of Congress

—Associations: National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators; National Association of College & University Business Officers; National Association of College Stores; and the Association of American Publishers, including McGraw-Hill Education in conjunction with Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, Cengage, and Pearson

—Advocacy Organizations: Center of American Progress; New America; The Institute for College Access & Success; Student Veterans of America; and the National Consumer Law Center

Additionally, FSA received numerous inquiries to the draft solicitation of January 19, 2018. The companies inquiring were: Citibank, Berkeley College, Capella University, NCC Group, Conduent, Knewton, PayPal, Shazam, Deltek, Teleperformance, Discover, IDEMIA, and Black Dog Merchant Solutions.

UNAUTHORIZED WITHDRAWALS FOR IMPROPER TITLE IV PAYMENTS UNDER PREPAID CARD PILOT

Question. Does FSA intend to make unauthorized withdrawals from students' FSA Payment Card that are not initiated by students, such as withdrawing funds from a student's account for improper Title IV payments without their consent? If so, from what statutory authority does FSA derive this function?

Answer. FSA does not intend to, nor will it have any authority to, make unauthorized withdrawals from a student's Payment Vehicle Account.

EXPECTATION OF VENDOR CAPACITY TO SEGREGATE DIFFERENT FORMS OF FINANCIAL AID IN FSA PAYMENT CARD

Question. How does FSA intend for potential vendors to be able to segregate Federal financial aid types into discrete categories, as requested in the solicitation for the FSA Payment Card?

Answer. Based upon input form interested parties, FSA has changed its approach and does not intend for potential vendors to be able to segregate Federal financial aid types into discrete categories.

THIRD PARTY ACCESS TO FSA PAYMENT CARD DATA

Question. Will FSA allow any user information (such as purchase history, amounts, merchant type, or frequency) to be accessible by a potential vendor, institution of higher education, or third-party to operate a merchant discount or reward program through the FSA Payment Card?

Answer. No potential merchant or other third party will have access to any user information.

FSA PAYMENT CARD "OPT-IN" INFORMATION SHARING WITH THIRD PARTIES

Question. What specific types of information will a student be able to opt-in to share with a potential vendor, institution of higher education, or third-party to participate in a merchant discount or reward program through the FSA Payment Card?

Answer. All information added to the Payment Vehicle Account is the property of the student and sharing of this can only be allowed by the student on a specific case-by-case, opt-in basis.

PROTECTING STUDENTS FROM VENDOR PRIVACY VIOLATIONS UNDER FSA PAYMENT CARD CONTRACTS

Question. What types of oversight or enforcement actions may FSA take or conduct to protect students' right to privacy if a vendor violates the terms of any contract of the FSA Payment Card?

Answer. In the event of a contract violation of a student's privacy rights, FSA will have the authority to terminate a vendor agreement. Students will also have the right to seek redress from the issuing bank.

ALLOCATION OF REVENUE DERIVED FROM MERCHANT REWARD OR DISCOUNT PROGRAMS

Question. How will revenue be divided or shared between FSA, a potential vendor, institutions of higher education, a third-party, or any other applicable party, under a merchant discount or reward program?

Answer. FSA will not receive any revenue or be charged for any expense associated with the Payment Vehicle Account Program. Similarly, institutions will not receive any revenue. Students are the beneficiary of all aspects of the Payment Vehicle Account Program.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN FSA PAYMENT CARD PROGRAM

Question. Will the terms and conditions for fees charged by a vendor change over the lifecycle of a student's participation in the FSA Payment Card Program?

Answer. Terms and conditions for fees will not change over the lifecycle of a student's participation in the Payment Vehicle Account Program.

FSA PAYMENT CARD WARNINGS OR ALERTS

Question. In which scenarios does FSA envision sending students warnings or alerts when accessing funds in their FSA Payment Card Program account?

Answer. FSA envisions that a student would receive payment use fraud alerts by way of the Payment Vehicle Account; this is an effective and proven method to deter fraud.

PREVENTING PAYMENT CARD ALERTS FROM STEERING STUDENTS AWAY FROM NECESSARY PURCHASES

Question. How will FSA ensure that notifications do not dissuade students from making purchases that are necessary to meet basic needs?

Answer. FSA will not impose purchasing restrictions nor send purchasing cautions in relation to the Payment Vehicle Account Program.

PREVENTING PAYMENT CARD "NUDGING" FROM LIMITING STUDENTS' ACCESS TO THEIR FINANCIAL AID

Question. How will FSA ensure that "nudging" behaviors in this pilot do not result in additional bureaucratic hurdles that may pose barriers for students to access their financial resources, including Federal student aid?

Answer. Nothing from FSA in the Pilot will prevent students from accessing funds related to their account; however, students have always been required to agree that Title IV funds will be used only to pay educational and education-related expenses.

SCOPE, INTENT, AND CAPABILITIES OF "PAYMENT CARD AUTHORIZATION STREAM"

Question. Please define the scope, intent, and capabilities of a "Payment Card Authorization stream," which is otherwise not specified in the solicitation.

Answer. The scope of access to the Payment Vehicle Account Program authorization stream is based on ISO 8583, which is the international standard for financial and transaction messaging utilized by the payment networks. This capability would enable student elected real-time fraud alerts and student administered real-time transaction controls (as determined by the student) to provide updates, such as current balance information, open to buy, card on/off functionality, etc.

METRICS TO DETERMINE FSA PAYMENT CARD SUCCESS

Question. Please identify and explain what "satisfactory determination of success of the pilot" means, including metrics of success.

Answer. FSA will use a mixed-methods research approach to evaluate the efficacy of the Payment Vehicle Account Program, measuring Program adoption and engagement using both quantitative and qualitative elements. The Pilot presents a "test and learn" period to identify the best long-term approach for a successful Program.

The quantitative measurements for Program adoption will measure numerous items, including: the number of Super Portal Mobile App myMoney tile clicks and subsequent downloads; views of the Vendor Mobile App; and the number of FSA borrowers that elect to use the FSA Payment Vehicle Account option.

The qualitative measurements for Program engagement will assess, through interview-based research, how Payment Vehicle Account students and institutions rate

and evaluate the customer experience associated with the new Payment Account Alternative compared to alternative balance refund methods.

In evaluating performance, an independent party or organization will assist FSA.

ENSURING STUDENTS WITH LIMITED TECHNOLOGY ACCESS EQUITABLY BENEFIT FROM FSA PAYMENT CARD

Question. What specific steps will FSA take to ensure students without smartphones or high-speed Internet can equitably benefit from the FSA Payment Card Program?

Answer. FSA will work with all Pilot Implementers to ensure that the Pilot Implementation accommodates access to Payment Vehicle Accounts for all students.

INPUT AND FEEDBACK TO BE SOLICITED BEFORE EXPANDING FSA PAYMENT CARD PILOT

Question. What type of public comment, Congressional review, and stakeholder feedback processes will FSA conduct before expanding the pilot?

Answer. The extent of public comment feedback processes will be determined depending on the evaluation of the Pilot.

OPEN TEXTBOOK PILOT IMPLEMENTATION

Question. Can you please provide an update on the Department's implementation of this Pilot and how you expect it to achieve savings for students?

Answer. The Notice Inviting Applications for the Open Textbook Pilot Program will be published in late July. We anticipate conducting peer review of applications in August and making new awards by late September. We believe several features of the program will contribute to savings for students, including the focus on addressing gaps in the open textbook marketplace, the emphasis on providing open textbooks that can be used in high enrollment courses and high demand fields, the promotion of open source textbooks for multiple courses along a degree pathway, and the engagement of subject matter and educational technology experts to ensure that materials are high quality.

LEVERAGING STATE SUCCESS TO INFORM DEPARTMENT'S OPEN TEXTBOOK PILOT

Question. Georgia, New York, North Dakota, and Washington are among several States that have distributed grants to support programs at institutions of higher education that expand the creation and use of open textbooks and have successfully achieved savings for students many times more than the amount originally invested. Has the Department consulted with these States and to what extent will the Department leverage successful State-level models to expand the savings created by open textbooks to the millions of students nationwide in need of relief?

Answer. The Department did use information available about the investments in these States to inform the development of our Notice Inviting Applications. For example, many of these State-led efforts require that institutions work in consortiums and/or partnerships and we made a similar requirement a key absolute priority in our competition. Additionally, we solicited input from institutions at various meetings about existing efforts to expand open textbooks, and we will build on these efforts by requiring applicants to describe how they will disseminate information about the results of the project to other IHEs.

STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH IN OPEN TEXTBOOK PILOT

Question. What other stakeholders has the Department consulted to date about implementation of the Pilot? Please provide a list.

Answer. While consultation was limited due to the tight timeframe for implementing the pilot, Department staff consulted with a wide range of experts in this area, including representatives of publishing companies, college book stores the Task Force on Apprenticeship Expansion, the American Council of Community College Trustees, American Association of Community Colleges, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation, and other institutions of higher education that participated in conferences or meetings where Department staff were in attendance.

ANTICIPATED GRANTS TO BE AWARDED THROUGH OPEN TEXTBOOK FUNDING

Question. How many grants does the Department expect to offer as part of the Pilot? What does the Department expect the average size of grants to be awarded under the Pilot?

Answer. The Department expects to award between 1 and 3 grants through the Open Textbook Pilot. We estimate that the grants will range from $1,500,000 to $4,950,000.

ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED THROUGH OPEN TEXTBOOK GRANTS

Question. What primary activity or activities will the grants support?

Answer. The grants will provide funding to one or more institutions of higher education that leads a consortium that includes other institutions of higher education, subject matter experts, experts in educational technology or electronic curricular design, and workforce stakeholders to create new open textbooks that have the greatest potential to lead to the highest level of savings for students. Grants will support the review of existing open source materials, the development of new materials that either build upon or fill gaps among existing materials, the assessment of the efficacy of those materials in improving learning and reducing cost, and widespread implementation of the materials through a well-designed dissemination plan that includes faculty from other institutions.

COMPLIANCE WITH CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTIVE TO SUPPORT CHILDREN WHO EXPERIENCE TRAUMATIC EVENTS

Question. Chicago is a great city that I am proud to represent. In recent years, the city has experienced an epidemic of gun violence. Through the end of May, there had been over 1,000 shootings in the city of Chicago. That number is significantly lower than the previous 2 years, but it is still unacceptably high. Common-sense changes to our gun laws are an important part of solving the problem. But we must also address the underlying issues present in communities that experience high incidents of violence including high unemployment, lack of resources, and the trauma that children who are exposed to these environments experience. According to the Department of Health and Human Services nearly half of children nationwide experience at least one traumatic event before they reach the age of 17. We know that having experienced trauma as a child makes a person more likely to become involved in the criminal justice system and suffer negative health, educational, and social outcomes. However, too few children who experience trauma are currently identified and provided with the right care and support. Frankly, your fiscal year 2019 budget would only exacerbate this problem so I want to focus on something Congress did in fiscal year 2018 to actually help. In addition to ignoring many of the harmful and shortsighted cuts put forward by this Administration, Congress also directed the Department of Education—and other agencies funded in the Labor-HHS bill—to enhance coordination of activities that address child trauma, identify trauma-informed best practices, and promote programs to identify, appropriately refer, and implement supportive interventions for children and families who have experienced trauma.

In April, Senator Capito and I sent you a letter about this directive and the critical nature of this issue across the country—not just in Chicago. Can you please provide us with an update on the Department of Education's activities to comply with this directive to support children who have experienced traumatic events?

Answer. The Department is engaged in a wide range of activities to support State educational agencies (SEAs), local educational agencies (LEAs), and schools in meeting the needs of children who experience trauma on and off school grounds, including identifying and adopting best practices in trauma-informed care. For example, the Project Prevent program currently helps 20 school districts: (1) increase their capacity to identify, assess and serve students exposed to pervasive violence; (2) ensure that affected students are offered mental health services for trauma or anxiety; (3) provide support for conflict resolution programs; and (4) implement other school—based violence prevention strategies to reduce the likelihood that these students will commit violent acts at a later time.

The Department's longstanding School Climate Transformation Grant (SCTG) program makes competitive grants to SEAs and LEAs to develop, enhance or expand systems of support for schools implementing multi-tiered behavioral frameworks for improving behavioral outcomes and learning conditions for all students. These frameworks help schools identify, adopt, and implement evidence-based interventions, which, in response to locally determined needs, may include trauma-informed care.

Our Project School Emergency Response to Violence (Project SERV) program funds short-term and long-term education-related services for LEAs and institutions of higher education to help them recover from a violent or traumatic event in which the learning environment has been disrupted.

We also fund technical assistance that is provided to youth who have experienced trauma. Our Office of Safe and Healthy Students (OSHS) funds the National Center on Safe Supportive Learning Environments, which offers information and technical assistance related to youth and trauma, including sexual assault trauma and the effects of the opioids crisis on children and families. OSHS also funds the National Center for Homeless Education TA Center, which provides a variety of resources related to youth trauma, including Child Trauma Toolkit for Educators, a Trauma-Informed Care and Trauma-Specific Services brief, a Trauma-Informed Organizational Toolkit, and an Understanding Traumatic Stress in Children guide.

PLANNED USE OF AUTHORITY TO EXPAND PERFORMANCE PARTNERSHIP PILOTS

Question. The Performance Partnership Pilot program provides States and local communities, like Chicago, with flexibility to improve services for disconnected youth. It encourages coordination among participating Federal agencies—including the U.S. Departments of Education, Labor, Health and Human Services, the Corporation for National and Community Service, the Institute for Museum and Library Services, and Department of Justice. This flexibility enables communities to pursue the most innovative and effective ways to use their existing funds to improve outcomes for the neediest youth, including those who have experienced trauma and gun violence. Section 525 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of fiscal year 2018 allows agencies to use Federal discretionary funds to carry out up to 10 additional Performance Partnership Pilots. Do you plan to carry out any new Pilots using this authority? If so, how many?

Answer. The Department plans to announce a competition for Performance Partnership Pilots under the fiscal year 2018 authority later this year. The number of pilots awarded will depend on the quality and quantity of applications received.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JACK REED

PROPOSED CUTS IN CONTEXT OF SUPPORTING GREAT TEACHERS

Question. When you testified at the House Education and Workforce Committee last month, you said, "I think great teachers need to be supported. I think they should be better compensated, and I think they should be treated as professionals . . . " Yet when teachers across the country have stood up for their profession and for their students, insisting that States invest in public education you told them that they should "keep adult disagreements and disputes in a separate place." Given that your budget eliminates the Teacher Quality Partnership Grant and over $2 billion in the Supporting Effective Instruction State Grants to support recruitment, induction, and professional development for our Nation's educators, how are you, in fact, supporting "great teachers?"

Answer. Recruiting, training, supporting, and retaining effective teachers is a core State and local responsibility under our education system, and the proposed reduction of $2.4 billion for teacher programs represents about one-third of 1 percent of the more than $700 billion that our Nation spends annually on public elementary and secondary education. Moreover, our research and evaluation efforts consistently have shown that Federal funds largely have been used for activities that have not been shown to be effective.

EVIDENCE FOR CLAIM THAT SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION STATE GRANTS ARE INEFFECTIVE

Question. You have also claimed that the Supporting Effective Instruction State Grant program is ineffective, but States are only in the early stages of implementation. What is your evidence that the new law is ineffective?

Answer. The reauthorized Supporting Effective Instruction State Grant program largely continues the activities supported under the antecedent program, Improving Teacher Quality State Grants, and there is no evidence that the changes would make a difference in program effectiveness. If States and districts have identified teacher practices that they would like to continue, they may do so with other Federal funds, such as Title I, or with State and local funds.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND CORRECTIVE MEASURES REGARDING TEACH GRANTS

Question. Thank you for agreeing to provide information on steps the Department is taking to address the servicing issues with the TEACH Grant Program. Specifically, please provide information on the on-going review of the program and how the Department plans to resolve issues related to TEACH Grants that were unfairly

converted into loans. Additionally, please provide information about the guidance the Department has given to FedLoan Servicing regarding administering the TEACH Grants and tracking the service requirement. What specific metrics are the Department using to evaluate the performance of FedLoan Servicing in administering this program?

Answer. The Department reaffirms its commitment to improve its administration of the Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) Grant Program. Taking note of past servicing issues, the Department is studying all aspects of the program to determine necessary modifications so as to align servicing of the TEACH Grants with Congressional intent. This will ensure that students who agree to teach for 4 years at an elementary school, secondary school, or educational service agency that serves students from low-income families have the resources and support that they need.

In the interim, the Department will continue to perform oversight and review of TEACH Grant-related disputes and escalated issues resulting from interactions with recipients. Moreover, the Department will continue to perform periodic on-site and off-site monitoring to ensure adherence to existing TEACH Grant regulations, requirements, and other issues.

FEDERAL LAWS APPLICABLE TO OPPORTUNITY GRANTS PROPOSAL

Question. You have previously testified that private schools receiving Federal funds would have to comply with Federal law. With regard to your Opportunity Grants proposal, please provide a detailed list of Federal laws that would apply to schools receiving voucher funds. For example, would all voucher schools be required to comply with all civil rights laws? Would these schools have to provide the same rights and protections as required under IDEA? Would they have to meet the accountability and reporting requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act?

Answer. We have consistently stated that all recipients of Federal education funds must comply with all applicable civil rights laws. As we are flexible on many aspects of program design and intend to work out the details of our proposals with Congress, it is impossible to be more precise regarding any applicable laws and requirements, including those related to accountability.

NEGATIVE ACHIEVEMENT OUTCOMES IN DC VOUCHER PROGRAM

Question. The Department of Education's evaluation of the D.C. voucher program found the program to have a negative impact on student achievement. Given your stated aim to promote evidence-based models, why do you continue to promote this program?

Answer. We know from other research, including studies of charter schools, that the positive effects of educational interventions may increase over time. Consequently, we believe it is too soon to reach a final conclusion on the effectiveness of private school choice options, and we look forward to the third and final impact report of the current evaluation expected during fiscal year 2019.

PROJECTED IMPACT OF DEPARTMENT'S PROPOSED STUDENT AID BUDGET ON ENROLLMENT, RETENTION, COMPLETION AND BORROWING

Question. Please provide an analysis of the impact on student enrollment, retention, completion, and borrowing if the Department's student aid budget were to be implemented. What would be the impact on unmet need for students from low- and moderate income families?

Answer. The fiscal year 2019 Budget for the Federal student aid programs focuses on simplifying funding for college and addressing the unique needs of today's students. To these ends, the Budget proposes expanding Pell Grant recipients' eligibility to include high-quality short-term programs that provide students with a credential, certification, or license in an in-demand field, with sufficient requirements in place to balance student needs with taxpayer interests. The Department estimates that in Award Year 2019–2020, 88,000 new recipients will avail themselves of this expanded eligibility. These numbers are expected to grow steadily to 168,000 new recipients by Award Year 2028–2029. As far as impact on overall student enrollment, it is difficult to estimate, because some of these recipients would have already been enrolled or planning to enroll. Nevertheless, this proposal can be seen as an important component of the Administration's overall strategy for improving America's workforce and expanding alternative pathways to postsecondary education.

The fiscal year 2019 Budget for the student aid programs is not expected to have a demonstrable impact on unmet need. Borrowing is expected to remain roughly level, with undergraduate volume largely shifting to Unsubsidized Loans. At page

36 of the Department's fiscal year 2019 Budget Summary, the first effects of this shift can be seen in the 2019 column. Although reductions are proposed in the Campus-Based Aid programs, these reductions amount to about 1.2 percent of Title IV aid available and less than 0.9 percent of all Federal aid available; however, these reductions are offset by the proposal to expand Pell eligibility. In addition, we propose to target aid more effectively (such as through Federal Work Study), which should improve the overall effectiveness of Federal student aid dollars. The Department does expect that its proposals will simplify student aid from the student perspective, which could have positive effects on enrollment, retention, and completion.

FUNDING NECESSARY TO CLOSE ACHIEVEMENT GAP IN ADULT EDUCATION

Question. In your budget justification, you noted, "there continues to be a need for Federal investment in adult education programs, in part because the United States is increasingly losing ground in employment related skills to many of its economic competitors." Yet your budget request once again recommends a cut for Adult Education State Grants. Congress provided an increase of $35 million for adult education for fiscal year 2018. Do you support increasing the Federal investment in adult education? What level of Federal, State, and local investments would be necessary to close the gaps between U.S. adults and our international competitors?

Answer. The Administration does not currently support an increase for Adult Education State Grants. Although we recognize that adult education may generally improve literacy, employment, and other outcomes, this program has not demonstrated its effectiveness. The Department has commenced a program evaluation that should provide insight into whether the program is making an impact that could justify increased Federal investment.

PLANS AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT IN SHIFTING FROM PRIVATE COLLECTION AGENCIES

Question. It has been reported that the Department plans to move away from hiring collection agencies and instead contract with other types of companies to provide enhanced services to borrowers who are delinquent. Please provide more details about these plans and the services you envision these companies providing. Do you plan to base outreach and enhanced services regionally or by some other borrower characteristics? How have you engaged stakeholders, including institutions of higher education, student loan borrowers, State and non-profit student loan entities, and consumer advocates in developing the proposal?

Answer. The Department is in the process of reviewing and refining our approach to delinquency prevention and default collection, with the goal of improving outcomes for borrowers and enhancing our stewardship of the over $1.5 trillion Federal student loan portfolio. Past experience, the results of pilots and other analyses, market research activities, and input from a broad range of sources within and outside of government will continue to inform this process. Details of our plans have not been finalized but will be made public as they are completed.

ALLOCATION OF TRIO FUNDING INCREASE

Question. Congress provided a 6 percent increase for the TRIO programs for fiscal year 2018. How does the Department plan to allocate that increase to address the issues with the 2017 applications and ensure that current grantees have sufficient funds to meet program requirements and provide for cost of living adjustments for program staff?

Answer. The Department is using the $60 million increase provided for the Federal TRIO programs consistent with the language included in the explanatory statement accompanying the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018. For example, we are currently reviewing the applications from 40 applicants from the fiscal year 2017 competitions whose applications were previously rejected for budget errors and will provide funding to any and all of these applicants that achieve scores that would have put them in the funding range in last year's competitions. We also plan to use a portion of the additional funding to provide an across-the-board increase to all current TRIO grantees.

POLICY SHIFTS FAVORING PRIVATE EDUCATION LOANS

Question. A June 1, 2018, article on MarketWatch quoted Federal Student Aid's Dr. A. Wayne Johnson as having said at a recent conference that the Department "was mainly supportive of Federal loan programs, but that would likely change in the near future" and the article noted that a Department spokeswoman didn't respond to requests for comment about the speech. Is the Department currently con-

sidering changes to FSA websites that would no longer encourage borrowers to exhaust their Federal loan eligibility before turning to private educational loan products?

Answer. The Department fully supports the current Federal student loan programs. We are committed to ensuring that our websites provide customers with clear, complete, and accurate information on the full range of options available to help finance their education, The Department is committed to working with Congress to do more to ensure that students fully understand the hazards of over-borrowing, of defaulting on their loans, and of the long-term cost of borrowing.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JEANNE SHAHEEN

EFFECT OF PROPOSED WORK-STUDY CUT ON UNDERGRADUATES

Question. Secretary DeVos, you testified that the proposed funding cut for the Federal Work Study Program requested in your Department's budget for fiscal year 2019 would only impact graduate students. Given that your budget requests $500 million for Federal Work Study, which is 56 percent below the $1.13 billion the program was funded at in fiscal year 2018, how do you anticipate that the undergraduate students who rely on the program would not be impacted?

Answer. As I stated in my response, our budget proposal was focused on providing the greatest opportunity for the students with the greatest need. Therefore, the Department proposes to focus Federal Work Study (FWS) dollars on undergraduate students and prioritize funding to institutions enrolling high numbers of Pell Grant recipients. Our proposal would also reform Federal Work Study to ensure that it supports workforce and career-oriented training opportunities for low-income undergraduate students as opposed to subsidizing employment as a means of financial aid. Overall, coupled with our other student aid proposals such as Expanding Pell Grant Eligibility to Short-Term Programs, I feel that this budget will positively impact undergraduate students with the most need, providing them alternative pathways to successful careers while minimizing costs to students and families.

APPEAL PROCESS FOR TEACH GRANT-TO-LOAN CONVERSION

Question. I am concerned about reports of problems within the Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) Grant program, particularly regarding high rates of erroneous conversions of participants' grants to loans. What is the current process for a TEACH Grant recipient to appeal a grant-to-loan conversion?

Answer. 34 C.F.R. § 686.43(d) states that, once a TEACH Grant is converted to a Direct Unsubsidized Loan, it cannot be reconverted to a grant; however, this does not preclude the Department from reinstating TEACH Grants when it has been determined that a TEACH Grant was converted to a loan due to a servicing error. The Department has taken steps to define what constitutes a servicing error and has formalized this step in contractual servicing requirements for TEACH Grant servicers. Recipients who contend that a servicer converted their TEACH Grant(s) in error may appeal to the Department. Moreover, recipients whose TEACH Grants converted for reasons other than a defined servicing error may also appeal to the Department, which will review the appeal.

NUMBER OF TEACH LOAN CONVERSIONS DISPUTED, REVIEWED, AND RECONVERTED

Question. How many TEACH Grant recipients have disputed the conversion of their grants to loans? In how many of those cases did ED staff review the disputes? In what share of the cases were the loans reconverted to grants?

Answer. The Department does not track the number of recipients submitting disputes and instead maintains data on the number of total TEACH Grant disputes received since FedLoan Servicing began originating TEACH Grants. There have been 10,908 TEACH Grant disputes related to grant-to-loan conversions since April 2013; of those disputes, 3,232 were appealed to the Department. The following table delineates the number of disputes approved for TEACH Grant reinstatement.

—FedLoan Approvals 5,175
—FSA Approvals 1, 508
—Total Approvals 6,683

FEDLOAN SERVICING CORRECTIVE ACTIONS FOR TEACH ERRORS

Question. Please provide any actions FedLoan Servicing has taken to correct grant-to-loan conversions that were or are suspected to have been made in error,

including details on whether loans were reconverted into grants, whether any payments were returned to teachers, and any communication to consumer credit bureaus.

Answer. In 2014, the Department detected anomalies in conversion rates that it later determined to be incorrect conversions. Although discovered while FedLoan Servicing was the designated TEACH Grant servicer, the errors occurred prior to its involvement in the program. Therefore, the actions taken consisted of contractual changes that required FedLoan Servicing to perform outreach to recipients whose TEACH Grants were incorrectly converted to a loan and to offer the option of TEACH Grant reinstatements. In general, the reinstatement of a TEACH Grant requires the following:

—Written communication to recipients explaining the TEACH Grant(s) reinstatement

—Application of previous loan payments to Department-held loans serviced at FedLoan Servicing. If no other Ed-held loans are serviced by FedLoan Servicing, payments are refunded automatically to the recipient; and

—Updated information to any credit reporting agencies.

FEDLOAN CUSTOMER SERVICE FOR TEACH RECIPIENTS

Question. Does FedLoan Servicing have specialized customer representative teams to respond to TEACH Grant recipients whose grants have been converted to loans?

Answer. FedLoan Servicing has dedicated Customer Service Representatives (CSR) for TEACH Grant servicing, and converted recipients are not hindered from handling disputes directly with them. Generally, converted recipients initially contact FedLoan Servicing's CSRs, who have the specialized training necessary to launch a TEACH Grant dispute. Once a dispute has been initiated, it would then be assigned to the dedicated TEACH Grant team for review and handling.

FEDLOAN TIMELINE FOR CORRECTING TEACH ERRORS

Question. Does FedLoan Servicing have clear timeframes for reviewing TEACH Grant paperwork for errors and communicating those errors to recipients? If so, what are those timeframes?

Answer. The review and response period for TEACH Grant certification is 10 days, which includes the review and the decision (approval, denial, or pending, if incomplete) Additionally, the Department reviews on a weekly basis various indicators, such as call center statistics, data on disputes, and denial reasons to ensure that processing anomalies are addressed. In the event an error does occur, FSA reviews to ensure a timely remediation, communications to the recipient, and completion of any remediation.

INVOLUNTARY COLLECTION RESULTING FROM ERRONEOUS TEACH LOAN CONVERSIONS

Question. How many TEACH Grant recipients are or have been the subject of involuntary collection proceedings for repayment of TEACH Grants converted to loans?

Answer. The Department is committed to providing the information requested to support the review and oversight of the TEACH Grant program; however, the Department does not typically calculate the requested metric. The Department is actively reviewing the data available to determine the most efficient means to provide this data as soon as it becomes available.

SPECIFIC PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS CHARACTERIZED AS "BAD ACTORS"

Question. As part of your confirmation hearing and in response to several questions for the record related to fraud and misconduct at colleges that misuse taxpayer dollars, you repeatedly stated that "Fraud should never be tolerated. Period. Bad actors clearly exist—in both public and nonpublic institutions". While there have been individual bad actors across many types of institutions, I am not aware of a public institution of higher education that has systematically defrauded the Federal student aid program with actions such as making false statements about graduates' earnings or misrepresenting the purpose of a degree program. Which public institutions were you referring to with your statement?

Answer. In 2012, an investigation revealed that the University of Illinois Law School had published inflated median grade-point averages and Law School Admission Test scores for six entering law school classes (2005 and 2007–2011, graduating in 2008 and 2010–2014). As a result, the American Bar Association (ABA) levied an unprecedented $250,000 fine and public censure against the institution.

Unfortunately, no sector of higher education is immune to this kind of conduct. By way of illustration, in 2012, it was reported that Claremont McKenna College, Emory University, and George Washington University submitted false data to U.S. News about undergraduate admissions, as did Tulane University's business school with regard to MBA degree admissions. Bucknell University has similarly admitted that, from 2006 through 2012, the institution misreported SAT and ACT averages to make the institution appear to be more selective than it was. More recently, Temple University admitted to misrepresentations regarding the percentage of its online MBA students who took entrance exams prior to being admitted—a misrepresentation that put Temple's online graduate business school at the top of U.S. News rankings.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JEFF MERKLEY

"ENFORCEMENT DISCLOSURE" POLICY EXPLANATION, REQUESTS AND DOCUMENTATION

Question. It was recently reported that the Department has issued a memorandum interpreting the requirements of the Privacy Act to deny access to State agencies seeking Federal student loan records from student loan servicers, which can include call recordings, and other work product created by these Federal contractors. The Department's Statement of Records Notice (SORN) for the Direct Loan Program (Common Services For Borrowers (CSB), 18–11–16), establishes through its "Enforcement Disclosure" provision that "in the event that information in this system of records indicates, either on its face or in connection with other information, a violation or potential violation of any applicable statute, regulation, or order of a competent authority, the Department may disclose the relevant records to the appropriate agency, whether foreign, Federal, State, Tribal or local, charged with the responsibility of investigating or prosecuting that violation or charged with enforcing or implementing the statute, Executive Order, rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant thereto."

a. Please provide a detailed explanation of the Department's policy that governs such a disclosure, including the name of the official responsible for making determinations related to this disclosure and the criteria used to determine the scope of records relevant to a request from an appropriate agency.

b. Please provide a detailed list of all individual requests made to the Department under the "Enforcement Disclosure" provision over the last 5 years, including the identity of the third party making the request, the identity of the student loan servicer or debt collector subject to investigation or oversight, and the date on which such a request was made.

c. Please indicate any requests for which the Department of Education has not yet made a determination under the "Enforcement Disclosure" provision and indicate the number of days such a request has been pending.

d. Please indicate any requests that have been denied under the "Enforcement Disclosure" provision over the last 5 years, along with the grounds for denial and the name of the Education Department official responsible for making this determination.

e. Please provide a copy of the memorandum cited in the Politico reporting on December 27, 2017, regarding the "Enforcement Disclosure" policy.

Answer. a. The Department's policies regarding disclosure of records subject to the Privacy Act reflect our utmost concern to protect borrowers' privacy and individually identifiable information. The Department has discretion ("may disclose the relevant records . . .) and generally considers Privacy Act requests from local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies "on a case-by case basis." Common Services for Borrowers (CSB) SOR (18–11–16) published at 81 F.R. 60686. FSA consults with the Department's Office of the General Counsel concerning decisions related to disclosing the applicable records.

b. The Department does not maintain a list of these applicable requests and so is unable to provide the requested information.

c. The Department does not maintain a list of pending Privacy Act requests and will not comment on any deliberations regarding any potential disclosure of Privacy Act-protected records requests made pursuant to the Privacy Act.

d. The Department does not maintain a list of the denied requests and is unable to provide you with the requested information. The decisions related to disclosing the applicable records are made by the office of Federal Student Aid in consultation with the Department's Office of the General Counsel.

e. Please see the enclosed memorandum (an example of the letter that was transmitted).

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jill Leitl
Great Lakes Educational Loan Services, Inc.
2401 International Ln.
Madison, WI 53704

FROM: Patrick A. Bradfield
Director, Federal Student Aid Acquisitions
U.S. Department of Education

DATE: December 27, 2017

SUBJECT Ownership of and Access to U.S Department of Education Records and Data

---

The U.S. Department of Education (Department) through its office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) maintains individually identifying information regarding the application for, distribution of, and repayment and collection of federal student loans and grants authorized pursuant to Title IV of the Higher Education Act (HEA) of 1965, as amended. The Privacy Act of 1974, as amended by 5 U.S.C. § 552a (Privacy Act), protects any such information in records regarding such applications, loans, and grants that the Department maintains in any system of records. A "system of records" is a group of records under the Department's control from which information is retrieved by the name of the individual or by some other unique identifier assigned to the individual. The Department cannot collect, maintain, use, or disseminate such information without complying with the Privacy Act, which provides for civil and criminal penalties for the unlawful release of protected information. The Privacy Act requires the Department to publish in the Federal Register a System of Records Notice (SORN) when establishing any new system of records or when making significant changes to an existing system of records.

All federal loan servicers, private collection agencies, and other Department contractors who support the federal student aid programs must comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act when they access or use Privacy Act-protected records of the Department. All records maintained in any Department systems of records to which the Department provides its contractors access remain at all times records of the Department, not records of a contractor. Any request from any third party for Department records to which a contractor has access must be made directly to the Department, where it will be evaluated for compliance with the requirements of the Privacy Act, unless the contract has specifically provided otherwise.

The procedures for submitting Privacy Act and Freedom of Information Act requests to the Department are found at 34 CFR Part 5 Subpart C and § 5b.5 and on the Department's website, respectively, at:

- http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/foia/request_privacy.html; and
- http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/foia/request_foia.html

The Department's compilation of SORNs is available at https://www2.ed.gov/notices/ed-pia.html.

Any questions concerning this Memorandum should be directed to your Contracting Officer.

830 First St. N.E., Washington, DC 20202
www.FederalStudentAid.ed.gov
1-800-4-FED-AID

CLARIFICATION OF STANCE ON OBAMA ADMINISTRATION BORROWER DEFENSE POLICY

Question. You have previously said that a cheated student loan borrower simply had to "raise his or her hands to be entitled to so-called free money" under the Obama Administration's borrower defense process. Given that the previous Administration simply provided a discharge of outstanding loan obligations that students would otherwise have otherwise been required to repay for an education that was determined to have been fraudulently provided, what did you mean by these comments?

Answer. The policies in this area introduced by the prior administration lacked the analytical rigor needed for an adjudicative process, without which could result in the loss of billions of taxpayer dollars. Borrowers who relied upon and were harmed by fraudulent misrepresentations should be eligible for borrower defense relief. The standards for evaluating such claims should be rigorous to ensure the approval of only valid claims from eligible borrowers.

INSTITUTIONAL LIABILITY FOR DEBT RELIEF EXPENSES UNDER BORROWER DEFENSE

Question. Is the Department considering any steps to recoup funds for the cost of debt relief from the institutions of higher education that are subject to borrower defense claims under the current borrower defense regulations and process?

Answer. Consistent with the Secretary's authority under 34 C.F.R. § 685.206(c)(3), the Department will initiate proceedings against an institution that had engaged in acts or omissions that would give rise to a cause of action under State law. To date, the Department has approved borrower defense claims related only to institutions that are insolvent and for which the appropriate statute of limitations stated in the borrower defense regulation has already run.

EXTRADEPARTMENTAL INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING BUDGETARY IMPACT OF BORROWER DEFENSE

Question. Has the Department ever been advised or directed to reduce the budgetary impact of borrower defense relief from senior officials within the Office of Management and Budget, U.S. Department of the Treasury, or the White House?

Answer. No, it has not.

DELAY OF BORROWER DEFENSE RULE AND STUDENT PROTECTION

Question. In a press release produced by your agency concerning the delay of the borrower defense to repayment ("borrower defense") rules, you stated that "It is the Department's aim, and this Administration's commitment, to protect students from predatory practices." Please describe specifically how the delay of the borrower defense rule protects students from predatory practices.

Answer. The Department continues to protect students from predatory practices through its program reviews, oversight activities and investigations, and we con-

tinue to process the nearly 170,000 borrower defense claims already received. The implementation of the borrower defense to repayment regulations was delayed in order to provide time for negotiated rulemaking to address the many elements of the regulation that were unworkable, costly, and unfair. The Department believes that students who have been deceived by predatory practices should receive financial compensation and be made whole, but this should be at the expense of the institution rather than the taxpayer. In addition, judicial proceedings or arbitration are the best ways for borrowers to pursue restitution for acts of consumer fraud since those proceedings can include not just reimbursement for Federal student loans, but for the total cost of attendance (including cash and other forms of credit) and for the opportunity costs associated with attending an institution that committed an act of fraud.

TOTAL VOLUME AND ACCRUED INTEREST ON LOANS RECEIVING PARTIAL RELIEF UNDER BORROWER DEFENSE

Question. In cases where the Department has granted "partial relief" to borrower defense claims, what is the current total volume and average amount of accrued interest on such loans from the period during which the claims were under review, and at the point in which the borrowers were expected to re-enter repayment on the remaining balance?

Answer. 15,029 borrowers were approved for partial discharge. The average amount of interest that accrued on those loans during the review period was $0.00 since borrowers at the time they entered repayment received a credit for the approximate amount of interest that had accrued during the time the claim was pending.

STUDENT AID ENFORCEMENT UNIT STAFFING

Question. What is the number of currently employed, full-time equivalent, nonmanagerial employees in each of the Student Aid Enforcement Unit's four staff groups: Investigations, Borrower Defense, Administrative Actions and Appeals, and Clery?

Answer. There are four full-time employees in the Investigations Group; six full-time employees and one part-time employee in the Borrower Defense Unit; 10 employees in the Administrative Actions and Appeals Service Group; and 16 employees in the Clery Act Compliance Division.

INVESTIGATIONS GROUP STAFFING ALLOCATION

Question. How many staff are currently dedicated to the work of conducting investigations within the Investigations Group—not including managers and others who have been assigned to other tasks?

Answer. Each member of the staff is dedicated to the work of conducting investigations. This investigatory work can be conducted as a standalone investigation or in support of other FSA teams, such as Program Compliance, the Administrative Actions and Appeals Service Group, and the Borrower Defense Unit.

STATUS OF DEVRY INVESTIGATION

Question. The Department announced in October 2016 that it would "continue to support the FTC's ongoing lawsuit against DeVry, while also continuing its own investigations of the institution." Has this investigation continued in your Administration?

Answer. To preserve the integrity of investigations, program reviews and other enforcement activities, the Department's practice is to neither confirm nor deny current or potential investigations.

RESPONSE TO STAFF REQUESTS TO CONTINUE DEVRY INVESTIGATIONS

Question. Has the Department responded to staff requests during your tenure (since January 20, 2017) to continue or move forward with investigations into DeVry?

Answer. To preserve the integrity of investigations, program reviews and other enforcement activities, the Department's practice is to neither confirm nor deny current or potential investigations.

NEW INVESTIGATIONS IN FSA UNDER TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Question. How many new investigations have been opened by the Investigations Group under your Administration (since January 20, 2017)?

Answer. Nine new investigations have been opened.

INVESTIGATIONS PROMPTING ENFORCEMENT UNDER TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

Question. How many investigations—not minor compliance reviews—conducted by the Investigations Group have resulted in an enforcement action under your Administration (since January 20, 2017)?

Answer. Not all investigations result in an enforcement action, but thus far there have been no enforcement actions taken as a result of investigations by the Investigations Group that have begun since January 20, 2017.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR BRIAN SCHATZ

BILINGUALISM IN NATIONAL SECURITY AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

Question. The American Academy of Arts and Sciences released a report last year that details the advantages of bilingualism. It calls for the U.S. to prioritize investments in language education for the purpose of increasing our national security and providing better social and cognitive development opportunities to our youth.

How will you utilize the findings and recommendations in this report to inform your work?

Answer. National security is one of this Administration's top priorities. The American Academy of Arts and Sciences' report entitled "America's Languages: Investing in Language Education for the 21st Century" cites a number of recommendations to improve access to language education for people of all ages, ethnicities, and socioeconomic backgrounds, as well as preparing language teachers and promoting public-private partnerships in language education.

The report aligns with a number of the major priorities in the President's 2019 Budget Request. For example, President Trump's emphasis on providing every student the opportunity to attend a school of his or her choice will lead to more options for students and families, including both public and private schools that give priority to bilingualism and foreign language instruction.

At the same time, the Administration is committed to strengthening the Federal investment in education by eliminating funding for programs that are duplicative, ineffective, or more appropriately supported with State, local, or private funds. For this reason, no funds are requested for the International Education programs at the Department. The Department of Defense, the State Department, and other Federal agencies offer a number of programs that support similar activities; consequently, the Administration's overall fiscal year 2019 request provides sufficient resources for programs critical to our national security and global competitiveness.

DUAL LANGUAGE IMMERSION IN CHARTER SCHOOLS

Question. In Hawaii, public charter schools play a significant role in language immersion education. Dual language immersion schools empower students to achieve fluency and literacy in multiple languages.

Will you commit to studying the impact of high quality dual language immersion schools as part of the Charter Schools Program?

Answer. The Department agrees that language immersion programs offer an important educational option for our Nation's students, including English learners. We will consider including effective charter school immersion programs in our efforts to disseminate best-practice information under the Charter Schools Program.

AUTHORITY TO FOLD OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION INTO OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Question. The legal basis for the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) derives from the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in Lau v. Nichols. Under this landmark 1974 case, school districts that receive Federal funding are required to ensure all students have equal educational opportunities, including through the establishment of multi-lingual programs for language minority students.

What legal authorities do you believe you have to eliminate the independent Office of English Language Acquisition and disperse its staff across the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education?

Answer. The Department of Education is proposing to integrate the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) into the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE), not eliminate it or its functions. The Secretary has general authority to reorganize the Department pursuant to section 413 of the Department of Education Organization Act (20 U.S.C. § 3473), and any reorganization of the Department would comply with this provision. The Department is working closely with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), its Office of the General Counsel

(OGC), and others to ensure that the reorganization is conducted in accordance with the law.

The Department recognizes the importance of ensuring that English learners are afforded equal access to education and the valuable role that the Director's position and OELA contribute to meeting that goal. The Department notes that the amendments made by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) places a heightened emphasis on English learners. ESSA moved the accountability provisions relating to English learner progress from Title III to Title I. Thus, the statute requires State ESEA plans to address long-term goals for English learner progress, including an English learner indicator, as an integral part of State school accountability systems. Just as States are adjusting to this change by breaking down silos between Title I and Title III State-level offices, so too is the Department. The proposed reorganization will allow the Department to provide States with the technical assistance needed across programs. Once implemented, the Department expects that its proposed changes will enhance Department operations and leverage resources to better serve English learner students and their families. The Department is committed to maintaining an effective OELA that continues to support and helps to facilitate compliance by States and local educational agencies in their efforts to provide a high-quality education to English learners.

OELA REORGANIZATION AND ESSA COMPLIANCE

Question. Do you believe the elimination of an independent OELA complies with the legislative provisions authorized in the Every Student Succeeds Act?

Answer. The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) place a heightened emphasis on English learners. ESSA moved the accountability provisions relating to English learner progress from Title III to Title I. Thus, the statute requires State ESEA plans to address long-term goals for English learner progress, including an English learner indicator, as an integral part of State school accountability systems. Just as States are adjusting to this change by breaking down silos between Title I and Title III State-level offices, so too is the Department with its proposed reorganization.

OELA REORGANIZATION AND STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS

Question. OELA is charged with preserving heritage languages and cultures in addition to ensuring educational support for English learners. How does the proposed reorganization serve the purposes of other statutes such as the Native American Languages Act?

Answer. The Department is committed to maintaining an effective Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA) that continues to support and helps to facilitate compliance by States and local educational agencies in their efforts to provide a high-quality education to English learners. The integration of OELA into the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education will not reduce its functions.

STUDENT DEBT AND FEDERAL ROLE IN ADDRESSING

Question. 44 million Americans currently have student loan debt. College debt has increased 170 percent since 2006 and now exceeds $1.4 trillion dollars. This is the highest category of consumer debt behind mortgages. It surpasses even credit card debt and auto loans. We are already seeing the economic drag of student loan debt. It is a major reason that homeownership is down—as many as 360,000 young Americans didn't buy a house in 2015 because of the costs of college.

a. Do you believe we have a student debt problem?

b. Do you believe that the Federal Government has a role in addressing student debt?

c. What are your justifications for undermining the Federal programs that help address student loan debt, like public service loan forgiveness and income-based repayment?

d. What steps will you take to ensure public higher education is affordable and accessible?

Answer. a. Student loan debt is a tremendous problem for students and parents, with potentially catastrophic consequences on the Federal budget and the national deficit in the not-so-distant future. The Department believes that income-based repayment plans and loan forgiveness programs, although beneficial to borrowers in repayment, also create perverse incentives that encourage students to borrow to the maximum limit because they believe (mistakenly) that income-driven repayment programs will reduce the repayment burden. Some institutions also promote income-

driven repayment plans as a strategy for reducing student and parent concerns about tuition costs.

b. The Department believes that the Federal Government has an important role to play in addressing student debt. For too many years the Government has promoted student and parent borrowing, first by introducing the unsubsidized loan program and raising the cap on ParentPLUS loans in 1992, and subsequently by continuing to increase borrowing limits. Increased borrowing limits, coupled with prohibitions on institutions interfering with a student's right to borrow (except in narrowly-defined situations), cost of attendance definitions that require institutions to include local housing costs (including for non-residential campuses) and policy objectives that emphasized the importance of every American earning a college degree have all contributed to the $1.45 trillion dollar student loan problem.

The Department is very concerned that, despite the best intentions, income-based repayment plans and loan forgiveness programs have created a set of perverse incentives that enable students to justify borrowing to the limits with the belief that they will not be burdened by large monthly payments and that they will receive loan forgiveness. What many of these borrowers do not understand is that loan forgiveness is taxed as income, resulting in unexpected tax liabilities that many borrowers may be unable to pay. Despite their usefulness in helping low-income borrowers manage their repayment obligation, research has shown that students who benefit most from income-driven repayment plans are those who earn a graduate education, meaning that resources intended to help the lowest income borrowers are being reappropriated to more affluent borrowers with higher earning potentials.

In addition, for far too long the Federal Government has encouraged all students to go to college, even when this may not be the best option for all students. The majority of our post-secondary resources and most of the major policies of the last four decades have been to encourage more and more students to enroll in college, thus using fear and threats of lifelong consequences to drive students into taking loans. It is time to provide lower-cost, shorter-term options that enable Americans prepare for careers and continue to upgrade their skills throughout their career, rather than saddling them with such large debts before they ever experience work in their chosen career.

c. Public service loan forgiveness puts the Government in the inappropriate position of deciding which jobs or occupations are more important than others or signaling, perhaps incorrectly, where workforce shortages exist. In addition, PSLF discriminates against students who completed the same program as their peers and work for the same wages, simply because their employer has a different tax status. The notion that private sector jobs always pay more than public sector jobs is outdated, and often times public sector jobs have benefits beyond a wage premium that make these jobs more desirable, especially during times of economic challenge. It seems unfair that a nurse who works at a public hospital, for example, receives loan forgiveness but a nurse who works in a private hospital does not, even though both nurses might have taken on the same level of debt and earn the same wages. We believe that institutions, not taxpayers, must be called upon to solve the debt crisis by developing innovative ways to reduce educational costs and help students manage debts. The Department gives tremendous credit to institutions like Perdue University for experimenting with Income Share Agreements as a new way for students to pay for college without taking on debt.

d. The most important way to ensure that postsecondary education is affordable and accessible is to expand the number of shorter-term programs and earn-and-learn opportunities available to students, thereby reducing the direct cost and the opportunity cost of education and enabling students to enter the workforce more quickly. We have proposed that Pell grants be made available to students enrolled in short-term programs that help them enter the workforce or update their skills throughout their career. We also believe that summer Pell grants help reduce the cost of higher education since students who take classes through the summer are more likely to graduate early or on time, thus saving money. The Department also encourages States to invest in public higher education and to resist the urge to give out-of-State students priority in enrollment decisions because they pay a higher tuition rate.

PROPRIETARY INSTITUTIONS AND STUDENT PROTECTIONS

Question. Students graduate from for-profit schools at less than half the rate of students at public colleges. They also graduate with more debt and their student loan default rate is twice as high. Every indicator suggests that for-profit schools are expensive and low-quality. Many of these for-profit colleges have been under in-

vestigation for fraud and deception by State attorneys general and several Federal agencies, including your own department.

a. What will you do to protect students at for-profit colleges?

b. What specific steps will you take to ensure quality outcomes?

c. What is your justification for dismantling the team at your department responsible for investigating abuses by for-profit colleges?

Answer. a. The Department believes that all students, and not just those who enroll at proprietary institutions, deserve the same rights and protections. Through its program reviews and investigatory functions, the Department will continue to hold institutions accountable for adhering to all Title IV requirements.

b. Accreditors play the primary role in evaluating academic quality, and they will continue to do so. The Department is working to develop new methods for measuring quality and providing more accurate data to inform consumer choice.

c. Staff reduction in the Enforcement Unit can be attributed to attrition. The investigations conducted by the Enforcement Unit were one part of the department's broad effort to provide oversight. Oversight is not relegated solely to the Enforcement Unit which was set up in 2016. We also have teams of people working together across the Program Compliance Unit and in coordination with the Department's Office of General Counsel.

As part of its oversight duties, Federal Student Aid requires the submission of annual compliance and financial audit reports and routinely conducts program reviews to confirm that a school meets FSA requirements for institutional eligibility, financial responsibility, and administrative capability.

During a program review, reviewers evaluate the school's compliance with FSA requirements, assess liabilities for errors in performance, and identify actions the school must take to improve its future administrative capabilities. After completing a program review, FSA issues a Program Review Report (PRR) to the institution and eventually, a Final Program Review Determination (FPRD). The FPRD includes each finding identified in the PRR, the institutional response, and the Department's final determination. The FPRD may or may not require additional action by the institution. Once FPRDs are shared with the institutions and screened for any necessary redactions, they are posted publicly at https://studentaid.ed.gov/sa/about/data-center/school/program-reviews.

In fiscal year 2017 alone, Program Compliance staff commenced over 200 new program reviews at institutions determined to present a risk to Title IV dollars. Additionally, PC staff issued over 300 FPRDs to institutions and collectively assessed over $75 million in liabilities due the Department via FPRDs issued in fiscal year 2017.

Annually, each school is required to submit a compliance audit, and Program Compliance staff resolved approximately 1,400 deficient compliance audits in fiscal year 2017. Each audit also is accompanied by a financial statement and, in fiscal year 2017, staff resolved over 1,500 financial statements which had been flagged for additional review.

While audit reports and program reviews are critical instruments, they are not the only tools available to the Department to conduct its required monitoring and oversight activities. In fact, program reviews and audits are but two of a spectrum of tools FSA deploys to monitor and manage compliance while gathering the evidence essential to implement enforcement actions. Oversight is also inherent via the analysis of financial statements which could lead to financial composite score issues, the requesting of backup data regarding 90/10 compliance, the role of heightened cash monitoring (HCM) in performing oversight, and in the collection and maintenance of Letters of Credit to mitigate financial risk for taxpayers. For example, in Award Year 2015, the Department requested and received 426 LOCs from 396 institutions or main OPEIDs in the amount of approximately $932 million.

As previewed above and as a result of any of the Department's oversight activities, an institution may be placed on a payment method other than advance payment, which may require varying degrees of documentation and Departmental approval before the institution may receive Title IV disbursements on behalf of eligible students. PC staff monitored the financial performance of the approximately 550 institutions which on average participated under the HCM method of payment throughout fiscal year 2017.

Additionally, all institutions are required to undergo a recertification for continued participation in the Title IV programs at least once every 6 years. This recertification includes a comprehensive review of the institution. In fiscal year 2017, PC staff completed over 1,150 recertification reviews/applications and processed another 2,300 eligibility updates and approval applications.

Finally, in fiscal year 2017, PC staff reviewed and resolved over 6,000 inquiries, concerns or institutional complaints submitted by students and constituents.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR TAMMY BALDWIN

SHORT-TERM PELL GRANT EXPANSION GUARDRAILS

Question. On June 5, 2018, you shared in response to a question from Senator Blunt that you would like to work with Congress to expand Pell Grants to short-term programs with "appropriate guardrails." Please discuss how the Department is thinking about guardrails. What are guardrails does the Department believe are work exploring for expanding Pell eligibility to short-term programs, and what is an example of a program that should not be eligible?

Answer. We believe it is important to help low-income or out-of-work individuals access training programs that can equip them with the skills to secure well-paying jobs in high-demand fields more quickly than traditional 2-year or 4-year programs. However, we also believe there should be sufficient guardrails in place to ensure taxpayer dollars are being used wisely and we are balancing students' needs with taxpayers' interests. Rather than opine on which programs should or should not be eligible, we look forward to discussing with you and your colleagues how to find the appropriate balance between access and accountability.

DEBT RELIEF SCAMS AND DEPARTMENTAL TRACKING

Question. Has the Department maintained a list of known student debt relief scams and their owners that can be shared with major technology companies, web publishers, social media platforms, and search engines to filter out potentially fraudulent advertisements? If not, why not?

Answer. The Department collects information on debt relief scams and affiliated companies from customers through the Customer Feedback System. In addition, the Department and its Federal loan servicers work together to collect and transmit information to the Federal Trade Commission and other Federal enforcement agencies for further investigation.

The Department aggressively pursues all companies, including debt relief companies that mislead borrowers by using the name or trademarks of the Department in any way.

The Department provided Google with a list of third-party debt relief companies that have had enforcement action taken against them or are the subject of borrower complaints received by FSA. Based on those efforts and information provided by other agencies, the Department has developed and provided recommendations to Google on how to help borrowers.

A common practice among companies engaged in debt relief scams involves the frequent creation and dissolution of numerous company names over a short period of time, often to avoid detection or bad publicity and to allow fraudulent debt relief actors to make unsolicited telemarketing calls. These tactics makes online advertising restrictions largely ineffective.

EFFORTS TO CONTROL DEBT RELIEF SCAMS THROUGH SERVICING CONTRACTS

Question. Has the Department issued any contract change requests to require loan servicers to build appropriate procedures to prevent and address the use of the debt relief scams, including proactively contacting borrowers whose accounts demonstrate the likely activities of a scam?

Answer. The Department and Federal servicers share information on potential and confirmed debt relief scams. The Department and its Federal loan servicers work jointly and independently to collect and transmit information to the Federal Trade Commission and other Federal enforcement agencies for further investigation.

Through the use of data analytics, the Department actively scans records to identify possible debt relief scams and has provided these data to servicers in order to contact the borrower and determine if they might be a victim of a debt relief scams. The Department also reaches out to borrowers affected by improper debt relief activity when Federal enforcement agencies have identified fraudulent debt relief companies. Under this arrangement, the Department recently supported the Federal Trade Commission's 2017 sweep of companies engaged in debt relief activity—Operation "Game of Loans"—by contacting approximately 12,000 impacted borrowers to make them aware of the possible scam and equip them with the name of their assigned Federal loan servicer, contact information, and additional resources. The Department continues to support Federal enforcement agencies on similar cases that may result in contact with additional borrowers.

Sharing of information also includes coordinated activities. For example, the Federal Trade Commission and the Department have worked to provide awareness of improper debt relief activity through social media and website postings. Additionally, the Department, Federal servicers, and enforcement agencies recently contrib-

uted to the May 15, 2018, Borrower Protection Summit hosted by MOHELA and Great Lakes to share important information on debt relief fraud with loan servicers and consumer advocacy groups. Presenters included the Federal Trade Commission and Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

CEASE-AND-DESIST ORDERS FOR FALSELY CLAIMING CONNECTION WITH DEPARTMENT

Question. Since January 20, 2017, how many unique cease-and-desist orders has the Department filed against any company or its owner that engages in fraudulent, illegal, unfair, or deceptive behavior at the expense of students and taxpayers for alleging a connection with the Department?

Answer. Since January 20, 2017, the Department has sent cease-and-desist letters to two companies based on alleged violations of the Lanham Act.

REQUIREMENTS FOR LOAN SERVICERS REGARDING THIRD-PARTY OPERATIONS

Question. Does the Department require loan servicers to identify and track student debt relief scams, and any other incidents of undisclosed operations of third parties, and to promptly report these findings to a dedicated point of contact within the Department?

Answer. The Department maintains dedicated points of contact for Federal servicers and enforcement agencies on matters related to improper debt relief activity. The Department and Federal servicers share information on potential and confirmed activity, including names, addresses, and other identifying information. The Department keeps this information on record and uses it to address borrower service calls and complaints, including calls to the FSA Ombudsman Group and borrower complaints submitted via the FSA Feedback System. Additionally, all reports of suspicious activity received in the FSA Feedback System are routinely uploaded to the FTC's Consumer Sentinel Network.

ROLE OF EVIDENCE AND BEST PRACTICES IN STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Question. How does the Department plan to use data collection, research, and/or best practices to support State and local education agencies as they administer the funds provided under ESSA's Title IV–A Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grant program?

Answer. The Department is committed to assisting States and local school districts in using Federal education program funds for activities that best meet their needs and are based on evidence of effectiveness. In addition to previously issued guidance on using evidence to strengthen education investments under the ESEA (see https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/guidanceuseseinvestment.pdf), the Department is providing a variety of technical assistance opportunities under Title IV–A (including general and individualized technical assistance to States through a new contract to be awarded later this fiscal year) that are designed to help stakeholders identify areas of need, connect them with content-area experts, and direct them to appropriate evidence-based interventions and programs. The Department also intends to collect data on uses of Title IV–A funds through the EDFacts system and are currently considering whether to conduct an in-depth analysis of how Title IV–A funds are being spent, including the extent to which they are used for evidence-based activities as intended by Congress.

GUIDANCE ON ELIGIBLE USE OF TITLE IV–A FUNDS

Question. Does the Department intend to update or alter the current guidance to State and local education agencies regarding the permissible uses of Title IV–A funds? If so, what is the timeline for any revisions?

Answer. The Department is currently studying how Title IV–A funds may be used to promote school safety and security. We continue to respond to questions from States and school districts on Title IV–A program implementation, including questions about allowable uses of funds. These responses may be found at https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/ESSA-TitleIVPartA-SSAE.

DEPARTMENT OUTREACH WITH LEAS TO ALLOCATE FUNDS FOR ALL THREE STATUTORY PURPOSES

Question. How does the Department plan to work with districts to determine how these funds are spent across the three program areas—well-rounded education, student health and safety, and meaningful use of educational technology—provided for under the statute?

Answer. States and school districts are responsible for determining how funds will be spent under the Title IV–A program. The Department, on the other hand, will collect data on uses of Title IV–A funds, including by program area, through the EDFacts system. In addition, we are developing a protocol for monitoring State administration of the Title IV–A program that will examine how States are ensuring school districts comply with the content-area expenditure requirements applicable to districts receiving $30,000 or more in Title IV–A funds.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JOE MANCHIN

FEDERAL HANDLE WITH CARE PROGRAM

Question. As you may know, there is a program in West Virginia called Handle with Care that works in collaboration between the West Virginia State Police and local West Virginia schools. This program connects children who interact with law enforcement at traumatic events, including domestic violence situations, drug raids, overdoses, and more, to school resources that are designed to provide the child with trauma-informed care.

The alert enables the school to exercise its trauma-informed training that Handle With Care provides participating schools to ensure that the student is provided with the support they need to help handle the traumatic event.

The goal of the program is to promote safe homes, schools, and communities, while ensuring that every child is able to thrive in school.

I have introduced a bipartisan bill in the Senate alongside Senators Capito and Kaine to establish 5-year demonstration grants for States to address the impact of substance use related and other trauma by building a Federal Handle With Care program.

My bill calls on the Secretary of Health and Human Services in conjunction with you, as the Secretary of Education, to award these demonstration pilots to states.

Are you familiar with this program?

If not, would you commit to learning more about the Handle With Care program in West Virginia and how we can collaborate together to make sure that schools have access to trauma-informed training?

Answer. The Department is familiar with the Handle With Care program, and it is always interested in exploring options for improving State and local efforts to strengthen school climate and safety. Trauma-informed care and related training are an important of these efforts.

IMPACT ON STUDENTS UNDER PROPOSED CUTS TO 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS

Question. I have always strongly supported funding for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers and afterschool programs. In fact, this was one of the few programs that was not consolidated into the larger block grant when the Congress passed the Every Student Succeeds Act, reauthorizing No Child Left Behind.

That Congressional support for this program comes from the fact that we recognize the critical need for safe and secure places for students to learn and be before and after school and during the summer months.

That is why I was so disappointed to see that the President's budget completely eliminated funding for this program—a $1.2 billion cut to Federal funding for afterschool and summer programs.

Too many students do not have a safe place to go afterschool or during the summer and do not have the academic resources or assistance at home. And in States like West Virginia, the State budget cannot replace the Federal funding needed to run these programs.

If this program is cut, where will the 7,353 West Virginia students go?

How will they get the academic assistance that they need?

Answer. We know that the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program often supports safe places for children to participate in a range of activities outside of the school day. However, we believe that afterschool activities are primarily the responsibility of families and communities, and not the Federal Government. Limited Federal education resources should be dedicated to programs with a stronger emphasis and track record of improvement in student educational outcomes. Local school districts seeking to prioritize afterschool or summer school activities in meeting the educational needs of students and families may use other Federal funds for this purpose, including the $15.8 billion Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies program.

EFFECT OF ELIMINATING FULL-SERVICE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS FUNDING

Question. McDowell County in southern West Virginia is one of the poorest counties in the entire country.

Reconnecting McDowell is a comprehensive effort to make educational improvements to give those students a chance to succeed despite the county's complex problems—poverty, underperforming schools, drug and alcohol abuse, limited medical services, and inadequate access to technology and transportation.

This program highlights the benefits and importance of full community schools and having the school be a place that serves the whole student. Through this program, schools don't just offer academic education, but physical and mental healthcare, counseling, and afterschool academic support. For the kids of McDowell County, these supports are as necessary to their education as the academic classes themselves.

That is why, when the Senate considered the Every Student Succeeds Act, I worked with my colleagues to push for the Full-Community Schools program, which provides funding to programs like Reconnecting McDowell.

So I was so disappointed to see that the President's budget request completely eliminates the $10 million in funding for the Full-Community Schools program.

I have seen firsthand how a small investment like this program can make a huge difference in the life of a child and can help rebuild a community. Reconnecting McDowell is lucky that they are able to attract some private funding to support these efforts, but the Federal funding is still a critical part of what they do.

What will happen to the students in communities like McDowell County if their schools are forced to cut back on the important health and wellness programs that set these students up for academic success?

Answer. The fiscal year 2019 request reflects the President's commitment to spend taxpayer dollars efficiently, in part by eliminating duplicative programs funding activities that can be supported with other Federal, State, or local resources. For example, to the extent that the problems that students face in McDowell County contribute to poor educational outcomes, the County's schools may use Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies to address those problems as part of their comprehensive Title I schoolwide programs.

DEPARTMENT'S PROCESS FOR REVIEWING TRIO APPLICATIONS

Question. The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–141) included report language instructing the Department to review all applications under fiscal year 2017 TRIO competitions that had minor technical issues, including those with minor budget issues. Please provide all the relevant information regarding the Department's process for reviewing and scoring and a timeline for awarding grants to newly funded applicants.

Answer. The Department is currently in the process of reviewing applications from all 40 applicants affected by the report language and intends to make awards to applicants scoring within the funding range of the fiscal year 2017 competitions by September 30.

DETERMINATION AND TRANSPARENCY REGARDING GEAR UP PRIORITIES

Question. In the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–141), Congress provided $350 million in GEAR UP funding. The 2018 notice inviting State and Partnership applications for the Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP) initiative includes a series of expansive and complex absolute priorities that if not met, would deem a State or community ineligible to receive a new award under this competitive grant program (1–Fostering Flexible and Affordable Paths to Obtaining Knowledge and Skills; 2–Promoting STEM, with a Particular Focus on Computer Science; 3–Protecting Freedom of Speech and Encouraging Respectful Interactions; 4–Fostering Knowledge and Promoting the Development of Skills that Prepare Students to be Informed, Thoughtful, and Productive Individuals and Citizens). Given the high stakes nature of an absolute priority, ensuring that the public understands how the absolute priority will be administered is important to ensure fairness, transparency, and clarity among applicants. Relative to this absolute priority:

a. When will the determination that an applicant has met or not met the absolute priority be determined? Will that determination precede the peer-review, occur during the peer-review, or following the peer-review?

b. Who will be making the determination if the absolute priority has been met or not? Will that be staff from the U.S. Department of Education, or the peer-reviewers themselves?

c. Will those individuals' names be made public or anonymous?

d. What assurances do you have that the individuals making the determination have the relevant expertise to effectively evaluate an applicant's response to each of the four categories, each of which require substantially different context expertise from one another?

e. What specific training and support will the individuals making the determination receive in advance of making the determination?

f. Will those training materials and support strategies be made public?

g. What specific steps are you taking to specifically assist applicants understand the intricacies of the absolute priority, the review process, and the determination process so that applicants may take the appropriate steps to meet this challenging priority?

Answer. a. The Department will determine whether a particular application meets the absolute priorities as soon as possible—ideally, prior to peer review. However, it is possible that some applications may be referred to peer review and subsequently deemed ineligible during the peer review process or after the conclusion of the full peer review process.

b. Department staff make eligibility determinations. Peer reviewers determine the extent to which an applicant addresses the selection criteria in the context of the absolute priorities established for the competition by evaluating the entire application.

c. The Department does not intend to make public the names of Department staff making eligibility determinations.

d. The Department staff making eligibility determinations have the relevant content knowledge and expertise to make those determinations

e. The Department will ensure that all staff making eligibility determinations receive specific training and support on the various requirements of the absolute priorities.

f. As a general practice, the Department does not make internal training documents publicly available. Applicants will have all of the information and support that they need to understand the requirements of the absolute priorities in advance of the application deadline.

g. Department staff held two pre-application technical assistance webinars and posted the materials on the Department's website to ensure that all potential applicants are aware of the competition requirements. In addition, the Department has published a Frequently Asked Questions document that discusses the absolute priority, available online at https://www2.ed.gov/programs/gearup/faq.html.

RATIONALE FOR APPLYING TRIO FUNDING BOOST TO ONE-TIME SUPPLEMENT

Question. In West Virginia, we have a lot of students who are first time college students, many of whom come from low-income families that don't have the resources or experience to help their children navigate things like AP classes, SAT tests, college applications, financial aid, and finally college itself.

That is why programs like TRIO are so important. TRIO programs provide the support that first time college students need to thrive in higher education. Without them, we'd see too many students who wouldn't know what opportunities are available or who wouldn't have the emotional and academic support to succeed.

As you are well aware, two schools in West Virginia—West Virginia University and West Virginia State University—had their applications thrown out during the fiscal year 2017 competition because of very minor budgeting errors. You and I have spoken about this issue multiple times, and I believe you understand how important this issue is for me and my State.

As you should be aware, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–141) Congress appropriated an additional $60 million to TRIO in the fiscal year 2018 Omnibus and included report language specifically directing you to read and score the applications from the 2017 competition that were rejected because of minor technical and budgeting errors. Most recently, I joined several of my colleagues in sending you a letter reiterating congressional intent for the additional $60 million for TRIO. However, it has come to my attention that Linda Byrd-Johnson, Senior Director of the Student Service Division at the U.S. Department of Education, shared that the Department would earmark most of the funds for a one-time supplemental increase for Upward Bound and Upward Bound Math/Science grantees interested in increasing their STEM activities. What is the Department's intent in sponsoring this one-time supplemental increase?

Why did the Department choose to sponsor a one-time supplemental increase over providing a larger increase in funding to existing grantees and reserving a greater

amount of funds to review and fund fiscal year 2017 grant proposals that had been rejected or had minor budget formatting errors?

Answer. As you note, in fiscal year 2017, approximately 40 applications were deemed ineligible under the Upward Bound, Upward Bound Math and Science, Veterans Upward Bound, and Ronald McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement competitions due to budget errors. I have appreciated the opportunity to discuss these issues with you and the specific implications those decisions have had for the students in your State. Our first priority when allocating the $60 million increase for Federal TRIO Programs this year is to review those 40 applications and make awards to all applicants that receive peer review scores within the funding range from last year's competitions. After ensuring we have sufficient funding to meet that need, we saw an opportunity to provide supplements this year to Upward Bound and Upward Bound Math and Science grantees that want to implement new or enhanced STEM activities. Like you, this Administration believes deeply in the importance of a high-quality STEM education so that all students are prepared for postsecondary education and careers. Finally, the additional funding provided in fiscal year 2018 will allow the Department to provide all TRIO grantees with an across-the-board increase—the third such increase in 3 years.

SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

Senator BLUNT. The subcommittee stands in recess.

[Whereupon, at 12:02 p.m., Tuesday, June 5, the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]