

OPPORTUNITIES

ENHANCEMENTS TO PELL GRANT PROGRAM

SUMMARY: Proposals vary in nature and breadth, but would generally expand student eligibility and strengthen federal investment in the Pell Grant program.

INTENT: Congressional intent is to expand opportunity and access to low-income and non-traditional students.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU is a strong supporter of expanding student choice and access through the Pell Grant program, and advocates for programmatic expansions to accomplish those goals. One of NAICU's top policy proposals, *Pell Plus*, is on pace to be introduced during the 116th Congress as a means to incentivize on-time graduation, lower student debt burden, and encourage colleges and universities to invest more resources in their students.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- House Republicans included a \$300 “Pell Bonus” in the *PROSPER Act* for students enrolling in the equivalent of 30 credits or more annually. House Republicans had previously led the charge to implement “Year-Round” Pell Grants, which became effective for the 2017-18 academic year.
- Senate Republicans have not rallied around a specific Pell expansion plan, but have distinguished themselves as some of the strongest supporters by increasing the maximum Pell Grant via the appropriations process.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- House Democrats included significant Pell expansions in the *Aim Higher Act*, including increasing the maximum grant, annually indexing the maximum award to inflation, increasing lifetime eligibility limits from 12 to 14 semesters, and allowing students to apply leftover Pell Grant eligibility to graduate studies.
- Senate Democrats have not rallied around a single plan, but remain staunch allies for expanding Pell. In a recent speech outlining her HEA reauthorization priorities, HELP Ranking Member Patty Murray (D-WA) specifically pointed to raising the Pell Grant maximum as one of her top goals.

FAFSA SIMPLIFICATION

SUMMARY: Proposal is to simplify the FAFSA by eliminating extraneous questions that pertain to only small subsets of students, while maintaining only those questions deemed essential.

INTENT: Congressional intent is to ease the student experience by shortening the form in order to increase the number of students who complete the FAFSA form and ensure that low-income students do not miss out on student aid due to a cumbersome form.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU has long supported FAFSA simplification, so long as the simplification process provides the federal government, states, and institutions with essential information to inform student aid packaging. Over-simplification could result in additional forms and undermine the purpose of simplification.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- House Republicans included minimal simplification in the *PROSPER Act*, including expansion of the IRS' Data Retrieval Tool (DRT) and requiring consumer testing on the user experience.
- Senate Republicans have been the primary proponents of FAFSA simplification. HELP Committee Chair Lamar Alexander (R-TN) has introduced standalone legislation, held hearings, and recently touted FAFSA simplification as one of his top priorities in HEA reauthorization. Notably, Senate Republicans seemed to have moved away from promoting a one or two question FAFSA to an application consisting of roughly 20 questions.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- House Democrats take a different approach to the FAFSA in their *Aim Higher Act*. Rather than streamline the form, House Democrats propose allowing students to automatically qualify for Pell Grants if they also qualify for certain federally means-tested benefits (e.g., food stamps). This would only require the FAFSA to be completed once during a student's undergraduate enrollment, and eliminates certain questions for low-income students.
- Senate Democrats also support streamlining the FAFSA, and Senator Murray teamed with Senator Alexander to introduce bipartisan legislation which would link certain elements of the FAFSA directly from the IRS as a means to simplify the FAFSA completion process.

FIXING THE FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY STANDARDS

SUMMARY: A statutory fix to improve the financial responsibility standards structure.

INTENT: Congressional intent is to provide a redesigned approach to the financial responsibility standards so as not to force private, nonprofit colleges and universities on solid financial footing to provide expensive and unnecessary letters of credit to the federal government.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU has advocated for a fix to the financial responsibility standards for more than a decade and supports a statutory solution.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- House Republicans included language in the *PROSPER Act* which would provide safe harbors for colleges and universities meeting certain financial criteria, and a more measured process for the Department of Education to evaluate the financial security of institutions with low scores.
- Senate Republicans have not taken a position on fixing the financial responsibility standards.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- House and Senate Democrats have not taken a position on a statutory fix to the financial responsibility standards.

LOAN REPAYMENT SIMPLIFICATION

SUMMARY: A proposal to streamline the structure and number of federal student loan repayment plans available to borrowers.

INTENT: Congressional intent is to simplify the payment plans offered to reduce borrower confusion in an attempt to lower unnecessary student loan defaults and ease administration of the programs by the federal government.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU supports reasonable attempts to simplify the loan repayment programs, so long as a simplified repayment model continues to provide borrower loan forgiveness and income-based protections.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- House Republicans proposed in the *PROSPER Act* to move to two repayment plans: 1) a standard 10-year plan; and 2) an income-based plan. The proposal would also eliminate any loan forgiveness opportunities.
- Senator Alexander supports an income-based model with a standard 10-year plan option, as well as modifying the system of loan repayment. Rather than borrowers proactively paying back their loans via their loan servicing company, Senator Alexander proposes having employers automatically withdraw funds from borrowers' paychecks.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- House Democrats proposed in the *Aim Higher Act* to move to two repayment plans: 1) a "fixed" repayment plan; and 2) an income-based plan. The length of the fixed plan would range from 10-25 years depending on the amount borrowed, while the income-based plan is similar in structure to those proposed by Republicans. The proposals would maintain the loan forgiveness provisions.
- Senate Democrats are also supportive of loan repayment simplification, but seek to address the problem by reforming the federal loan servicing process. Senator Murray has been critical of automatic loan repayment deductions by employers.

CONCERNS

MAJOR-BY-MAJOR FEDERAL STUDENT AID ELIGIBILITY (“GAINFUL EMPLOYMENT FOR ALL”)

SUMMARY: This proposal would make each academic program at a college or university qualify to receive federal student aid based on the repayment success of past students in that major, as opposed to the current institutional eligibility structure.

INTENT: Congressional intent behind this proposal is threefold: 1) ensure that students do not assume a major in which they will not earn enough to pay off their debt in a reasonable amount of time; 2) apply the Gainful Employment mechanism to all programs at all colleges and universities; and 3) incentivize colleges to lower the cost of specific programs based on student earnings outcomes.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU is opposed to this proposal, as it would endanger the right of low-income students to choose the major they most prefer and incentivize colleges to charge more for majors that are more expensive to deliver. This would further discourage students from choosing their preferred majors.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- Sen. Alexander sees this proposal as one of his top priorities in HEA reauthorization.
- House Republicans are supportive of this proposal and included it in the *PROSPER Act*.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- House Education Chair Bobby Scott (D-VA) is opposed to this proposal.
- Senate Democrats are less clear on their position.

FREE PUBLIC COLLEGE

SUMMARY: Proposals vary in scope and intent, but generally would provide federal funds to states to help pay for tuition and fees at community colleges and four-year public colleges and universities.

INTENT: Congressional intent is multifaceted, but primarily free public college is seen as a panacea to address problems of college affordability and student debt.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU believes that limited federal resources should continue to follow the student, allowing low-income students the choice to enroll in the institution that best fits their educational needs. Instead of “Free Public College,” NAICU is advocating for a federal-state partnership that includes private, nonprofit colleges and universities as part of the solution.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- House and Senate Republicans are opposed to a free public college plan at the federal level, but several lawmakers, including Sen. Alexander, have supported free community college programs in their home states.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- Rep. Scott does not support free four-year college but has included a free community college proposal in the *Aim Higher Act*. The proposal includes a funding pot for four-year HBCUs and MSIs. The intent of this set-aside is to encourage 4-year completion after community college and to mitigate the enrollment impact that a free community college program would have on institutions eligible for the set-aside. Other committee Democrats support free four-year public college in addition to free community college.
- Senate Democrats have not coalesced around a single free public college plan, but several Democratic members of the Senate HELP Committee have introduced free four-year and free community college proposals. Sen. Murray has been supportive of a federal-state partnership approach but has cost concerns over free public college.

INSTITUTIONAL RISK-SHARING

SUMMARY: Multiple proposals would require colleges and universities to have more “skin in the game,” tied directly to student outcomes.

INTENT: Congressional intent is to force colleges to share in the risk associated with the federal government providing grants and loans to American students. This is based on an assumption that colleges do not share in the risk with students who do not complete or repay their loans.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU is opposed to federal risk-sharing proposals because they ignore the fact that private colleges do have skin in the game, as more than 70% of student grants and scholarship aid comes directly from the institutions. In addition, putting a federal “tax” on admitting poor students will discourage equal opportunity.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- House Republicans included a risk-sharing proposal in the *PROSPER Act* which related to the Return of Title IV funds (R2T4). NAICU views this proposal as reasonable.
- Senate Republicans have not yet formally introduced risk-sharing legislation, but Sen. Alexander focused one of his three “white papers” from 2015 on the concept of risk-sharing and cited numerous potential policy solutions that could be pursued in a comprehensive HEA reauthorization bill.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- House Democrats do not include any new risk-sharing proposals in *Aim Higher Act*.
- Senate Democrats have introduced several different bills aimed at increasing institutional skin in the game, including legislation that would require institutions to reimburse the federal government for loan defaults and legislation to create a risk-sharing fund to which colleges would be forced to contribute based on their student loan volume. NAICU is opposed to these bills.

ELIMINATION AND LOWERED BORROWING LIMITS OF FEDERAL LOAN PROGRAMS

SUMMARY: This proposal would eliminate Parent PLUS Loans and lower the maximum eligible borrowing limit for Graduate PLUS Loans.

INTENT: Congressional intent is to lessen student and parent debt, lower federal exposure to loan defaults by limiting the amount of loans that certain borrowers can receive, and allow the private market greater access to student borrowers. There is also a tendency among Members of Congress to make the incorrect assumption that borrowers taking out large sums of debt are driving the default problem, which is not in line with research on the topic.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU is open to consideration of reasonable loan limits for Parent PLUS Loans and Graduate PLUS Loans. However, the proposed thresholds are far too low and would likely result in parents and graduate students turning to a private market, which might not offer them a loan, could offer a loan without the robust protections of the federal loan programs, or could result in excessive interest rates for certain borrowers and families.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- House Republicans included in the *PROSPER Act* a proposal to limit Graduate PLUS Loan borrowing to \$28,500 annually with a \$150,000 aggregate limit and Parent PLUS Loan borrowing to \$12,500 annually per child with an aggregate limit of \$56,250 per child.
- In past Congresses, Sen. Alexander has proposed reduced loan limits similar to those in the *PROSPER Act*.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- House Democrats did not propose to eliminate or lower federal loan limits in the *Aim Higher Act*.
- Senate Democrats have not coalesced around borrowing limits at the committee level, but rank-and-file Members have expressed interest in exploring lowered borrowing limits.

CAMPUS-BASED AID FORMULATION AND ELIMINATION OF SEOG

SUMMARY: Proposals would move to “one grant, one loan” which would result in the elimination of the campus-based aid programs, such as Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants. There are also proposals to rewrite the existing campus-based aid formulas that would redistribute the current federal contributions.

INTENT: Congressional intent is to simplify the federal aid programs and reallocate existing campus-based aid funds in favor of institutions serving larger numbers of Pell recipients rather than the historical beneficiaries.

NAICU Position: NAICU is a strong supporter of the campus-based aid programs and strongly opposes the elimination of those programs in favor of simplification. NAICU is open to revisiting the existing allocation formulas, but such reforms should focus on unmet student need and institutions that serve a high percentage of low-income students.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- House Republicans have proposed eliminating SEOG, doubling the authorization of the Federal Work-Study (FWS) Program, and requiring institutions to increase their matching funds to 1:1 (from the current 3:1 federal share). The allocation formula for FWS would also be rewritten relative to unmet need and proportion of Pell students attending the institution.
- Senate Republicans have proposed ending all of the campus-based aid programs without clarifying the future of the Federal Work Study program. Sen. Alexander personally blocked bipartisan efforts to reauthorize the Perkins Loan program at its termination date on October 1, 2017.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- House Democrats support proposals to expand the existing campus-based aid programs, reauthorize the Perkins Loan Program, and rewrite the allocation formulas. The rewritten allocation formulas are based on unmet need and relative proportion of Pell Grant recipients enrolled at the institution to the total national percentage.
- Senate Democrats have not introduced legislation related to the campus-based aid programs, but have expressed interest in expanding them to include greater federal investments and more students.

PELL GRANT ELIGIBILITY FOR SHORT-TERM JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS

SUMMARY: This proposal would make short-term job training programs eligible for Pell Grants.

INTENT: Congressional intent is to promote educational innovation and to tackle the “skills gap” by making low-income students eligible to use their Pell Grants at coding boot camps and other short-term programs.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU is opposed to allowing short-term job training programs access to Pell Grants. Historically, the predominant fraud and abuse within the Pell Grant program occurred within similar short-term programs (until they were made ineligible in 1992).

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- House Republicans propose in the *PROSPER Act* to allow short-term job training programs of 300 clock hours delivered over 10 weeks of instruction to be eligible for Pell Grants. The House Republican proposal would require institutions to receive approval by their accrediting agencies to offer such programs.
- Senate Republicans discuss “innovation” in broad terms, but Sen. Alexander has not put forth a specific policy proposal in his white papers or speeches on HEA reauthorization. A bipartisan group of rank-and-file Senators have cosponsored bipartisan legislation authored by Senators Rob Portman (R-OH) and Tim Kaine (D-VA) to allow programs of 150 clock hours delivered over 8 weeks of instruction to become eligible for Pell Grants.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- House Democrats propose in the *Aim Higher Act* to allow short-term job training programs of 150 clock hours delivered over 8 weeks of instruction to be eligible for Pell Grants. The House Democratic proposal would not require accreditors to approve such program offerings by institutions.
- Senate Democrats have not coalesced on a short-term program eligibility proposal, but similar to their Republican counterparts, several rank-and-file Democrats have cosponsored bipartisan legislation authored by Senators Portman (R-OH) and Kaine (D-VA) to allow programs of 150 clock hours delivered over 8 weeks of instruction to become eligible for Pell Grants.

ELIMINATION OF LOAN FORGIVENESS PROVISIONS

SUMMARY: This proposal would terminate the Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) program and end the loan forgiveness incentives currently associated with the income-based repayment programs.

INTENT: Congressional intent is to lower the cost of the federal student aid programs and to end a program viewed as too generous to student borrowers, particularly graduate students.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU supports the continuation of the PSLF and income-based loan forgiveness programs.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- House Republicans proposed ending Public Service Loan Forgiveness and the income-based loan forgiveness programs in the *PROSPER Act*. Many rank-and-file Republicans were opposed to the termination of these programs.
- Senate Republicans have proposed to maintain the loan forgiveness programs, but are interested in making program eligibility tweaks to PSLF.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- House and Senate Democrats are supportive of expanding the loan forgiveness programs.

SCRUTINY OF INSTITUTIONAL SPENDING HABITS ON INSTRUCTION

SUMMARY: This proposal would impose bright line standards on institutional operational expenses on instruction, terminating the ability of a college to use Title IV funds for marketing, advertising, recruiting, or lobbying if it fails to meet the proportional spending threshold.

INTENT: Congressional intent is to punish for-profit colleges that spend a high portion of their resources on marketing and recruiting activities rather than student instruction.

NAICU POSITION: Using institutional spending habits as an accountability metric is a slippery slope. Institutions justifiably classify spending habits differently, and there are many elements of institutional spending that are fundamental to the student experience that fall outside of the bounds of “instruction” (i.e., tutoring, libraries, etc.). Such a formula would need to be created using the utmost care, and it is likely that nonprofit colleges would be collateral damage in this effort to target the for-profit sector. Considerations must also be made about the underlying differences in the financing models of independent colleges versus public colleges, and the role played by state and local appropriations to offset certain spending categories in the public sector that are not enjoyed by the private, nonprofit sector.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- House Republicans did not include this proposal in the *PROSPER Act*.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- House Democrats included this proposal in the *Aim Higher Act*, and it was written in such a way that would be detrimental to independent colleges.
- Senate Democrats have indicated neither support nor opposition to this proposal, but left-leaning think tanks have been seeking a Senate Democratic champion for this idea.

LOSS OF IN-SCHOOL INTEREST SUBSIDY ON UNDERGRADUATE FEDERAL STUDENT LOANS

SUMMARY: This proposal would end the in-school interest subsidy awarded to undergraduate borrowers receiving Subsidized Stafford Loans.

INTENT: Congressional intent is to bring down the federal cost of the federal student aid programs and to streamline the loan programs.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU is opposed to this proposal because it would increase low-income undergraduate student loan debt burdens over both the short- and long-term.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- Sen. Alexander has made public statements in support of ending the in-school interest subsidy in favor of a single loan program.
- House Republicans included the proposal in the *PROSPER Act*.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- House and Senate Democrats do not support this proposal.

NONPROFIT GOVERNANCE REFORMS

SUMMARY: This proposal would alter the eligibility criteria for serving on boards of directors at nonprofit colleges and universities to exclude anyone who “receives any substantial direct or indirect economic benefit (including a lease, promissory note, or other contract) from the nonprofit institution of higher education.”

INTENT: Congressional intent is to target institutions that have converted from for-profit to nonprofit status, several of which have been caught blurring the line of self-dealing.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU supports targeting bad actors, but views this proposal as overly cumbersome and too broadly written to appropriately achieve its intended goals. Such a proposal could do lasting damage to the recruitment and retention of boards of directors at nonprofit institutions of higher education. Additionally, all nonprofit colleges and universities must already maintain and publish their conflict of interest policies on the annual IRS Form 990.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- Neither House nor Senate Republicans have indicated any support for this proposal.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- House Democrats included this proposal in the *Aim Higher Act*.
- Senate Democrats have not yet introduced legislation or coalesced around a single policy proposal, but rank-and-file Members have shown an interest in pursuing this idea further.

ACCREDITATION REFORMS

SUMMARY: Proposals would require accreditors to consider student outcomes during accreditation review.

INTENT: Congressional legislators believe that accreditation needs to be a more reliable measure of quality and that accreditation standards themselves need to be measurable and focused on employment outcomes.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU is concerned about the provisions that would require accreditors to shift from focusing on educational inputs to educational outputs, such as workforce participation and earnings. Although such measures are important aspects of student success, they are neither an accurate nor complete measure of educational quality.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- House Republicans included a variation of this proposal in the *PROSPER Act*.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- The *Aim Higher Act* would require an accreditor’s evaluation of student achievement to include “standards for compliance” related to completion and workforce participation and to assess institutional progress toward meeting those standards.

CAMPUS SAFETY

SUMMARY: Proposals range from relatively minor modifications of the Clery Act to more expansive proposals – embodied by the *Campus Accountability and Safety Act* – that would add substantial new disclosure requirements, monetary penalties, and requirements for institutions to appoint additional employees to respond to incidents of sexual assault.

INTENT: Democrats continue to place a high priority on addressing campus safety and sexual assault, especially in the wake of the Trump Administration’s decision to rescind the Obama-era Title IX guidance and replace it with new Title IX regulations that the party generally views as unfavorable to sexual assault survivors. Republicans are also likely to propose some changes in this area, though of a more modest nature.

NAICU POSITION: Students attending college should expect to find a safe and supportive environment. Legislative and regulatory initiatives to enhance campus safety must ensure the safety and fair treatment of all students. They must also be flexible enough to be adapted to state-of-the art intervention strategies and the particular circumstances of each institution.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- The *PROSPER Act* contained relatively modest changes that would have required institutions to: 1) conduct campus climate surveys regarding sexual assault at least once every three years; 2) ensure a fair process for all students; and 3) provide additional flexibility to institutions with respect to reporting requirements and the standard of evidence to be used in disciplinary hearings.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- Democrats in both chambers generally oppose the new Title IX rules as they are currently proposed. Campus safety is one of Sen. Murray’s top priorities for HEA reauthorization, and the *Campus Accountability and Safety Act* is likely to form the basis for Democrats’ negotiations with Senate Republicans.
- In the House, the *Aim Higher Act* contains several amendments to the Clery Act, including provisions requiring schools to provide students with crime statistics about each study abroad program and to report incidents of hazing and harassment.

TEACHER PREPARATION

SUMMARY: Proposals related to teacher preparation include tying TEACH Grant eligibility to program assessments based on student learning outcomes on standardized tests, providing grants for program improvement, and eliminating Title II and any federal role in teacher preparation.

INTENT: Democrats want to continue to apply education reform metrics with punitive consequences for program accountability, while Republicans want either limited federal grant programs or no role in teacher preparation at all.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU believes it is time to re-center the federal role in teacher preparation on a federal partnership grant program that can help program improvement, disseminate best practices, and support cutting edge research in the field. With the repeal of the Obama-era Teacher Preparation Regulations, NAICU believes the construct of program-teacher-pupil accountability tied to Title IV student financial aid should not be revisited.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- House Republicans eliminate Title II Teacher Preparation in the *PROSPER Act*.
- Senate Republicans have not coalesced around a single position on teacher preparation, but proposals include eliminating the Teacher Preparation Report Cards and keeping a grant program, updating the grant program, or eliminating Title II completely.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- Rep. Scott includes the *Educator Preparation Reform Act* in the *Aim Higher Act*, which includes the accountability construct NAICU is concerned about, and ties performance to TEACH Grant eligibility.
- Senate Democrats also support the Educator Preparation Reform Act, but some have also co-sponsored bipartisan bills to expand the grant program.

STATE AUTHORIZATION

SUMMARY: Proposals range from eliminating the existing regulations related to in-state state authorization and state authorization for distance education programs to adding new requirements related to state licensure and student complaints.

INTENT: In general, Republicans view these regulations as burdensome and would like them eliminated, while Democrats view such provisions as essential to cracking down on unscrupulous higher education providers.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU has long supported the elimination of the state authorization regulations for both brick and mortar institutions and distance education programs. These provisions have created confusion about the legal status of many private, nonprofit colleges and imposed significant costs on institutions seeking to comply with the burdensome requirements in the regulations.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- The *PROSPER Act* would eliminate the regulations governing both standard state authorization and state authorization for distance education.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- The *Aim Higher Act* would require institutions seeking authorization to operate in a state to meet, among other things, state standards relevant to state licensure and student complaints. It is unclear what effect these requirements would have on institutions participating in SARA.

FEDERAL STUDENT UNIT RECORD DATA SYSTEM

SUMMARY: This proposal would require institutions to turn over educational records for all students – including those who do not receive federal financial aid – to be stored in a centralized database managed by the federal government.

INTENT: The congressional intent is to gather comprehensive data on student outcome measures in order to provide additional information to consumers and new data for researchers to analyze.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU is generally in favor of efforts to increase transparency in higher education, but has long supported the current ban on establishing a federal student unit record data system due to concerns about the risks such a system would pose to student privacy. NAICU therefore opposes legislation that would overturn the ban, including the bipartisan *College Transparency Act*. However, NAICU is aware of an alternative bill – the *Student Right to Know Before You Go Act* – that would rely on new technology to get policymakers the information they want while still preserving student privacy. Although there are still some unanswered questions about the viability of the new technology and possible implementation challenges, NAICU supports further exploration regarding the feasibility of this approach.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- Representative Virginia Foxx (R-NC), the ranking member on the House Education and Labor Committee, is the original sponsor of the ban on the establishment of a federal student unit record system. Rep. Foxx remains adamantly opposed to eliminating the ban, but several members of her caucus are co-sponsors of the *College Transparency Act*.
- Several Republican members of the Senate are sponsors of the *College Transparency Act*, but it's not clear whether Sen. Alexander will support the bill.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- The *Aim Higher Act* would repeal the student unit record ban and incorporate the *College Transparency Act's* provisions establishing a student unit record data system.
- In both the House and Senate, there is growing momentum around the *College Transparency Act* which has garnered significantly more Democratic co-sponsors than the *Student Right to Know Before You Go Act*.

CREATING DIFFERENTIAL STANDARDS FOR PRIVATE, NONPROFITS TO PARTICIPATE IN FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAM

SUMMARY: The proposal would provide grants to colleges and universities to help improve student loan default rates. The proposal would automatically make eligible all public colleges and universities for grant assistance, while limiting eligibility for private, nonprofit colleges and universities to those institutions enrolling large percentages of Pell Grant recipients.

INTENT: Congressional intent is to assist institutions to lower their cohort default rates.

NAICU POSITION: NAICU is generally supportive of federal assistance programs designed as incentive programs, but is opposed to the federal government creating differential eligibility standards between publics and private, nonprofits based on arbitrary criteria.

IN CONGRESS – REPUBLICANS

- Neither House nor Senate Republicans have indicated any interest in this issue.

IN CONGRESS – DEMOCRATS

- House Democrats included this proposal in the *Aim Higher Act*
- Senate Democrats have not taken a position on this issue.