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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There are more than 43 million borrowers in the United States carrying $1.6 trillion in student loan debt. The Department of Education (ED) contracts with non-profit and for-profit companies—known as student loan servicers—to help support and provide loan services for these borrowers.

For years, borrowers have been harmed by student loan servicer misconduct. Even as new servicers entered the federal student loan system, problems—such as extended customer service wait times, billing errors, and lack of transparency—have continued. These failures have resulted in borrowers being unable to properly manage their loans and take advantage of longstanding student debt relief programs.

During the Biden-Harris Administration, there have been significant changes with the federal student loan system—notably, the COVID-19 pandemic payment pause, the return to repayment, reformed debt relief programs, and improved servicing accountability metrics and enforcement actions—with multiple servicers leaving the system. Efforts by the Biden-Harris Administration have resulted in significant improvements to the student loan system and have canceled debt for millions of borrowers.

But student loan servicer incompetence and misconduct continues to affect millions of borrowers across the country. This report, prepared on behalf of Senators Warren, Blumenthal, Markey, and Van Hollen reveals that:

STUDENT LOAN SERVICERS HAVE A DECADES-LONG PATTERN OF FAILURES:
The COVID-19 pandemic only exacerbated and highlighted a decades-long problem: lack of accountability allowed student loan servicers’ abuses to go unchecked and caused harm for borrowers crushed by student loan debt.

SERVICERS FAILED BORROWERS DURING THE RETURN TO REPAYMENT:
After an over three-year pause on student loan payments, collections, and interest due to the COVID-19 pandemic, borrowers were required to resume payments on their student loans starting in October 2023. But servicers failed to adequately prepare for the return to repayment, despite receiving continued warnings and having the resources to do so. As a result, millions of borrowers experienced countless billing errors and customer service problems—many of which resulted in overpayments and other borrower harms.

In total, loan servicers made more than 3.9 million billing-related errors during the return to repayment. Nearly 3.3 million borrowers received no billing statement or had their billing statement delayed. ED also found nearly 270,000 other servicer errors that harmed borrowers, including miscalculating bills for borrowers converting to a Saving on a Valuable Education (SAVE) repayment plan and incorrectly removing borrowers from forbearance.
MOHELA alone miscalculated approximately 280,000 bills for borrowers already enrolled in the SAVE plan by using outdated poverty guidelines, resulting in higher payment amounts. When ED asked servicers to audit their files, it uncovered 140,000 more miscalculations’ servicers made to borrowers’ family size, income, or marital status, which also resulted in higher payments for borrowers.

Borrowers who tried to fix these problems faced long waits and atrocious customer service—with one servicer reporting that it took them nearly six weeks to respond to email inquiries. For some servicers, more than one-third of phone calls from borrowers were abandoned because of long hold times or other problems.

Information provided to Senator Warren and other members of Congress by the student loan servicers and ED, and released for the first time today, revealed a host of problems:

- EdFinancial sent 15,370 borrowers incorrect information and received more than 1,000 borrower complaints between September and December 2023.

- Maximus reported the highest call abandonment rate among the servicers after September 2023 (48.2 percent) and had the lowest customer service ratings, with borrower satisfaction reaching as low as 55 percent.

- MOHELA received the most complaints of any federal loan servicer according to their internal records and reports made to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), and MOHELA self-reported more than 37,000 complaints between July 1, 2022 and December 31, 2023. The company also had the highest self-reported average call and email wait times of any servicer, reaching more than 38 minutes and 39 business days, respectively. Roughly half of MOHELA’s new borrowers did not set up online accounts at the start of repayment.

- Nelnet refused to answer basic Congressional inquiries about its performance as a servicer. According to data from ED, Nelnet’s customer service rating fell to 57 percent during the leadup to the return to repayment, the lowest of any servicer during that period. The company had the highest call abandonment rate of any servicer from July to September 2023, reaching 41.2 percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMOUNT AND SOURCE OF ERRORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,500,000 delayed or missing billing statements by MOHELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>758,000 delayed billing statements by Maximus, EdFinancial, and Nelnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268,000 additional servicer errors reported in ED memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280,000 miscalculations for borrowers who converted to SAVE by MOHELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140,000 miscalculations due to family size, income, or marital status by all servicers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. Total Billing-Related Errors Reported During the Return to Repayment**
THE BIDEN-HARRIS ADMINISTRATION RESPONDED TO SERVICER FAILURES AND STRENGTHENED THE STUDENT LOAN SERVICING SYSTEM:

The Biden-Harris Administration improved accountability metrics for servicers that prioritized the borrower’s customer service experience, provided temporary protections for borrowers during return to repayment—like requiring servicers to place borrowers affected by their errors into short administrative forbearance while they fix the problem\textsuperscript{19}—and held servicers accountable when they failed.\textsuperscript{20} While the Biden-Harris Administration has taken aggressive action to protect borrowers, it can do more by providing additional pathways to cancel student debt for victims of servicer error.
Loan servicers that participate in the federal student loan program are contracted and paid hundreds of millions of dollars annually by the Department of Education (ED or the Department) to administer billing and other related services for federal student loans. Servicers are responsible for tracking, collecting, and processing loan payments. Servicers also communicate with borrowers by answering their questions and, ideally, by helping borrowers understand all repayment options to determine the one that best fits their needs. Currently, there are more than 43 million federal student loan borrowers, with $1.6 trillion worth of student loan debt.

To date, five companies have been awarded contracts to service loans for ED in 2024. Four are continuing participants in the federal student loan system: EdFinancial Services (EdFinancial), Higher Education Loan Authority of the State of Missouri (MOHELA), Maximus Education (Maximus), and Nelnet Diversified Solutions (Nelnet). The fifth, Central Research, Inc. (Central Research), is a new entrant into the field of federal student loan servicing.

The loan servicer landscape is constantly fluctuating as new servicers enter the field and other servicers unload their portfolios. In the past few years, four in ten borrowers saw their loans change hands to a different servicer.

EdFinancial has been servicing federal student loans since 2012 and currently manages accounts for over five million borrowers. Nelnet began servicing federal student loans in 2009 and services 13.4 million federal student loan borrowers. Maximus began servicing loans for ED in October 2021, when another loan servicer, Navient, decided to exit the direct loan market. It currently manages more than 9 million accounts. MOHELA began servicing federal student loans in 2011, and its lending portfolio has more than tripled in the last three years. MOHELA manages approximately 8.4 million borrowers and is the exclusive servicer for borrowers seeking Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF).
II. Loan Servicers Had a Decades-Long Pattern of Failure Prior to the COVID-19 Payment Pause

For decades, loan servicers have engaged in predatory and deceptive practices that have harmed borrowers across the country. Among the most prominent early examples of such failures are those by Affiliated Computer Services (ACS), Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency (PHEAA), and Navient. As concerns about these servicers and others came to light, members of Congress, multiple federal agencies, and state attorneys general launched a variety of investigations into loan servicers’ practices, revealing industry-wide failures.

ACS was the sole servicer of ED’s Direct Loan program from 1992 to 2009, managing up to seven million loans, including those eligible for PSLF, during its peak. ACS also had a long history of misleading borrowers, mishandling monthly payments, and inappropriately using forbearance. For instance, ACS failed to correctly track the number of payments that more than 18,000 borrowers made toward PSLF. ACS also inappropriately placed more than 2.8 million borrowers into forbearance when they could have been enrolled in income-driven repayment (IDR) plans. As a result of ACS’s egregious errors, ED chose not to renew its contract with ACS in 2013, requiring ACS to transfer 35 million accounts to other servicers. During this transfer, ACS made more than five million servicing errors, which harmed more than 1.36 million borrowers.

PHEAA began servicing federal student loans in 2009. Like ACS, PHEAA had a concerning history of harming borrowers throughout its twelve-year record as a servicer. According to a suit brought by then-Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey, PHEAA detected an error that resulted in tens of thousands of borrowers being overcharged, yet failed to take adequate corrective action. New York Attorney General Letitia James filed a suit against PHEAA for misleading tens of thousands of borrowers by inaccurately counting payments for PSLF and failing to provide borrowers explanations for its determinations. Indeed, PHEAA rejected a staggering 98 percent of PSLF applications during its tenure. PHEAA’s errors were so extensive it was subject to nine different ED reviews and placed on four corrective action plans. In July 2021, PHEAA declined to renew its contract with ED, and its accounts were transferred to MOHELA, EdFinancial, Maximus, and Nelnet.

Navient (formerly Sallie Mae) also engaged in widespread predatory practices, including unlawfully capping service members’ loan interest rates. ED investigated Navient and other loan servicers to determine if they overcharged service members. However, subsequent oversight by Senator Warren and other members of Congress revealed that federal loan error rates for service members were ten times greater than what the Department documented in
its analysis. The ED Inspector General released a report in March 2016, confirming that ED significantly underestimated the servicers’ errors.

Navient’s misdeeds extended beyond its mistreatment of service members. Navient, then as Sallie Mae, made predatory lending arrangements with for-profit colleges, which allowed students to take out government-backed loans to attend these fraudulent institutions, even though the company was well aware these borrowers would have a high likelihood of default. Navient repeatedly steered its borrowers to worse repayment options so that call operators could save time and money. Navient also overcharged the government more than $22 million to administer the student loan program, which the company only paid back years later.

Despite increasing calls for greater transparency and accountability for federal loan servicers, much of this progress was undermined by the Trump Administration. In 2017, under Secretary Betsy DeVos, ED terminated its memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) that required the agencies to “cooperate in connection with their respective student financial services oversight and supervisory activities.” Without the agreement, it was more difficult for agencies to share data and conduct oversight over loan servicers.

In March 2018, ED adopted new guidelines advancing the interpretation that federal law preempts state laws regulating federal loan servicers, reversing prior administration policy. In practice, these guidelines stripped states’ ability to fill the gaps where the federal government failed to adequately protect borrowers. By limiting state regulation and inter-agency coordination, these Trump Administration decisions emboldened loan servicers to continue engaging in predatory practices without the threat of meaningful consequences—creating a lending landscape that was increasingly difficult to navigate while student debt continued to climb to extraordinary levels.
III. Student Loan Servicers Repeatedly and Systematically Failed Borrowers During the Return to Repayment

The COVID-19 pandemic created unprecedented financial hardships across the United States and threatened to exacerbate the already precarious state of student debt. Even before the pandemic, student loan debt made up 11 percent of American household debt, exceeding all credit card debt and trailing only mortgage debt in volume. Additionally, low-income, Black, and Latino borrowers experienced disproportionate economic harms as a result of the student debt crisis.

The Coronavirus Aid, Relief, Economic Security Act (CARES Act) offered temporary economic relief for borrowers through the suspension of payments, collections, and interest on federal student loans. But the relief was limited in time, spanning from March 2020 to September 2023, and the return to repayment for borrowers was complicated by several factors.

The first blow was the Supreme Court’s decision to strike down President Biden’s initial broad-based debt relief plan. On August 24, 2022, the Biden-Harris Administration announced its plan for ED to cancel up to $20,000 in debt for low- to middle-income borrowers, which would have eliminated student debt for 20 million borrowers and provided relief for 23 million more. Republican attorneys general rushed to the courts to block the President’s plan, and the Supreme Court’s conservative supermajority acceded to their demands, stripping debt relief from borrowers across the country. As a result, tens of millions of borrowers who would have otherwise had their debt cancelled saw the resumption of student loan interest in September 2023 and payments in October 2023.

To protect borrowers from the impact of the Court’s decision, on the same day the decision was released, President Biden announced he was pursuing an alternative pathway to broad-based debt cancellation; a new IDR plan, SAVE; and a 12-month “on ramp” to help protect borrowers during repayment.

To further complicate borrowers’ experiences, many loan servicers exited the federal student loan program during the repayment pause. Between the summer of 2021 and fall of 2023, five of the largest loan servicers—Granite State, Great Lakes, Navient, Oklahoma Student Loan Authority, and PHEAA—discontinued their contracts with ED. As a result, these servicers transferred nine million borrower accounts to the remaining student loan servicers and one new servicer, leaving EdFinancial, Maximus, MOHELA, and Nelnet to service federal student loans at the time that payments resumed.

The four student loan servicers that were under contract with ED at the end of the payment pause had ample time, clear contractual requirements, and sufficient funding from the federal government. Yet, they still made a series of mistakes that harmed millions of borrowers...
when payments restarted. The following findings are drawn from responses to a series of oversight letters to student loan servicers and ED by Senator Warren and her colleagues and public reports documenting loan servicers’ errors and failure to support borrowers during the return to repayment, including memos and reports released by ED, CFPB, and the Student Borrower Protection Center (SBPC), and American Federation of Teachers (AFT).

A. Servicers Did Not Sufficiently Prepare for the Return to Repayment

Despite continued warnings about the return to repayment, every servicer failed to adequately prepare for potential challenges once payments resumed. On July 18, 2023, Senators Warren, Blumenthal, Brown, Markey, Menendez, and Van Hollen sent letters to the four servicers requesting information about how they would support borrowers during repayment, including their plans for hiring and training new employees, managing call wait times, and conducting borrower outreach. The servicers’ employment plans indicated that they would not have enough staff to handle the influx of new accounts. For example, under its plans, EdFinancial gained roughly 7,111 new borrowers for every new employee it planned to hire, and MOHELA gained approximately 16,965 new borrowers for each new employee. Nelnet failed to provide any meaningful information about how they would manage new accounts once payments resumed, and in fact, laid off roughly 900 employees and fired 210 others in 2023, creating even more concerns about the company’s ability to uphold its responsibility to borrowers.

These failures were further documented by a January 2024 report from the CFPB. According to the CFPB, in the months preceding the return to repayment, borrowers experienced a variety of billing errors and customer service challenges: borrowers received inaccurate account information, had their monthly payments miscounted, or found errors with their payment records. And when borrowers attempted to address these concerns, they were often unable to reach their servicer due to excessive wait times. On average, borrowers had to wait over 73 minutes before getting a hold of a live customer service representative, with one borrower reporting a wait time of 565 minutes—over nine hours.

As a result, borrowers filed a combined total of nearly 43,000 complaints, according to information provided by the loan servicers in response to Congressional requests. MOHELA received the most complaints of any servicer by far, accounting for roughly 85 percent of all reported borrower complaints. From July 1, 2022 through September 30, 2023, CFPB received more complaints about MOHELA than any other loan servicer, totaling nearly 3,000 complaints. Even more concerning, millions of borrowers were never set up an online account.
B. Servicers Created Significant and Widespread Harms for Borrowers After Payments Resumed

When payments restarted, loan servicers’ immediate failures resulted in more than 3.9 million billing-related errors. Nearly 3.3 million borrowers received no billing statement or had their billing statement delayed. When ED asked servicers to audit their files, it uncovered 140,000 miscalculations servicers made to borrowers’ family size, income, or marital status, which resulted in higher payment amounts. On October 29, 2023, ED released a memo documenting more widespread servicer errors during the start of return to repayment. ED found that 78,000 borrowers received incorrect monthly bills after converting to the new SAVE plan; ED attributed this failure to servicers’ incomplete transfer of more than five million borrower accounts. More than 21,000 people were billed “very high” and “potentially incorrect” amounts, and servicers also incorrectly removed 16,000 borrowers from forbearance. Additionally, servicers failed to send required disclosures to 153,000 borrowers who converted to the new SAVE repayment plan—amounting to nearly 270,000 billing-related errors.

CFPB released a report in October 2023 detailing a further deluge of servicer failures after payments resumed. MOHELA was arguably the biggest perpetrator of harms to borrowers. MOHELA failed to send timely billing statements to 2.5 million borrowers. MOHELA also miscalculated bills for approximately 280,000 borrowers enrolled in the SAVE plan by using outdated poverty guidelines. According to a recently released report from SBPC and AFT, several millions of MOHELA’s borrowers experienced some form of servicing issue after the payment pause ended in September 2023. MOHELA had a backlog of more than 800,000 PSLF applications as of June 2023 and denied PSLF credit to public service workers with eligible employment. Recent data from ED reveals that as of March 2024 there were approximately 370,000 PSLF forms still in the backlog. Additionally, EdFinancial, Maximus, and Nelnet all failed to send timely billing statements, impacting a combined total of 758,000 borrowers. As of October 2023, one-third of all newly transferred Maximus borrowers and half of all new MOHELA borrowers had still not set up an online account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICER</th>
<th>Total Complaints Reported by Servicers from July 2022 to Aug. 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EdFinancial</td>
<td>3,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximus</td>
<td>3,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHELA</td>
<td>36,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelnet</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42,841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Total Complaints Self-Reported by Servicers from July 2022 to August 2023
To better understand servicers’ performance during the return to repayment, Senator Warren and her colleagues sent another series of inquiries to student loan servicers and ED.111 The letters requested additional information about some of the most prevalent problems that borrowers faced, including call and email wait times and billing errors.112 Servicers’ responses and performance metrics provided by ED, much of which are being released for the first time as part of this report, offered additional data indicating significant deficits in servicers’ performance. The biggest failures across all servicers included extended call and email response times, high call abandonment rates, and poor customer service ratings—all of which contributed to an influx of borrower complaints.

**Long Call Wait & Email Response Times**

MOHELA had the longest self-reported average call wait time of any servicer at 38 minutes, followed by Maximus at 31 minutes.113 Servicers’ reported wait times during the return to repayment grossly exceeded their targets. The disparity between servicers’ predictions and actual wait times raise questions of whether their forecasts were provided in good faith.114 Even the servicers' reported call wait times should be viewed with some skepticism. Though MOHELA reported a 38-minute average call wait time, a recent CFPB report found that servicers’ average call wait time was 62 minutes in mid-September, 47 minutes at the end of September, and 73 minutes in October.115

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICER</th>
<th>Servicers’ Forecasted Call Wait Times at Start of Repayment</th>
<th>Reported Average Call Wait Times at Start of Repayment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EdFinancial</td>
<td>90 seconds</td>
<td>15 min, 25 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximus</td>
<td>60 seconds</td>
<td>30 minutes, 48 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHELA</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>38 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelnet</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Servicers did no better in their email responses to borrowers, and every servicer reported wait times of two weeks or more.116 In fact, borrowers served by MOHELA waited an average of 39 business days—nearly six weeks—before receiving an email response.117 MOHELA also reportedly used a “call deflection” scheme to prevent borrowers from reaching service representatives.118 MOHELA’s call center representatives directed borrowers to alternative resources, such as MOHELA’s website or the Office of Federal Student Aid’s (FSA) website, rather than providing live customer service over the phone.119 Yet, borrowers could not get all the information they needed from consulting these websites alone; MOHELA’s website reportedly experienced log-in issues and was missing key information impacting borrowers’ options, including President Biden’s on-ramp to repayment.120
Call Abandonment Rates

ED’s maximum threshold for call abandonment rates was set at four percent prior to April 2023 and increased to eight percent thereafter. As payments were set to resume, the number of abandoned calls for each servicer skyrocketed, and for multiple servicers, more than one-third of phone calls from borrowers were abandoned. From July to September 2023, EdFinancial’s abandonment rate was 24.4 percent, Maximus’s was 34.3 percent, MOHELA’s was 24.4 percent, and Nelnet’s was 41.2 percent. Together, servicers’ call abandonment rates was roughly 31 percent when averaged—more than 20 times greater than the collective average of 1.54 percent prior to July 2023. Servicers reported even higher call abandonment rates after September 1, 2023. For example, Maximus reported an abandonment rate of 48.2 percent, and MOHELA reported an abandonment rate of 35 percent.

Table 4. Call Abandonment Rates by Servicer from Q1 to Q3 of 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICER</th>
<th>Q1 (Jan. to March 2023)</th>
<th>Q2 (April to June 2023)</th>
<th>Q3 (July to Sept. 2023)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EdFinancial</td>
<td>.30%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>24.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximus</td>
<td>.40%</td>
<td>.70%</td>
<td>34.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHELA</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>24.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelnet</td>
<td>.04%</td>
<td>4.22%</td>
<td>41.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Customer Service Ratings

ED requires a minimum threshold of 70 percent customer satisfaction for loan servicers. With only one exception, every servicer failed to meet this threshold in every quarter of 2023 where data was available. Maximus, operating as Aidvantage, received the lowest customer service rating of all servicers, with only 55 percent satisfaction between April and June 2023. In fact, Maximus was the only servicer to never break 60 percent satisfaction. When averaged, customer service ratings across all servicers declined each quarter.

Table 5. Customer Service Satisfaction Rates by Servicer from Q1 to Q3 of 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICER</th>
<th>Q1 (Jan. to March 2023)</th>
<th>Q2 (April to June 2023)</th>
<th>Q3 (July to Sept. 2023)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EdFinancial</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximus</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHELA</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelnet</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Incorrect Billing Information**

Servicers provided almost no information about their billing errors in response to Congressional requests. EdFinancial did voluntarily disclose it had sent 15,370 bills with incorrect information.\(^{130}\) As discussed above, ED also found that MOHELA sent bills with incorrect payment amounts to approximately 280,000 borrowers enrolled in SAVE.\(^ {131}\)

**Borrower Complaints**

Borrower complaints continued to pour in after payments resumed, with each servicer receiving complaints regarding both customer service difficulties and account errors. For example, the vast majority of complaints against EdFinancial were for customer service problems,\(^ {132}\) whereas approximately 93 percent of Maximus’s 1,639 complaints were for errors.\(^ {133}\) Some of these figures appear inconsistent with the realities that borrowers faced, raising concerns about the effectiveness of servicers’ process for recording borrower complaints. For example, Maximus reported only 118 customer service complaints despite its self-reported call wait times reaching over 30 minutes.\(^ {134}\) Additionally, EdFinancial only reported receiving 100 complaints for errors, when its reports indicated 15,370 borrowers received bills with incorrect information.\(^ {135}\)

**Table 6. Total Complaints Self-Reported by Servicers from September 2023 to December 2023**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICER</th>
<th>Total Complaints Reported by Servicers from Sept. 2023 to Dec. 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EdFinancial</td>
<td>1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximus</td>
<td>1,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHELA</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelnet</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Biden-Harris Administration has taken forceful action to reform accountability mechanisms for student loan servicers. In May 2021, FSA issued new guidance enabling the agency to streamline the process for sharing information with states attorneys general and regulators and making it easier for states to enforce their consumer protection laws against servicers. On August 9, 2021, ED reversed the Trump-era preemption rule to encourage greater collaboration between the federal government and states on student loan servicing accountability. And on October 15, 2021, ED announced it would strengthen standards for evaluating student loan servicers’ performance by adding new accountability metrics into its contracts with servicers. Service-level agreements (SLAs) between FSA and servicers established minimum thresholds for servicers to meet, including “70 percent borrower satisfaction with customer service; 95 percent casework accuracy; and a call abandonment rate no higher than 4 percent.”

The Biden-Harris Administration responded to the student loan servicer failures during the return to repayment by announcing its new framework for servicer accountability in November 2023. The framework outlined three tenets for FSA to strengthen servicer oversight, which includes improved monitoring of servicers’ customer service responses, greater coordination with federal and state regulators, and increased scrutiny of complaints against servicers to determine if there were broader systemic problems. In addition to these oversight strategies, the framework also announced new accountability measures when servicers failed to uphold their responsibilities to borrowers. These new measures included withholding payments to servicers, re-allocating borrowers to better performing servicers, issuing Contractor Performance Reports (CPARS), and using Corrective Action Plans (CAP) when servicers commit errors or other harms to borrowers.

Most importantly, the new framework outlines a series of remedies for servicers to employ if they commit errors that impact borrowers. First, servicers are required to put borrowers into short administrative forbearance while they fix errors. Second, when a borrower’s progress toward forgiveness is harmed by servicer errors, ED directs servicers to count the forbearance period toward PSLF and IDR relief with accrued interest adjusted to zero.

The Biden-Harris Administration has already begun implementing these accountability measures. ED announced on October 30, 2023 that it was penalizing MOHELA for its failure to send timely billing statements to 2.5 million borrowers by withholding $7.2 million from the servicer. The Department also withheld $2 million from Maximus, $161,000 from EdFinancial, and $13,000 from Nelnet for their respective harms to borrowers. Further, ED...
directed the servicers to place borrowers into administrative forbearance and have those months count as credit towards PSLF and IDR. These were important steps to impose accountability and protect borrowers in response to student loan servicers’ errors.
More can and should be done to remedy the sheer scope and severity of harms that federal loan servicers caused to borrowers as payments resumed. To summarize, the most significant failings of each servicer in the leadup to and during the return to repayment include:

**EdFinancial**
- EdFinancial sent 15,370 bills with incorrect information.\(^ {148} \)
- EdFinancial received more than 1,000 borrower complaints between September and December 2023.\(^ {149} \)

**Maximus**
- Among the four student loan servicers, Maximus had the lowest customer service ratings, with borrower satisfaction reaching as low as 55 percent.\(^ {150} \)
- Nearly 3 million borrowers served by Maximus did not set up online accounts at the start of the return to repayment, roughly one-third of all borrowers they serviced.\(^ {151} \)
- During the return to repayment, Maximus’s average self-reported call wait time reached 30 minutes, 48 seconds.\(^ {152} \)
- Maximus self-reported the highest call abandonment rate among the servicers after September 2023, at 48.2 percent.\(^ {153} \)

**MOHELA**
- MOHELA received the most complaints of any federal loan servicer according to reports made to CFPB and its internal records, with the latter reaching more than 37,000 complaints between July 1, 2022 and December 31, 2023.\(^ {154} \)
- MOHELA sent bills with incorrect amounts to approximately 280,000 borrowers enrolled in the SAVE plan.\(^ {155} \)
- MOHELA failed to send timely billing statements to 2.5 million borrowers.\(^ {156} \)
- During the return to repayment, MOHELA had the highest self-reported average call and email wait times of any servicer, reaching more than 38 minutes and 39 business days, respectively.\(^ {157} \)
• Roughly half of MOHELA’s new borrowers did not set up online accounts at the start of repayment.158

• MOHELA had a backlog of more than 800,000 PSLF applications as of June 2023, and as of March 2024, the backlog of PSLF forms stood at approximately 370,000.159

• As the sole PSLF servicer, MOHELA’s failures were disproportionately harmful to public service workers.

Nelnet

• In response to Congressional inquiries, Nelnet refused to provide a transparent, accurate account of the conditions its borrowers faced or take accountability for its failures.160

• Nelnet’s customer service rating fell to 57 percent during the leadup to the return to payment, the lowest of any servicer during that period and the third lowest of all customer service ratings reported in 2023.161

• According to data collected by ED, Nelnet had the highest call abandonment rate of any servicer from July to September 2023, reaching 41.2 percent.162

Despite ample warnings, resources, guidelines, and opportunities to learn from the decades-long pattern of servicers turning a blind eye to borrowers’ needs, EdFinancial, Maximus, MOHELA, and Nelnet perpetuated the same cycles of harm. These servicers’ failure to adequately prepare for the return to repayment, support borrowers as payments resumed, and disclose their errors reveals deep flaws within the entire system of loan servicing.

The totality of the harms caused by these failures cannot be remedied solely by withholding future payments to loan servicers. Millions of borrowers have already felt the negative effects of servicers’ widespread processing errors and poor customer service, and they deserve more options to be made whole after making unnecessary payments or being denied debt relief due to servicing mistakes. To remedy servicers’ historic failures and protect borrowers from future harms, there must be a path for debt relief for borrowers harmed by their servicers.

The Biden-Harris Administration has already approved loan cancellation for nearly 3.9 million Americans.163 However, these measures do not fully account for the harms to more than three million borrowers who experienced some form of servicer error during the return to payment.164 As ED works to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking for student debt cancellation, it should establish a path for debt cancellation for victims of servicer error.
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