

ED Guidance on Competency-Based Education: Barriers to Adoption Remain

October 5, 2015

Months after its anticipated release date, the Department has published a collection of CBE guidance documents including one it has named the [Competency-Based Education Reference Guide](#). Although the guidance is geared toward institutions already participating in one of the Department's CBE-related Experimental Sites, it is accompanied by expanded commentary on CBE published in the new [2015-2016 Federal Student Aid Handbook](#). While the new guidance represents an important step in the Administration's efforts to minimize some of the barriers to CBE within the existing federal student aid system, it is notable what is not changed: despite a number of waivers and modifications that chip away at the barriers to the widespread adoption of CBE, such programs remain tethered to the time-based limitations of clock- and credit-hours. Significantly, the guidance does not fundamentally alter the federal student financial aid system that is built around the clock time and credit hours—both of which are fundamentally time-based rather than competency-based measures of student learning.

Under Secretary Ted Mitchell, a long-time advocate of CBE, has been supportive of reducing barriers to the adoption of what [he has described](#) as a “promising new delivery model with the potential to improve degree completion, reduce costs to students and improve transparency and alignment of learning outcomes to the needs of employers and society.” That position has been echoed by Senator Lamar Alexander, Chair of the Senate's Health, Education, Labor and Pensions (HELP) Committee that is working on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Congress attempted to make provision for CBE in a so-called “direct assessment” statutory provision in 2005, but this has proved to be only a partial solution.

Last July, ED [invited institutions to apply](#) to participate in a set of CBE-focused “Experimental Sites Initiatives.” These [experiments](#), designed to test alternative methods of administering federal student financial aid programs, allow the Department to waive or modify participation requirements. Implementation of these projects has been exceedingly slow, however, as the Department has sought to provide clarifications and better describe how the Experiments would be expected to operate.

This week—on the one-year anniversary of the application deadline for participation—the Experimental Sites Initiative website hosted by the Department's Office of Federal Student Aid finally includes specific details about the waivers and modifications and what policies and procedures institutions will need to draft in order to accommodate the revisions.

Highlights from the new guidance include:

- Expectations regarding the type of documentation that institutions must submit from their accrediting agencies in order for CBE programs to be considered eligible;
- Examples of what the Department considers to be “regular and substantive interaction” between students and faculty in the context of CBE;
- The definition of a “qualified” faculty member as distinguished from other individuals who frequently play a role in CBE programs, such as tutors and learning coaches;
- Clarification regarding when development of an “academic action plan” can be considered an educational activity that counts toward an institution's provision of “instructional services”; and
- Details on when institutions can make disbursements of federal grants and loans for direct costs (like tuition) versus indirect costs (like room and board).

The Reference Guide also adds requirements for Experimental Site participants that will involve the development of new processes and policies.

We will continue to monitor developments related to CBE, including the implications of the Reference Guide for institutions participating in the Experimental Sites program or developing CBE programs within their existing student aid system.

Mike Goldstein has been a pioneer in the development of new and more effective and efficient approaches to education in general and eLearning in particular through the creation of innovative approaches to combining the resources and interests of the various sectors of the education, technology, financial and governmental communities.

Vince Sampson focuses on helping clients predict, navigate and understand the increasingly complex involvement of federal agencies and Congress.

Naomi Harralson May works with colleges and universities to develop effective, compliant practices – and then translate them to accreditors, state educational agencies and the DOE.

This content is provided for general informational purposes only, and your access or use of the content does not create an attorney-client relationship between you or your organization and Cooley LLP, Cooley (UK) LLP, or any other affiliated practice or entity (collectively referred to as “Cooley”). By accessing this content, you agree that the information provided does not constitute legal or other professional advice. This content is not a substitute for obtaining legal advice from a qualified attorney licensed in your jurisdiction, and you should not act or refrain from acting based on this content. This content may be changed without notice. It is not guaranteed to be complete, correct or up to date, and it may not reflect the most current legal developments. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. Do not send any confidential information to Cooley, as we do not have any duty to keep any information you provide to us confidential. This content may have been generated with the assistance of artificial intelligence (AI) in accordance with our [AI Principles](#), may be considered Attorney Advertising and is subject to our [legal notices](#). Copyright © 2026