New Federal Student Loan Caps Target Graduate Debt, But Colleges Still Avoid Real Accountability

May 31, 2026 - The federal government's new student loan reforms are being presented as a major effort to control runaway education debt, particularly at the graduate school level. New rules are expected to cap borrowing for graduate students, eliminate Grad PLUS loans, and impose tougher accountability standards on programs whose graduates struggle financially after leaving school. But despite the tougher rhetoric from Washington, the reforms still avoid addressing what many see as the core problem behind America's student debt crisis: colleges themselves still face little direct financial responsibility when students cannot repay what they borrowed.
Under the new framework, graduate students will face fixed borrowing limits based on the type of degree they pursue. Professional programs such as medicine and law are expected to retain higher borrowing allowances than many standard graduate programs. Federal regulators are also moving toward earnings-based accountability systems that could eventually threaten federal aid eligibility for programs with weak repayment outcomes or low graduate earnings.

Supporters say the changes could slow tuition inflation and discourage schools from offering expensive degrees with limited economic value. Critics counter that the reforms may simply push students into private lending markets with higher interest rates and fewer consumer protections.

These changes focus heavily on graduate borrowing while leaving much of the undergraduate debt system largely intact. That distinction matters because undergraduate debt remains one of the largest and most widespread segments of the student loan crisis. While graduate borrowing has grown rapidly in recent years, millions of Americans continue to struggle with debt tied to four-year undergraduate degrees that often produce modest earnings. Undergrads can still accumulate well over $200,000 in total debt through combinations of federal loans, Parent PLUS loans, and private lending while pursuing their degrees at expensive universities. That's absolutely insane for some degrees. Think Art History or Women's Studies. If you have one of these degrees you probably already know that the market demand for them is low, as is the earning potential. You could be mired in debt for the rest of your adult life.

The new reforms increase accountability pressure indirectly through earnings tests and program oversight, at least at the graduate level. But they still stop short of requiring universities to directly absorb losses when graduates default. For decades, the federal student loan system has operated under a structure that many economists describe as fundamentally misaligned. Colleges receive tuition payments immediately while taxpayers absorb much of the long-term financial risk if graduates later struggle financially. That structure has allowed tuition costs to rise far faster than inflation while universities expanded administrative staffing, facilities spending, and faculty compensation.

While the new rules do represent progress, meaningful reform would require colleges to have direct financial exposure tied to the repayment performance of their graduates.

One possible model would involve the federal government allocating universities their own lending pools. Schools would then decide how much students could borrow, which programs justify larger loans, and how much financial risk the institution is willing to accept. If graduates repay successfully, the university would maintain or potentially expand its future lending authority. But if graduates default heavily, the school's future lending pool could shrink.

Such a system could dramatically reshape incentives across higher education. Universities would likely become far more cautious about tuition increases if excessive borrowing threatened future funding. Schools could place greater emphasis on job placement services, internships, employer partnerships, and career counseling to improve graduate outcomes. Admissions standards might also change. Colleges could become more selective about admitting students into programs with historically poor employment or repayment outcomes. The system could also encourage schools to reevaluate academic programs that consistently leave students with large debts and limited earning potential.

Another possible outcome would be risk-based lending similar to practices used throughout the banking industry. Universities could theoretically charge lower interest rates for programs with strong repayment records and higher rates for programs carrying greater financial risk. Programs in engineering, nursing, accounting, or computer science with strong labor-market demand might qualify for lower borrowing costs. Programs with weaker historical repayment performance could face tighter lending standards or reduced borrowing limits. This would finally align incentives between schools and students by forcing colleges to consider the real-world financial consequences of the degrees they offer.

The changes could also extend beyond lending practices and tuition costs. Critics of the current system argue universities themselves may eventually need to reevaluate compensation structures and spending priorities that have expanded dramatically over the past several decades. For much of the 20th century, many professors entered academia less for high salaries and more for intellectual freedom, job stability, research opportunities, and the lifestyle associated with teaching. Faculty positions often carried prestige and long-term security even if compensation lagged behind private

industry. That model has shifted substantially over the past 30 to 40 years as tuition climbed sharply and university spending expanded across many categories, including faculty compensation, administration, and campus development projects.

If universities were forced to bear greater responsibility for loan defaults, schools would face pressure to reduce overall operating costs and place greater emphasis on affordability.

Opponents of risk-sharing models warn that such systems could create unintended consequences. Universities might become less willing to admit low-income students, first-generation applicants, or students viewed as financially risky. Some humanities and arts programs could face severe financial pressure if lending decisions become too closely tied to expected earnings. But the truth is, if there is no market for an expensive degree, there is no purpose in going into debt for it. Virtually anyone can obtain all of the information on art history by picking up a few books. The same can be said for many other fields of study as well. And a professor making six figures teaching these subjects is more of a drain on the system than anything else.

Fortunately, the broader policy direction in Washington appears to be moving steadily toward greater accountability for schools whose graduates struggle financially after leaving campus. That's good news for education in general and for those entering universities. It mean the future degrees could actually be worth what students pay for them and that future generations of students may avoid being saddled with debt that they will never be able to repay. The new graduate loan caps may represent the beginning of that transition. But these reforms shouldn't focus solely on graduate schools while leaving much of the undergraduate debt system untouched.

Unfortunately for the time being, even with these reforms universities continue to receive tuition payments upfront while students and taxpayers carry most of the long-term financial risk when educational debt becomes unmanageable.
by Jim Malmberg
Note: When posting a comment, please sign-in first if you want a response. If you are not registered, click here. Registration is easy and free.

Follow ACCESS