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Introduction

When industry created modern Income Share Agreements (ISAs) as a way to finance higher education, its advocates contorted themselves trying to circumvent the federal consumer laws that govern credit. ISA advocates avoided terminology typically used for loans, like “interest” and “principal,” and instead developed “agreements” that purportedly disassociate repayment obligations from the amount borrowed: student borrowers must pay back either a share of their monthly income or a fixed sum that is typically higher than the cost of the education. ISA lenders represent their product to students and policymakers alike as a new alternative to traditional student lending.

But ISAs are just another type of student loan. To obtain an ISA, as with a student loan, students apply to a company to obtain money for their education in exchange for a promise to repay the company in the future. The common understanding of a loan is the familiar opportunity to “gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today.” With ISAs, students are getting a hamburger today (education) in exchange for a promise to pay for it on the proverbial Tuesday. The fact that borrowers can pay back their ISAs as a percentage of their post-graduate income is nothing special—in fact, payment plans based on a percentage of income are available to the vast majority of students repaying federal student loans and a growing number with private student loans. The thing an ISA most resembles in the world is a student loan.

1 See Michael Stratford, Income-Share Agreement Supporters Lobby Congress, Politico (June 26, 2019, 10:00 AM), https://www.politico.com/newsletters/morning-education/2019/06/26/income-share-agreement-supporters-lobby-congress-450909; Tariq Habash et al., Will Income-Share Become the Next Payday Loans?, Am. Prospect (July 2, 2019), https://prospect.org/education/will-income-share-agreements-next-payday-loans/ (“[Advocates of ISAs] are using a familiar playbook: Just like payday loans, auto title loans, and other ‘alternative debt products’ unveiled before them, ISA lenders are creating debt instruments and then convincing policymakers to roll back the rules that keep consumers safe from exploitation, based on immaterial or specious distinctions between their product and traditional loans.”).

ISA lenders tout their service as a desirable and low-risk option for students who purportedly will be required to pay only what their incomes support. Their claims, which are themselves subject to criticism from consumer advocates for being deceptive, elide the myriad ways ISAs can harm student borrowers. ISAs typically establish harsh collections practices, including allowing lenders to collect multiples of the amount borrowed in the event of default, permitting them to seek an offset of a defaulted borrower’s state tax refund, and making defaulted borrowers responsible for expenses associated with collections. The income share a student must pay under an ISA often depends on the student’s major, so these arrangements create the potential for discrimination based on characteristics that often track particular fields of study—like race, gender, and national origin. And because ISAs often do not replace other student debt, but rather provide additional funding above and beyond a borrower’s federal student loans, a student may leave school with an overall repayment obligation that is higher than if the student had simply financed their entire education with traditional federal and private student loans.

ISA lenders contend their agreements are not subject to existing federal consumer protection law because they—unlike private student lenders—do not extend credit. That claim alone should raise red flags for policymakers.

---

3 See e.g., Back a Boiler Program Overview, Purdue Univ., https://www.purdue.edu/backaboiler/overview/index.html (last visited July 12, 2020) (describing Purdue University’s ISA as “an alternative to private or Parent PLUS Loans to fund a Purdue education which can be paid back with greater flexibility and freedom”); Better Future Forward, Better Future Forward launches Income Share Agreements Fund for Low-Income Chicago Students Pursuing a College Degree, Educ. Credit Mgmt. Corp. (Nov. 15, 2018), https://www.ecmcfoundation.org/informed/2019/better-future-forward-launches-income-share-agreements-fund-for-low-income-chicago-students-pursuing-a-college-degree (explaining that ISAs are a “low-risk, broadly-accessible, income-based college financing”).


7 See Morgan et al, supra note 5 (“Our research shows that when accounting for both federal student loans and an ISA, these monthly payments could be as high as 40 percent of pre-tax income for some students, further threatening their economic security.”); James Gallagher, State of the Coding Bootcamp Market Report 2020, Career Karma (Apr. 29, 2020), https://careerkarma.com/blog/bootcamp-market-report-2020 (“The majority of coding bootcamps continue to offer upfront or installment payment plans, in addition to ISAs. This suggests that ISAs are not being seen as a replacement for other models of financing, rather an additional option for students. This is important because, for students who already have savings, or who are averse to the prospect of paying back multiples more than the cost of tuition, ISAs are not a good option.”).

and enforcers alike, particularly when made in a market historically fraught with peril for borrowers. But existing law does not support industry’s position that it does not reach them, and we believe the federal consumer protection statutes, as-written, provide an effective framework to regulate ISAs now. This paper examines why ISAs constitute “credit” within the meaning of the relevant federal consumer protection statutes and therefore are already subject to federal regulation and enforcement.

In Part II, we provide an overview of ISAs and their place in the student lending market. And in Part III, we explain why ISAs constitute credit under and therefore must comply with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (ECOA), the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA), the Truth in Lending Act (TILA), and the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (CFPA). Although we consider this question to be straightforward under existing law, we provide a step-by-step analysis that we hope will be useful to those with the authority and tools to protect student borrowers.

---


11 This analysis does not, and is not intended to, constitute legal advice.
Context for Income Share Agreements

ISAs are neither a new nor unique form of lending. They should be understood within the broader historical context of income-driven repayment plans and among the other options that exist today for students to limit loan repayment obligations to a percentage of their incomes. Modern ISAs, which have emerged in certain segments of the student lending market in recent years, exhibit certain key features, discussed below, that are important to the determination that ISAs are credit under federal law.

Student Loan Market

The student loan market is the second largest consumer credit market in the United States (second only to mortgages), consisting of 45 million borrowers who have nearly $1.7 trillion in outstanding student debt.\(^\text{12}\) Student loans are unsecured loans taken out to pay for tuition and other costs of higher education. The vast majority of student loans today are originated by the U.S. Department of Education and are generally subject to few underwriting requirements. In addition, there is a $140 billion private student loan market.\(^\text{13}\) Banks and other lenders underwrite private student loans, and thus, because many student loan borrowers are young and have a thin credit file, as many as 93% of private student loans include a cosigner.\(^\text{14}\)

As a practical matter, students apply for loans directly from the government or private student lenders. Lenders will usually distribute principal funds directly to the school. A student borrower’s repayment obligation is often deferred until the student leaves school, at which point the borrower must repay each loan according to its terms. As noted below, those terms include several repayment options, including, for federal loans and some private loans, income-driven repayment options.

Borrowers usually take out multiple student loans, not just one.\(^\text{15}\) There are multiple federal loan programs and types of loans with different borrowing caps, interest subsidies, and benefits. The Department of Education caps


\(^{14}\) See Student Borrower Prot. Ctr., supra note 13 at 12.

the amount a borrower can obtain from each loan program or loan type,\textsuperscript{16} so it is not unusual for some students to graduate with more than 10 loans from a combination of federal and private lenders.

Student borrowers are struggling to repay their loans. As of the first quarter of 2020, 10.8\% of student debt was 90 or more days delinquent.\textsuperscript{17} That is a higher delinquency rate than credit cards, mortgages, auto loans, or any other class of loan tracked by the New York Federal Reserve. For a sense of gravity, a 10.8\% delinquency rate is higher than the delinquency rate for mortgages during the 2008 financial crisis. It is also higher than the delinquency rates for student loans during the financial crisis—meaning the Student Loan Crisis is worse now than it was during the Great Recession.\textsuperscript{18}

### Income-Driven Repayment Options for Student Loans

The concept of having students borrow to pay for education and later repay with a percentage of their post-completion salaries originated in the 1940s and 50s in a series of papers written by economists Milton Friedman and Simon Kuznets.\textsuperscript{19} Several prominent universities experimented with this concept in the 1970s, but these programs were discontinued and generally considered failures.\textsuperscript{20} Federal policy discussions surrounding income-contingent lending continued throughout the 1980s and 90s.\textsuperscript{21}

The federal government first introduced an income-driven repayment plan for federal loans during the Clinton administration.\textsuperscript{22} The Department of Education currently offers several income-driven repayment options, including the Income-Contingent Repayment Plan (ICR Plan), the Income-Based Repayment Plan (IBR Plan), the

---

\textsuperscript{16} PLUS Loans are an exception. Parents and graduate students borrowing through the federal PLUS program are not subject to a loan limit; rather, annual borrowing may be used to finance the entire gap remaining between financial support provided through other forms of Federal Student Aid and the full cost of attendance. There are no lifetime limits in the PLUS program. See PLUS Loans, U.S. Dep’t of Educ., https://studentaid.gov/understand-aid/types/loans/plus/ (last visited July 18, 2020).


\textsuperscript{18} See id.


\textsuperscript{21} See Shireman, supra note 20, at 188, 192–94.

Pay As You Earn Repayment Plan (PAYE plan), and the Revised Pay As You Earn Repayment Plan (REPAYE plan). These income-driven repayment plans are available to both borrowers of federally-owned Direct loans and borrowers of privately-owned loans made under the Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL) Program. Under each of the income-driven repayment plans, a student's payment amount is established as a percentage of their discretionary income. Each plan has a defined repayment period (usually 20 or 25 years), after which any remaining loan balance is forgiven. The Department of Education’s website explains that, depending on a borrower's income and family size, they may make no payments and that periods when required payments are zero “will count toward [a borrower’s] total repayment period.”

A growing number of private student loan programs also feature income-driven repayment options. These range from loan modifications limited to distressed borrowers under extremely limited circumstances, to publicly advertised repayment options available to any borrower that elects the option. Lenders offering income-driven repayment options for private student loans include state-backed lending authorities responding to state legislative mandates, as well as private lenders who recognize that payment flexibility may improve borrower repayment success over the long-term.

---


24 The Department of Education defines “discretionary income” for each plan. For the IBR, PAYE, and REPAYE plans, a borrower’s discretionary income is “the difference between [their] adjusted gross income (AGI) and 150 percent of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Poverty Guideline amount for [their] family size and state.” Id. And for the ICR Plan, “discretionary income is the difference between [the borrower’s] AGI and 100 percent of the HHS Poverty Guideline amount for [their] family size and state.” Id.

25 See id.

26 If a borrower's discretionary income is less than 150 percent of the federal poverty guidelines, then they will be eligible for $0 payments. See id. (“If your income is low enough, your payment could be as low as $0 per month.”).

27 See, e.g., Income-Based Repayment, R.I. Student Loan Auth., https://www.risla.com/ibr (last visited July 13, 2020) (“Income-Based Repayment (IBR) is designed to reduce monthly payments to help borrowers make student loan debt manageable. To qualify for IBR, borrowers and cosigners must demonstrate financial hardship based on current wages and family size. Financial hardship can be demonstrated when the monthly payment amount required to pay RISLA’s non-federal loans under a standard repayment plan is higher than the monthly amount under IBR. IBR payment amounts may increase or decrease each year based on the income, family size, and location of the borrower and cosigner.”); FAQs, Chi. Student Loans by A.M. Money, https://chicagostudentloans.com/faqs (last visited July 13, 2020) (“Yes! We are the first private student lender to offer an income-based repayment option to our borrowers. If you cannot afford your standard monthly payment, you may be eligible to adjust your payment based on your income.”); Private Student Loans, Navient, https://navient.com/in-repayment/private-student-loans (last visited July 13, 2020) (“If you and your cosigner (if applicable) are experiencing difficulty, options may be available to you depending on your circumstances. Your lender, loan program, or promissory note may provide repayment options. Some plans may require a review of the borrower’s and any cosigner’s financial situation and ability to pay.”).

Income-driven repayment is popular among student borrowers. A Consumer Financial Protection Bureau report issued in 2017 noted that “the share of all federal Direct loan borrowers on income-driven repayment plans or payment plans lasting longer than ten years has increased by about 50 percent” in recent years. In 2019, over 8 million borrowers of federal loans were enrolled in one of the available income-based repayment plans for their loans.

Against this backdrop of active and growing participation in income-driven repayment plans, new ISAs have emerged in recent years, providing similar repayment options in the private student lending space. Industry experts and scholars credit the rise of these new ISAs to a variety of factors: the cost of higher education continues to rise while college degrees and certain vocational certificates remain prerequisites to many careers. The downside risk of taking on student debt, however, is higher than ever for individual borrowers.

**Today’s ISA Market**

ISAs are a type of loan with income-driven repayment options, not unlike the other income-driven plans described above. ISAs are primarily available to undergraduate students at a growing number of colleges and universities and students enrolling in coding bootcamps and vocational education programs that do not confer degrees. Purdue University was one of the first four-year programs to launch an ISA option for students in 2016. Purdue’s program has grown since then, and similar programs are now available to undergraduates at a number of schools, including the University of Utah, Clarkson University, Colorado Mountain College, Lackawanna College, Messiah College, Berry College, and Southern New Hampshire University.

---


33 See Back a Boiler Program Tops 1,000th Contract for Student Funding, Purdue Univ. (Nov. 22, 2019), [https://www.purdue.edu/newsroom/releases/2019/Q4/back-a-boiler-program-tops-1,000th-contract-for-student-funding.html](https://www.purdue.edu/newsroom/releases/2019/Q4/back-a-boiler-program-tops-1,000th-contract-for-student-funding.html).

twenty-seven US-based coding bootcamps offered ISAs to their students.35 One industry estimate suggests that by the end of 2020, 175 institutions will offer ISAs collectively lending over $500 million.36 Some ISAs are funded and serviced directly by schools, while others are provided by third parties, often in collaboration with a school.37

Key Features of ISAs

ISAs vary across institutions, but they share certain key features. Each agreement specifies an amount the borrower will receive and the amount they will be responsible for paying back, described as a percentage of their post-graduation income. Agreements also identify the period during which the borrower will be responsible for repaying, the maximum amount the borrower can expect to repay, and the monthly salary below which the borrower's payment obligations will be suspended. Many contracts also identify a maximum number of payments a borrower will make. And all ISA lenders appear to take the position that they do not provide loans or extend credit. ISA lenders use different defined terms to describe the same concepts. For ease of reference, this paper uses and describes the definitions in Purdue’s agreements except where otherwise noted.

The “Funding Amount” of an ISA is the sum the lender disburses on the student borrower’s behalf, analogous to the principal for a traditional student loan.38

The “Income Share” for an ISA is the percentage of borrowers’ monthly income that they will owe during each month of the payment term.39 ISAs also typically include an “Income Threshold,” a monthly income amount below which a borrower will not have to pay the Income Share.40 Income Shares for undergraduate ISAs tend to range from approximately 2% to 5% of gross income and may vary based on a student’s degree level, year in school, 

---


36 Id.

37 See id.

38 Purdue ISA, supra note 5.

39 Id.

40 See e.g., Clarkson ISA, supra note 34.
and major.\textsuperscript{41} For bootcamps, the percentage is generally much higher, ranging from 10% to 20% of a borrower’s post-graduation income.\textsuperscript{42} In 2019, the average Income Share for the 27 bootcamps then offering ISAs was 13.8%.\textsuperscript{43} Notably, this is higher than the PAYE or REPAYE income-driven repayment plans, which limit payments to 10% of \textit{discretionary} income.\textsuperscript{44}

The “Payment Term” refers to the period during which the borrower will pay the Income Share back to the lender on a monthly basis.\textsuperscript{45} ISA lenders use the finite nature of the Payment Term—7 to 15 years for most undergraduate programs and 1 to 4 years for most bootcamps\textsuperscript{46}—to promote their programs. University of Utah’s website explains: “If your ISA is in good standing, the obligation ends when the payment window is over even if you’ve paid less than the initial funding amount.”\textsuperscript{47} Part of the appeal of these programs to student borrowers is that the Payment Term, in the words of one school, “effectively sets a maximum time limit on your obligation:” no matter how much or how little you have paid back, you are only required to pay during the period agreed upon in your agreement.\textsuperscript{48} The Payment Term is analogous to the 20- or 25-year payment term on an income-driven repayment plan for a federal loan.

But Payment Terms, according to most ISA contracts, can be extended.\textsuperscript{49} At Purdue, for example, if a borrower is out of the workforce by choice, enrolled in another academic program, or making below the Income Threshold, they are not required to make monthly payments, but their Payment Term is extended. In other words, borrowers

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{41} A Purdue PharmD major borrowing $10,000 and graduating in December 2020 has a 1.73% income share, while art majors at the University of Utah borrowing $10,000 and graduating in December 2020 have an income share of 4.90%. Compare Back a Boiler Comparison Tool, Purdue Univ., \url{https://www.purdue.edu/backaboiler/comparison/index.html} (last visited July 13, 2020), with ISA Comparison Tool, Utah Univ., \url{https://isa.utah.edu/comparison-tool/} (last visited July 13, 2020).
\item \textsuperscript{42} See Gallagher, supra note 7. Lambda School and Holberton School require a 17% income share, a common rate among coding bootcamps. See \textit{What is an ISA?}, Lambda, \url{https://lambdaschool.com/isa} (last visited July 13, 2020); \textit{How does the ISA work?}, Holberton, \url{https://www.holbertonschool.com/faq/articles/360022564934_how-does-the-isa-work} (last visited July 13, 2020).
\item \textsuperscript{43} See Gallagher, supra note 7.
\item \textsuperscript{44} 34 C.F.R. § 685.209 (2013).
\item \textsuperscript{45} Some providers refer to this period as the Payment Window and use “Payment Term” to refer to the maximum number of payments a borrower may be required to pay. See, e.g., Utah ISA, \textit{supra} note 34.
\item \textsuperscript{47} \textit{Income Share Agreement: Frequently Asked Questions}, Utah Univ., \url{https://isa.utah.edu/frequently-asked-questions/} (last visited July 12, 2020); see also \textit{FAQ About Back A Boiler—ISA Fund}, Purdue Univ., \url{https://www.purdue.edu/backaboiler/FAQ/index.html} (last visited July 12, 2020) (“An ISA recipient is simply required to pay the agreed upon percentage of post-graduation income for the prescribed term of the contract. After making successful payments over that term, no additional payments are required even if they have paid less than the amount of funding they received.”).
\item \textsuperscript{48} Clarkson ISA, \textit{supra} note 34.
\item \textsuperscript{49} See Peek, \textit{supra} note 46 (“All respondents said students who earn below a certain threshold can skip or pause payments, but nearly all must extend the payment period.”).
are not making $0 payments, as they could in a federal income-driven repayment plan. Instead, they are effectively in forbearance.\textsuperscript{50} Payment Terms can be extended by one month for each month of deferment, up to an additional 5 years.\textsuperscript{51}

The “Payment Cap” is the maximum amount the borrower can be required to repay under the ISA and is typically presented as a multiple of—in some cases up to 3 times—the Funding Amount.\textsuperscript{52} If a borrower meets the Payment Cap before the end of the Payment Term, their obligation to repay is satisfied. Conversely, if the borrower does not meet the Payment Cap, they will continue paying monthly until the conclusion of the Payment Term.\textsuperscript{53}

The Payment Cap is also the total fixed amount a student borrower must pay if they wish to fulfill the ISA before the end of the Payment Term, similar to an early payoff of a traditional student loan. And if a student borrower defaults on the ISA by missing payments, the ISA is accelerated, and the borrower typically owes the Payment Cap (accounting for payments already made).\textsuperscript{54}

To demonstrate how harmful this default acceleration feature can be, consider a borrower who has $10,000 of traditional student debt. If that borrower is never able to pay, the principal might accrue $500 to $1,000 in interest, and after a year, the borrower will owe $10,500 to $11,000, which the creditor might send to a debt collector or sue to collect. If it is a federal loan, perhaps the borrower has loan rehabilitation or consolidation options to exit default. But if that same borrower obtained an ISA with a Payment Cap 2.5 times the Funding Amount (the Payment Cap at Purdue), the ISA lender could accelerate the contract, and the borrower would owe $25,000. In other words, a borrower could take out a $10,000 loan and have to repay a total of $25,000 after one year, which is a 150% APR.

\textsuperscript{50} A forbearance is a technical term under the federal student loan system where a borrower is not obligated to pay on their loans, but interest continues to accrue. See 34 C.F.R. § 685.205 (2014). Months in forbearance do not count towards the 20- or 25-year forgiveness under income-driven plans. In other words, under the federal system, a borrower can be paying $0 a month, but if they are paying $0 per month in an income-driven plan, that month counts towards forgiveness. If a borrower is paying $0 on forbearance, it does not.


\textsuperscript{53} Some ISAs also specify a number of payments after which a borrower’s obligation will be satisfied. In these agreements, the borrower’s obligation ends whenever the first of three events occurs: the borrower makes the required number of payments, they reach the end of the Payment Term, or they hit the Payment Cap. See, e.g., Utah ISA, supra note 34.

\textsuperscript{54} See, e.g., Purdue ISA, supra note 5.
The Claim That the ISA is Not a Loan

ISAs typically claim, in the agreement, that they are not loans or extensions of credit. ISA lenders market these products as alternatives to traditional education loans and debt. The first words in the sample ISA contract Purdue makes available on its website are: “THIS IS NOT A LOAN OR CREDIT.” Lenders contend that, even though students will have to later repay the money they have borrowed, ISAs present an opportunity to complete school “without worrying about interest rates or decades of student loan payments.”

The compliance bar has similarly taken the position that ISAs do not constitute extensions of credit and should not be subject to federal consumer protection regulation.

55 See, e.g., Utah ISA, supra note 34.
56 Clarkson ISA, supra note 34.
57 Purdue ISA, supra note 5.
59 See Morrison Foerster, supra note 8; Reed Smith, supra note 8.
ISAs are Credit Under All Applicable Federal Consumer Financial Laws

Consumer financial protection under federal law centers around a collection of statutes and regulations monitored and enforced by several government agencies, including the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Federal Trade Commission. Many of the requirements in these statutes only apply to “credit,” and thus, this paper will focus on whether ISAs are “credit.” In particular, we analyze this question as it pertains to the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (ECOA), the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), the Truth in Lending Act (TILA), and the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (CFPA). We will also consider the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA), as its definitions are instructive to the analysis of these other consumer laws. Violations of the CFPA and, through it, the ECOA, FCRA, FDCPA, and TILA, can be addressed by government enforcers with a wide array of consumer-facing remedies—including rescission or reformation of contracts and restitution—and, where warranted, met with civil money penalties of up to $5,883 to $1,176,638 for each day during which a violation continues.60

Distilled to its essential components, an ISA is an agreement in which:

A. A lender promises to pay a sum to a student (usually distributed to a third party, the school);

B. In exchange for the student’s promise to repay the lender at a later time, by either:

1. Paying a fixed Payment Cap that is higher than the sum the student received (in cases of early payoff or default), or

2. Making payments, calculated according to a formula in the agreement that is based on the student’s income, over a period determined in the agreement.

As we will discuss, these components are sufficient to satisfy the various definitions of credit under the applicable laws.

Before we turn to a statute-by-statute analysis, it is worth noting that ISAs are functionally equivalent to student loans with income-driven repayment options. Both ISAs and student loans provide financing for higher

education. They both require the borrower to repay with a set number of payments calculated as a percentage of income. In both circumstances, the monthly payments can be as low as $0. And student loans with income-driven repayment options are subject to federal consumer financial law governing credit, unless explicitly exempted.61

The fact that ISA lenders claim they do not extend credit to student borrowers does not change this analysis. In the consumer law context, courts consistently look to the substance of agreements over conclusory claims of the parties to determine whether an arrangement is an extension of credit.62

When faced with contracts that purport not to be “credit,” courts will interpret the nature of the parties’ agreement “after peeling away . . . labels from these transactions.”63

With this framing in mind, we turn to the analysis of why Income Share Agreements are “credit” under federal consumer financial law.

### ISAs Are Credit Under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act and Fair Credit Reporting Act

The ECOA prohibits discrimination and requires certain disclosures relating to adverse actions, while the FCRA governs accuracy and fairness in the credit reporting ecosystem. The ECOA only applies to “credit,” a defined


62 See Ford Motor Credit Co. v. Cenance, 452 U.S. 155, 158 (1981) ("We agree with the Court of Appeals that it would be elevating form over substance to conclude that FMCC is not a creditor within the meaning of the Act."); Edwards v. Your Credit Inc., 148 F.3d 427, 436 (5th Cir. 1998) ("The Supreme Court and many other courts, including this one, have applied the substance-over-form doctrine to consumer finance law."); Burnett v. Ala Moana Pawn Shop, 3 F.3d 1261, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993) ("Because the Truth in Lending Act is liberally construed to protect consumers . . . the court [will look] past the form of the transactions to their economic substance in deciding whether the Act applied."); Thompson v. 10,000 RV Sales, Inc., 31 Cal. Rptr. 3d 18, 27 (Cal. Ct. App. 2005) ("[I]n determining whether consumer protection laws . . . apply to a particular transaction, we look to the substance of the transaction and do not allow mere form to dictate the result.").

63 Consumer Fin. Prot. Bureau v. RD Legal Funding, LLC, 332 F. Supp. 3d 729, 763 (S.D.N.Y. 2018) (holding that a company offering advances to consumers entitled to payouts from victim compensation funds or lawsuit settlements was extending credit within the meaning of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, despite its claim to the contrary).
term, and certain requirements of the FCRA similarly attach to “credit.” Because the FCRA defines credit to have “the same meaning as in . . . the Equal Credit Opportunity Act,” ECOA and FCRA case law and analysis are interchangeable on this question. Our analysis shows ISAs are covered by both the ECOA and the FCRA.

Under the ECOA and the FCRA, “the term 'credit' means the right granted by a creditor to a debtor [1] to defer payment of a debt or [2] to incur debts and defer its payment or [3] to purchase property or services and defer payment therefor.” As a general rule, courts liberally construe the ECOA to achieve the statute's goal of eradicating credit discrimination. And the ECOA definition of credit is intended to be broader than that in the Truth in Lending Act, discussed below.

A “creditor” under the ECOA is “any person who regularly extends, renews, or continues credit” or anyone who regularly arranges or participates in decisions regarding the same. So, whether the ISA is provided by a school, by a school in partnership with a private company, or by a private company that simply distributes funds to the school or student, all parties that fund, extend, arrange, or participate in decisions regarding ISAs would be creditors, if ISAs themselves are credit.

ISAs Grant Student Borrowers the Right to Purchase Services and Defer Payment

The fact that student borrowers purchase education services and are given the right to pay for those services later under an ISA is sufficient to meet the ECOA definition of credit. The third prong of the definition simply requires deferred payment. Indeed, “[t]he hallmark of ‘credit’ under the ECOA is the right of one party to make

---

65 Id.; 15 U.S.C. § 1691a(d) (2018) (“The terms ‘credit’ and ‘creditor’ have the same meanings as in section 702 of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.”). The CFPB’s rule interpreting the ECOA, Regulation B, similarly defines credit as “the right granted by a creditor to an applicant to defer payment of a debt, incur debt and defer its payment, or purchase property or services and defer payment therefor.” 12 C.F.R. § 1002.2(i).
66 Brothers v. First Leasing, 724 F.2d 789, 793 (9th Cir. 1984) (“We must construe the literal language of the ECOA in light of the clear, strong purpose evidenced by the Act and adopt an interpretation that will serve to effectuate that purpose.”); Miller v. American Express Co., 688 F.2d 1235, 1239 (9th Cir. 1982) (rejecting a restrictive interpretation of the regulations in light of the ECOA’s purpose “to protect woman, among others, from arbitrary denial or termination of credit.”); Williams v. AT&T Wireless Servs., Inc., 5 F. Supp. 2d 1142, 1146–47 (W.D. Wash. 1998) (following Ninth Circuit precedent that “the ECOA should be interpreted liberally to achieve its goals.”).
67 Regulation B makes clear that the ECOA “covers a wider range of credit transactions than Regulation Z (Truth in Lending). Under Regulation B, a transaction is credit if there is a right to defer payment of a debt – regardless of whether the credit is for personal or commercial purposes, the number of installments required for repayment, or whether the transaction is subject to a finance charge.” 12 C.F.R. § 1002.2, Supp. I, cmt. 2(j) (2016), available at https://www.consumerfinance.gov/policy-compliance/rulemaking/regulations/1002/Interp-2/42-1-Interp (last visited July 12, 2020).
deferred payment,” and the payment obligation under the ECOA can result from “a debt or other obligation.”

For example, CFPB commentary on the ECOA’s implementing regulation, Regulation B, makes clear that utility bills are generally considered “credit,” though they may be eligible for certain exemptions. And courts have found that the ECOA applied because deferred payment satisfied the statute’s definition of credit in the context of an application for cellular telephone service, the provision of propane gas, and a request to purchase electrical service.

Neither the amount the consumer is paying for a service, nor whether it is ascertainable or fixed when an agreement is signed, matters for the third definition. Obligations to pay utility bills, for example, which are “credit” under the regulations, are not for an amount ascertainable at the time of the execution of the contract between the consumer and the lender. As with ISAs, consumers agree to pay based on a prescribed formula (in the case of utilities, a rate based on the amount of energy consumed).

ISA lenders clearly grant students the right to purchase services—their education—and defer payment. ISAs allow students to avoid having to pay for school until after they complete it, and that is all the ECOA requires.

**ISAs Permit Borrowers to Defer Payment on a Debt**

ISAs also meet the statute’s first two definitions of credit because they create debts that student borrowers are given a right to defer paying.

---

69 Riethman v. Berry, 287 F.3d 274, 277 (3d Cir. 2002).


72 Williams v. AT&T, *supra* note 66 (an application for a cell phone service agreement was an application for credit because it gave the consumer the right to use phone services and pay for them later).

73 Mick v. Level Propane Gases, Inc., 183 F. Supp. 2d 1014, 1019 (S.D. Ohio 2000) (plaintiffs enjoyed deferred payment for propane services brought the service under the ECOA’s definition of credit even though plaintiffs did not explicitly request credit from the defendant).

74 Gunter v. Long Island Power Auth./Keyspan, No. 08 CV 498 (RRM)(LB), 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 131667, at *27 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 8, 2012) (a request to purchase electrical service and defer payment for that service was a request for credit within the meaning of the ECOA).

The ECOA does not define debt, and there is a dearth of case law on the meaning of debt under the statute. In assessing whether transactions are credit under the ECOA, courts instead focus on the right to defer payment. For the purposes of this analysis, though, we consider various possible definitions of debt that a court might apply in considering the ECOA’s application to an ISA.

The only federal consumer protection statute to define debt is the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA), which defines the term “quite broadly” as “any obligation or alleged obligation of a consumer to pay money arising out of a transaction in which the money, property, insurance, or services which are the subject of the transaction are primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.” Thus, to constitute a debt under the FDCPA, an obligation to pay must have arisen from a transaction and have been incurred for personal purposes. The statute does not require an obligation to pay to be for a particular amount or that the amount be ascertainable at the time of the transaction. Nor does it require the obligation to be reduced to a judgment.

Bankruptcy law similarly embraces a broad definition of debt. The Bankruptcy Code defines “debtor” as “liability on a claim,” where a “claim” is “the right to payment, whether or not such right is reduced to judgment, liquidated, unliquidated, fixed, contingent, matured, unmatured, disputed, undisputed, legal, equitable, secured, or unsecured.” Courts have determined that “‘debt’ is to be given a broad and expansive reading for purposes of the Bankruptcy Code, and that when a creditor has a claim against a debtor—even if the claim is unliquidated, unfixed, or contingent—the debtor has incurred a debt to the creditor.”

---

76 Riethman v. Berry, 113 F. Supp. 2d 765, 768 (E.D. Pa. 2000) (“[t]he sine qua non of ‘credit’ under ECOA is a right held by the debtor to defer payment of existing debt or to incur future debt and defer its payment.”).

77 Bass v. Stolper, Koritzinsky, Brewster & Neider, S.C., 111 F.3d 1322, 1326 (7th Cir. 1997) (holding that “debt” under the FDCPA is not limited to obligations derived from transactions involving the extension of credit).


79 Franklin v. Parking Revenue Recovery Servs., 832 F.3d 741, 744 (7th Cir. 2016) (“First, although the statute does not define ‘transaction,’ we have held that the term is a broad reference to many different types of business dealings between parties. Next, the ‘arising out of’ language limits the FDCPA’s reach to only those obligations that are created by the contracts the parties used to give legal force to their transaction.”) (citations omitted) (quoting Bass, 111 F.3d at 1325).

80 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5) (2018); Yelin v. Swartz, 790 F. Supp. 2d 331 (E.D. Pa. 2011) (money allegedly owed under a rental car agreement was “debtor” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5) because the use of the rental car was primarily for personal purposes.)

81 Such a reading would remove from coverage debts that are clearly covered by the FDCPA, like debt arising from medical bills and mortgages with variable interest rates. See Debt Collection FAQs, F.T.C., https://www.consumer.ftc.gov/articles/debt-collection-faqs (last updated Mar. 2018).


84 In re Chase & Sanborn Corp., 904 F.2d 588, 595 (11th Cir. 1990) (citing In re Energy Cooperative, Inc., 832 F.2d 997, 1001 (7th Cir. 1987)) (rejecting the argument that a contingent obligation was not a debt).
One can alternatively look to definitions of debt in various law dictionaries. Nolo’s Plain-English Law Dictionary defines a debt as “an amount owed by one person or entity to another.” One edition of Black’s Law Dictionary defines “debt” as “a sum of money due by contract” and notes that “it is not essential that the contract should be express, or that it should fix the precise amount to be paid.” Another defines it as “a specific sum of money due by agreement or otherwise.”

A borrower’s obligations under an ISA clearly meet the FDCPA definition of debt: they arise from a transaction between the borrower and the ISA lender—the signing of an ISA—and they are for the personal purpose of funding an individual borrower’s education. Courts have applied a similar analysis to find that traditional student loan obligations are debt under the FDCPA. Even ISA proponents appear to agree that the FDCPA applies to ISAs. If an ISA lender sends an account to a third-party for collection, and the other conditions of coverage are met, the collection activity would be subject to the FDCPA. So applying the FDCPA definition of debt to ISAs brings them within the meaning of credit under the ECOA.

More broadly, under any plausible definition of the term, an ISA creates a debt, the payment of which is deferred. An ISA is an agreement creating a right to payment of an amount, pursuant to specified formulas and terms in the agreement. ISA lenders have a right to receive an agreed-upon portion of a borrower’s income. If the borrower refuses to pay or otherwise defaults, the lender has a right to collect a specific sum of money, the amount of the Payment Cap. Any borrower wishing to pay early, a very common occurrence with student loans, similarly would be required to pay the specific Payment Cap amount. It is perhaps true that, at the time a student borrower signs an ISA, neither the student nor the lender knows precisely how much the student will end up repaying. But that is typical of many loans—those with variable interest rates set using a formula or even fixed interest rates because a consumer may pay the loan off early. It is certainly true of federal student loans where student borrowers could end up paying less than the principal balance through the combination of income-driven repayment and forgiveness programs.

---


88 Courts have determined that federal student loans are debt. See, e.g., Carrigan v. Central Adjustment Bureau, Inc., 494 F. Supp. 824, 826 (N.D. Ga. 1980) (“A ‘debt’ so defined is clearly involved in the present case. Plaintiff, while a student, incurred an indebtedness to the University of Florida in the form of a federal loan for tuition. As a student, Plaintiff acted as a ‘consumer’ of educational services in securing an obligation to pay money arising out of a transaction in which the subject thereof was a ‘service,’ education, intended for Plaintiff’s ‘personal use.’”).

89 See Morrison Foerster, *supra* note 8, at 12.
Arguments Seeking to Avoid ECOA Regulation Fail

In seeking to avoid consumer protection regulation, ISA lenders argue that because the amount due under an ISA is not certain and could be as low as zero, ISA obligations are not debts under federal law. Because borrowers are not required to repay during months when their income is low enough to result in a $0 payment, they argue, it is conceivable that a borrower may never make a payment. As a result, the argument goes, the obligation to pay under an ISA is conditional. And because they posit that “debt” is an unconditional obligation to pay a specific amount, they conclude that ISAs do not create debt and are not credit.

This argument fails. First, it is only applicable to the first two prongs of the ECOA definition of “credit,” which require a debt. Even if a court were to conclude that ISAs do not create debts under ECOA, the statute would still apply because ISAs permit borrowers to defer payment for services.

Second, there simply is no case law stating that, under federal law or the ECOA specifically, a “debt” must be a specific sum ascertainable upon the execution of an agreement. Such a reading would exclude, for example, all credit card debt because whether and how much a credit card holder will owe depends on how much they spend. It would also exclude every variable-interest loan with a rate based on an index, or federal student loans for which, as described above, income-based payments of $0 and total loan forgiveness are also available. Loans with payment amounts that are not fixed, but rather, based on a formula, are common.

Third, just because a payment formula could result in a $0 payment does not mean the obligation to repay is conditional. Rather, the obligation to pay whatever the formula would require is unconditional. Notably, if a borrower making more than the Income Threshold were to simply refuse to pay anything at all, that borrower would default and legally owe a specific amount: the Payment Cap.

Fourth, even if the obligation arising out of an ISA could be considered conditional, consumer laws have long considered conditional loans to be debts and credit. For example, many auto loans made by car dealers are

---

90 See, e.g., Morrison Foerster, supra note 8.

91 See, e.g., Copley v. Rona Enters., 423 F. Supp. 979 (S.D. Ohio 1976) (an agreement to purchase a mobile home was an extension of credit under the Truth in Lending Act where the purchasers were committed to the terms of the agreement even though the seller’s obligation was conditioned upon financing).
conditional on a finance company purchasing the loan from a dealership. That fact has never been used to conclude that indirect auto loans are not credit under the ECOA.92

Finally, the notion that ISAs do not create debts because an agreement to pay a percentage of income is conditional is at odds with accepted business practices in the commercial context where the notion that a contract for a percentage of revenue creates a debt is widely accepted.93 Consider, for example, the common revenue-sharing agreement in which profits and losses are split among parties. Holding that all agreements with this form of promise fail to create valid “debts” would create ripple effects across the entire economy.94

**ISAs Are Credit Under the Truth in Lending Act**

TILA protects consumers by requiring lenders to provide particular information to borrowers before extending credit.95 Like the ECOA, TILA is a remedial statute that courts read liberally to achieve its goals of protecting consumers.96 TILA applies to ISAs because ISAs create debts that student borrowers may defer paying and because ISA lenders meet TILA’s definition of “creditor.”

The definition of “credit” under TILA mirrors the first two parts of the ECOA definition discussed above; it is “the right granted by a creditor to defer payment of debt or to incur debt and defer its payment.”97 The meaning of “creditor” under TILA, however, provides additional boundaries on the

---

92 See, e.g., In re Ally Financial Inc., 2013-CFPB-0010 (Dec. 20, 2013). The same applies for the definition of “credit” under TILA. See Madewell v. Marietta Dodge, Inc., 506 F. Supp. 286 (concluding that a retail installment contract for purchase of an automobile was subject to TILA even though it was contingent on the seller’s ability to arrange financing).

93 See, e.g., University of Tennessee v. Professional Food Serv. Mgmt., Inc., Shelby Cty. No. 70, 1986 WL 645 (Ct. App. Tenn. Jan. 6, 1986) (adjudicating a dispute over “debts” arising from a contract that gave the University of Tennessee a right to receive a percentage of profits from vending machines).

94 It appears at least one litigant tried this argument. In In re Jones, No. 16-41283-ELM-7, 2019 WL 1167812 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 11, 2019), the plaintiff argued that “no value was realized at all [and thus there was no consideration to create a contract] because the Investment Note did not constitute a valid antecedent debt. In this regard, Plaintiff reasons that because ‘the Revenue Sharing Agreement only contained a contingent obligation on the part of Aquaphex to pay the Sherwoods, if and when a plant was up and running and generating a profit, Jones’ later promise to reimburse the Sherwoods’ investment in Aquaphex was an unenforceable promise.” Id. at *9. The court ruled that the Revenue Sharing Agreement created a “valid antecedent debt,” and thus, there was a contract.


96 Curtis v. Propel Prop. Tax Funding, LLC, 915 F.3d 234, 245 (4th Cir. 2019) (holding that an agreement for financing the payment of local taxes was a credit transaction under TILA).

statute's applicability. A creditor is a person who both “(1) regularly extends, whether in connection with loans, sales of property or services, or otherwise, consumer credit which is payable by agreement in more than four installments or for which the payment of a finance charge is or may be required, and (2) is the person to whom the debt arising from the consumer credit transaction is initially payable on the face of the evidence of indebtedness.”

TILA’s implementing regulation, Regulation Z, defines “consumer credit” as credit offered or extended to a consumer primarily for personal, family, or household purposes. It specifies that, to regularly extend credit, a person must extend credit more than 25 times in a calendar year. Regulation Z also states that the requirement to pay in more than four installments must be by written (rather than oral) agreement. And TILA defines “finance charge” as “the sum of all charges, payable directly or indirectly by the person to whom the credit is extended,” including most fees charged by a creditor and “interest, time price differential, and any amount payable under a point, discount, or other system of additional charges.”

In summary, to be covered by TILA, an ISA must (1) create a debt that a student borrower is granted the right to defer paying, and (2) their repayment must be made in more than four installments by written agreement or be subject to a finance charge. Further, the transaction (3) must be for personal, family, or household purposes, and (4) the ISA lender must make more than 25 ISAs a year. ISAs and their lenders meet all these criteria, and therefore their agreements constitute credit under TILA.

**ISAs Permit Borrowers to Defer Payment on a Debt**

Like the ECOA, neither TILA nor Regulation Z define debt. So, for all the reasons discussed above that ISAs should be considered debt under the ECOA, they should be treated as debt under TILA as well. In particular, at least one federal court of appeals has ruled that the definition of “debt” in the FDCPA applies to TILA, and as discussed above, ISAs plainly create debt as that term is defined by the FDCPA. Also discussed above, ISA

---

98 Id. § 1602(g).
100 Id. § 1026.2(a)(17)(v).
101 Id. § 1026.2(a)(17)(i).
103 Pollice v. National Tax Funding, Ltd. P’ship, 225 F.3d 379, 410 (3d Cir. 2000) (“Although [TILA] does not contain a definition of the term ‘debt,’ we believe the term as used in [TILA] should be construed as it is defined in the FDCPA.”).
lenders clearly grant student borrowers the right to defer payment on these debts. Accordingly, ISAs are extensions of credit under TILA if ISA lenders meet the statute's definition of creditor.

**ISA Lenders Are Creditors Under TILA**

ISA lenders are creditors under TILA because they “regularly extend consumer credit which is payable by agreement in more than four installments or for which the payment of a finance charge is or may be required.”\(^\text{104}\)

ISA lenders make ISAs for the personal purpose of funding students' education and therefore are extending “consumer credit.”

Whether a particular ISA lender satisfies Regulation Z’s numerical test for regular extensions of credit will be a factual question worthy of investigation by regulators. But for the purpose of this analysis, we assume ISA lenders issue more than 25 ISAs per calendar year, as we know some programs issue many multiples of that.\(^\text{105}\)

ISAs are also either subject to a finance charge or payable in more than four installments under a written agreement, depending on how a borrower chooses to repay their ISA. If a borrower prepays or defaults on their ISA and therefore owes the amount of their ISA’s Payment Cap, they will be paying an amount higher than the original Funding Amount. This constitutes a “time price differential,” which TILA recognizes as a finance charge.\(^\text{106}\) If instead the borrower pays back the ISA by making payments according to the income-based payment option, they would be responsible for making more than four installments in accordance with their written agreement (and in many cases will also end up paying more than the Funding Amount).\(^\text{107}\) Therefore, ISA lenders are creditors extending credit under TILA when they enter into ISAs with student borrowers.

\(^{104}\) 15 U.S.C. § 1602(g).

\(^{105}\) See *Back a Boiler*, Purdue Univ., supra note 33 ("Since its inception [in 2016], Back a Boiler has issued just over 1,200 funding contracts to 760 unique students representing more than 150 majors at Purdue. The program has disbursed $13.9 million in funding.").


\(^{107}\) All ISAs we are aware of involve more than four installments. While theoretically possible, it seems unlikely that an ISA would ever involve fewer than four installments, so we will not analyze how an ISA with fewer than four installments might implicate TILA applicability.
Treating ISAs as Exempt from TILA is Wrong and Would Lead to Absurd Results

Proponents of ISAs assert that TILA does not apply because ISAs should be treated like investment plans, which are excluded from the definition of credit in the Official Commentary to Regulation Z. Specifically, that commentary says:

Investment plans in which the party extending capital to the consumer risks the loss of the capital advanced [are excluded from the definition of credit]. This includes, for example, an arrangement with a home purchase in which the investor pays a portion of the downpayment and of the periodic mortgage payments in return for an ownership interest in the property, and shares in any gain or loss of property value.

These proponents argue that this creates a broader interpretive principle that a transaction is not credit if the financing company and not the borrower retains the risk of loss. There are several ways in which this argument is troubling and wrong. First, the commentary is framed as an exclusion, not an interpretive principle, meaning that these investment plans would be credit if not for the exclusion. Therefore, something that is like an investment plan, but is not actually an investment plan, would be credit and would be covered by TILA unless it was covered by another specific exclusion. The Commentary in Regulation Z does not exempt ISAs.

Second, the fact that the lender retains some risk of loss cannot be the governing principal for whether something is credit because all creditors retain some risk that borrowers will fail to repay. Risk of nonpayment is a major factor in pricing credit in the United States. Either this interpretive principle would be an exclusion that swallows the rule, or a new and unworkable principle would be born in which a judge would have to weigh how much risk of loss the finance company holds. Such inquiries are best left to the underwriters. The suggestion that ISAs cannot be credit because the lenders retain some risk of loss would also lead to the perverse conclusion that some subprime loans could be so risky that consumer protections do not apply.

Third, the troubling implication of this argument is that it imagines a world in which financiers are making investments in people, and thus, treats people as property. The commentary to Regulation Z excludes investment plans, where financiers invest in real estate. If ISAs are investment plans, then the property that finance companies are investing in is people. Indeed, proponents of ISAs explicitly describe them as “bet[s] on the future

---

108 See Morrison Foerster, supra note 8 at 5-6.
110 See Morrison Foerster, supra note 8.
earning power of students.” ISA investment platform Edly actually encourages investors to “select pools of students coming from your favorite schools.” At the most basic level, this concept seems to run afoul of the constitutional prohibition against taking property rights in people. And scholars have noted the challenges associated with these so-called “human capital contracts.” The very fact that ISA proponents have to argue that their service is an investment or bet in people to show that it is not credit covered by federal consumer law shows just how much one has to strain to look at an ISA and not see credit.

Additionally, taking the ISAs-as-investment-plans framing to its logical conclusion would likely run into other legal challenges. For example, Utah has strict gambling laws prohibiting “risking anything of value for a return . . . when the return or outcome . . . is based on an element of chance.” The law includes an exemption for “lawful business transactions,” which surely exempts typical stock market investments, loans, and the like, but it is not clear the exemption would extend to an “investment in people.” ISA lenders like the University of Utah and its partner Vemo give student borrowers a thing of value (education funding) and bet on the chance of making a profit if the student obtains a high-earning job. There is certainly an element of chance associated with whether a person will get a good job and thus how much they will pay under their ISA. If ISA lenders were to embrace the position that their products are extensions of credit, they likely would be eligible for the “lawful business transaction” exemption. But it is unlikely a court would give the same treatment to “an investment in people.”

For all these reasons, ISAs are extensions of credit by creditors under TILA and subject to the statute’s protections and disclosure requirements.

**ISAs Are Credit Under the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010**

The CFPA and its prohibitions against unfair, deceptive, and abusive acts and practices apply to “covered persons,” a term the statute defines as those providing consumer financial products or services and their affiliate

---


service providers. Consumer financial products and services include “extending credit and servicing loans,” if they are “offered or provided for use by consumers primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.”

ISA lenders plainly offer a product or service primarily for personal, family, or household purposes. The only question requiring analysis is whether an ISA meets the CFPA’s definition of credit. ISA lenders—whether they are schools, third parties affiliated with schools, or independent third parties—are all covered persons under the CFPA because they extend credit to student borrowers.

The definition of credit under the CFPA is broad and quite similar to the ECOA definition. Credit means “the right granted by a person to a consumer to (1) defer payment of a debt, (2) incur debt and defer its payment, or (3) purchase property or services and defer payment for such purchase.”

As with the ECOA, the simplest reading of the statute focuses on the third definition. Although this portion of the CFPA has not yet been considered by courts or opined upon by the CFPB through regulation, courts’ treatment of the similar language in the ECOA is instructive. As discussed above, courts have held that the ECOA “only requires deferral of payment, not the existence of debt.” And ISA lenders clearly grant students the right to purchase services and defer payment for such purchase.

ISAs also satisfy the other components of the CFPA credit definition. Through ISAs, lenders grant students the right to “defer payment of a debt” and “incur a debt and defer its payment.” For all the reasons discussed in our consideration of the ECOA above, the obligations arising from ISAs are debt under federal law, bringing ISAs and their lenders within the ambit of the CFPA.

117 12 U.S.C. § 5481(15)(A)(i), (5)(A). Courts have read the term “extending credit and servicing loans” in § 5481(15) in the disjunctive, noting that it is sufficient to extend credit to fall within the meaning of providing a financial product or service. See Consumer Fin. Prot. Bureau v. RD Legal Funding, LLC, supra note 63 at 766–67 (citing Peacock v. Lubbock Compress Co., 252 F.2d 892, 894 (5th Cir. 1958)).
119 Gunter v. Long Island Power Auth, supra note 74 (quoting Williams v. AT&T Wireless Servs., Inc. 5 F. Supp. 2d 1142, 1144-1145 (W.D. Wash. 1998)).
Conclusion

ISA lenders and their advocates seek to present their services as a new and innovative disruption to the troubled student lending market. ISAs, however, are not an innovation requiring a new regulatory framework. Rather, ISAs are a form of credit, just like traditional student loans. Accordingly, despite their fervent claims to the contrary, unless ISA lenders offer these products in compliance with federal consumer financial law, they expose themselves—and their investors—to liability.

ISAs are a form of credit, just like traditional student loans. Accordingly, despite their fervent claims to the contrary, unless ISA lenders offer these products in compliance with federal consumer financial law, they expose themselves—and their investors—to liability.