



LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR
CIVIL RIGHTS
U N D E R L A W

July 27, 2026

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave SW
Washington, DC 20202

CC: Kirsten Baesler, Assistant Secretary, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education; Dr. Michelle Daley, Team Supervisor for the Comprehensive Centers Program and Identified Contact for Proposed Rule

RE: Proposed Rule Rescinding the Equity Assistance Center Program Regulations at 34 CFR Part 270, Docket ID ED-2026-OESE-0958, RIN 1810-AB72

Via regulations.gov and OESE.EAC@ed.gov

Dear AS Baesler and Dr. Daley:

The Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law ("Lawyers' Committee"), together with the 26 undersigned organizations that work in furtherance of civil rights and educational access, submit this comment in response to the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education's (OESE) [proposed rule](#), which would rescind the Equity Assistance Center Program Regulations at 34 CFR Part 270. **We urge OESE to immediately withdraw this proposed rule, which would eliminate more than five decades of regulatory infrastructure that provides essential support to school communities. The Department of Education (Department or ED) has provided no reasonable justification for the proposed rule, which would undermine the core purpose of the underlying statute and ED's mandate to eliminate segregation and remedy discrimination in public education.**

The Lawyers' Committee is a nonpartisan civil rights organization founded in 1963 by the nation's leading lawyers at the request of President John F. Kennedy to secure equal justice for all through the rule of law by targeting the inequities confronting Black communities and other communities of color. The Lawyers' Committee uses legal advocacy to achieve racial justice and to ensure that Black people and other people of color have the voice, opportunity, and power to make the promises of our democracy real. To that end, the Lawyers' Committee has participated as counsel or amicus curiae in cases addressing race, ethnicity, and national origin discrimination in a wide range of subjects, including education, employment, health care and fair housing. *See, e.g., Am. All. for Equal Rts. v. Fearless Fund Mgmt., LLC*, 103 F.4th 765 (11th Cir. 2024); *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President & Fellows of Harv. Coll.*, 600 U.S. 181 (2023); *Comcast Corp. v. Nat'l Ass'n of Afr. Am.-Owned Media*, 589 U.S. 327 (2020). The Educational Opportunities Project at the Lawyers' Committee has been a national leader in protecting and defending equitable and inclusive education efforts in PK-12 schools for many years.

The proposed rule would eliminate resources and support relied on by school communities and constrain ED's accomplishment of statutory obligations. The Department of Education, with

its current capacity, is itself no longer equipped to fully meet the pressing technical assistance needs of states and school districts. The Department of Justice, as a litigation and enforcement office, is neither the appropriate entity to meet these technical assistance needs nor capable of doing so based on its current structure and staffing. And the justifications provided by OESE for recission of 34 CFR Part 270 are disconnected from the statutory aims of the underlying statute, Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; and untethered from the educational realities impacting school communities.

I. EQUITY ASSISTANCE CENTERS CONTINUE TO SERVE AN ESSENTIAL MISSION AND MEET CRITICAL NEEDS

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title IV) is aimed at effectuating the equal protection guarantees under the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, including by eliminating segregation and other forms of discrimination in public schools. To accomplish this aim, Title IV authorizes the Attorney General to bring civil actions to remedy alleged denials of equal protection in public elementary and secondary schools. 42 U.S.C. § 2000c–6. And it charges the U.S. Department of Education with providing technical assistance to states and school districts to assist in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of plans for desegregation, as well as resolving related discrimination facing students. 42 U.S.C. § 2000c–2. As amended, Title IV defines desegregation broadly, to mean students’ ability to attend public schools on an equal basis, “without regard to their race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.” 42 U.S.C. § 2000c.

The regulations implementing Title IV’s directive for the Department of Education, at 34 CFR Part 270, create the Equity Assistance Center Program, providing financial assistance to operate Equity Assistance Centers (EACs) which provide technical assistance to schools and other government agencies. Rooted in decades-long desegregation efforts, ED’s funding of the EACs, which were once known as Desegregation Assistance Centers, is one of ED’s longest standing investments in technical assistance and plays an essential role in ensuring that all students have equitable access to learning opportunities, regardless of their race, sex, national origin, or religion. Though the regulations in their current form have governed for a single decade, the regulations and their framework for funding technical assistance efforts have existed for more than five decades, predating the creation of ED from its predecessor agency, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The effort to rescind these regulations eviscerates, without benefit or need, more than five decades of precedent and infrastructure.

Today, the need for the EACs’ technical assistance persists, even as the overall student population grows significantly more diverse. Since 1988, segregation between white and Black students has increased by 64% in the 100 largest school districts (which enroll 40% of the nation’s K-12 population).¹ School segregation by race, ethnicity, and economic status remains high

¹ Carrie Spector, *70 Years After Brown v. Board of Education, New Research Shows Rise in School Segregation*, Stanford Graduate School of Education (May 4, 2024), <https://ed.stanford.edu/news/70-years-after-brown-v-board-education-new-research-shows-rise-school-segregation>.

throughout the country.² In 2022, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that 18.5 million students attended a predominately same race/ethnicity school.³ Additionally, on average, white students attend schools with higher white-to-Black student ratios than the schools Black students attend.⁴ White students and Black students who attend racially isolated schools have drastically different classroom experiences. Educational opportunities, including access to high-rigor courses and programs as well as equipped and functional school facilities differ by race, color, and national origin. According to the most recent Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC), Black students represented 15% of total high school student enrollment but accounted for only 8% of the students enrolled in AP science courses, and 6% of students enrolled in AP math courses.⁵ Additionally, CRDC data indicates that white students participate in dual enrollment or dual credit programs at much higher rates than Black or Latine students. White students account for 48% of total students enrolled in high school, but 60% of students in dual enrollment or dual credit programs.⁶ In contrast, Black, Latine, and students of two or more races are underrepresented in dual enrollment or dual credit programs.⁷ Segregation and exclusion continue to permeate our nation's schools—ED should be focused on eliminating that discrimination—not eliminating the support and resources that schools and states rely on in their own efforts to meet their legal obligations.

Currently, there are three active EACs whose staff bring in-depth institutional knowledge and renowned expertise every day to the tremendous task of supporting schools in combating growing segregation and other forms of discrimination. For Region I (Mid-Atlantic) and Region III (Midwest), the Mid-Atlantic Equity Consortium, Inc. is the designated EAC. The Southern Education Foundation supports Region II (South), and the Western Educational Equity Assistance Center supports Region IV (West). While the Region II EAC support continues to be vital for the more than 120 school districts still operating under court-ordered desegregation plans, Title IV's reach, and the EACs value, extend well beyond such cases. Each of the three EACs provide school districts with essential training, audits, and policy recommendations to ensure all students receive equitable access to learning opportunities “without regard” to race, sex, national origin, or religious background, consistent with Title IV's equal protection framework. ED's proposed rule will

² Ann Owens, et. al., *Trends in Racial/Ethnic and Economic School Segregation, 1991-2020*, Segregation Index (May 2022), https://edopportunity.org/papers/Trends-in-Racial-Ethnic-Segregation_Rnd6.pdf.

³ U.S. Gov't Accountability Off., GAO-22-104737, K-12 Education: Student Population Has Significantly Diversified, But Many Schools Remain Divided Along Racial, Ethnic, and Economic Lines (2022), <https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-22-104737.pdf>.

⁴ Owens, *supra* note 2.

⁵ U.S. Dep't of Educ., Off. for C.R., Student Access to and Enrollment in Mathematics, Science, and Computer Science Courses and Academic Programs in U.S. Public Schools at 16 (2024), <https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/crdc-student-access-enrollment.pdf>.

⁶ *Id.* at 15.

⁷ *Id.*

dismantle decades of the EAC's work, create more costs for schools and reduce access to quality education for millions of students.

II. EACS SERVE AS A VITAL RESOURCE FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND SCHOOL COMMUNITIES

EACs serve as expert and no-cost or low-cost consultants, providing free materials, professional development training, and webinars designed to address discrimination issues, including around race, sex, and religion-based harassment. EACs also conduct customized needs assessments specifically tailored to each client, provide guidance on how to improve access to rigorous courses, assist state agencies with analyzing and interpreting racial/ethnic disproportionality data, offer culturally responsive pedagogy training for educators, and cultural proficiency webinars to support integration amongst students of different national origins. Additionally, EACS review district and agency policies and procedures to ensure they are equitable, effective, and within state and federal compliance. EACs are staffed by experienced educators and practitioners, not solely attorneys or investigators. They employ multidisciplinary teams of experienced educators, school leaders, researchers, implementation specialists, and community engagement professionals who understand both the legal requirements of federal civil rights law and the practical realities of improving schools.

ED erroneously asserts that the current EAC regulations are “unnecessary or obsolete.” Yet ED provides no evidence to show that desegregation technical assistance is no longer needed. In fact, current research demonstrates that segregation and other barriers to educational opportunity are persistent, and that EACs continue to be in substantial demand. In 2022, EACs accepted 96% of requests they received, providing free technical assistance to 24 state education agencies, 222 districts, and 145 schools across 46 states.⁸ EACs yield successful results because they address the root causes of discrimination, support districts in evaluating their own practices, educate teachers and other staff, and provide both preventative and responsive assistance. The current data still clearly demonstrates EACs' efficiency, national reach, and functional capacity. For over six decades, school districts and the federal government have relied on EACs' expertise because the districts and ED cannot adequately combat segregation and other forms of discrimination on their own. Therefore, terminating an effective program is counterproductive and perilous.

Within the past 15 years, ED's Office of Civil Rights (OCR) has required school districts to work with EACs to directly address bullying, racial harassment, student discipline, racial disparities, and underrepresentation of students of color in college and career preparatory courses.⁹ As a result, EACs have been able to provide strategies for preventing harassment and bullying,

⁸ Naaz Modan, *Education Department Targets Equity Assistance Centers Again*, K-12 Dive (July 9, 2026), <https://www.k12dive.com/news/education-department-targets-equity-assistance-centers-again/824760/>.

⁹ See also U.S. Dep't of Educ., Off. for C.R., Resolution Agreement: Grants/Cibola County Schools, Case No. 08-19-1269 (Sept. 17, 2020), <https://www.ed.gov/media/document/08191269-bpdf-28542.pdf>.

including national origin-based discrimination.¹⁰ These OCR agreements have allowed EACs to develop non-exclusionary discipline practices and facilitate student discipline and bias trainings for school districts.¹¹ In addition to helping school districts, EACs also empower students and educate them on their right to be protected from discrimination. DOJ, too, has requested that school districts seek guidance from EACs to better implement their obligations under consent decrees or other settlement agreements. By engaging EACs, school districts have been able to offer free and robust training for staff and students on nondiscrimination protections and requirements. Moreover, EACs have conducted racial discrimination and sex-based harassment audits to determine what additional measures school districts needed to take to promote equity and desegregation.

III. RESCISSION UNDERMINES THE DEPARTMENT’S FULFILLMENT OF ITS STATUTORY AIMS

Our nation has had a cabinet-level agency focused on education for more than 7 decades. Throughout that time, the U.S. Department of Education, and its predecessor agency before it, as key civil rights agencies, have focused on moving our country towards the realization of equal access to education. Across its many components, ED has maintained a focus on the realization of the guarantees promised by the most foundational federal civil rights laws in this country—laws that collectively seek to eliminate segregation and end other discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, and age.

ED’s OCR is statutorily and regulatorily obligated to evaluate and if appropriate, investigate and resolve, civil rights complaints alleging discrimination or retaliation under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Age Discrimination Act of 1975. As part of its role in enforcing these federal civil rights laws for decades, OCR has provided technical assistance to school communities; students, parents, teachers, school leaders, and others could call, email, or otherwise contact OCR to ask questions about their rights and the legal requirements under civil rights laws, and an attorney or civil rights investigator would answer the call to provide technical assistance. This technical assistance has made the difference every day in the lives of students—moving them from rights guaranteed on paper to rights realized. And it has made the difference for teachers and school leaders who care deeply about their students and school communities but need OCR’s support to fully understand the civil rights laws. Beyond these individual requests for technical assistance, OCR has provided fact sheets, FAQs, dear colleague letters, and other resources in several languages to ensure all individuals within school communities could receive technical assistance needed to understand and effectively advocate for their rights.

¹⁰ U.S. Dep’t of Just., C.R. Div. & U.S. Dep’t of Educ., Off. for C.R., Agreement Between the United States of America and the Jefferson Parish Public School System (July 8, 2014), <https://www.ed.gov/sites/ed/files/documents/press-releases/jefferson-parish-agreement.pdf>.

¹¹ U.S. Dep’t of Educ., Off. for C.R., Resolution Agreement: Lodi Unified School District, Case No. 09-13-1317 (Aug. 17, 2016), <https://ocrcas.ed.gov/sites/default/files/ocr-letters-and-agreements/09131314-b.pdf>.

OCR is not alone at ED in the focus on technical assistance and the breadth of assistance offered. For years, the Office of English Language Assistance (OELA) disseminated information about educational research, practices, and policies for students who are English Learners to assist schools and states in ensuring that students who are English learners could attain English proficiency, meaningfully and equally participate in their school's education program, and achieve academic success. For years, the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), responsible for administering the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act, has funded technical assistance centers responsible for providing data, research, and tools to school communities. And OSERS has directly provided technical assistance support to states, and webinars and written resources for school communities. ED, across its components, has substantively always been focused on ensuring equal educational access for students, and functionally has done that, in large part, through the provision of technical assistance to school communities.

In line with this fundamental role of ED and consistent with its core functionality of providing technical assistance, Title IV of the Civil Rights Act charges ED with providing technical assistance to states and school districts to assist in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of plans for desegregation, as well as resolving related discrimination facing students. For more than a decade, ED has met its directive under Title IV and supplemented its capacity to carry out this essential technical assistance by funding, supporting, and directing school districts to the EACs for support. The proposed rescission of the Equity Assistance Center Program Regulations at 34 CFR Part 270 would eliminate future funding for EACs, stripping away the capacity, expertise, and institutional knowledge of the EACs, and constraining ED's capacity to meet its directive under Title IV and its broader function to provide technical assistance to school communities. The supplemental information provided by ED in support of the proposed rule is cold comfort, essentially explaining that eliminating the EAC regulations will create more flexibility for ED to export even more of its responsibilities to the DOJ, an agency ill-suited to provide technical assistance needed by school communities.

IV. ED, IN ITS CURRENT DIMINISHED STATE, IS NOT EQUIPPED TO MEET THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE NEEDS OF SCHOOL COMMUNITIES

Though the supplemental information provided by ED in support of the proposed rule makes clear that ED intends to parcel out to DOJ its responsibility under Title IV to provide technical assistance, it also inaccurately claims that the existence of EACs precludes ED from other means of providing technical assistance. As discussed, ED as it has existed for decades, has heavily focused on providing technical assistance to school communities. Eliminating funding, support, and the entirety of the regulatory framework for EACs substantially shrinks ED's remaining capacity to provide technical assistance. But historically, ED has never been precluded from providing technical assistance through additional means at all and ED, in fact, has provided a great deal of technical assistance for decades.

In its current, highly diminished state, ED does not have capacity to provide the robust technical assistance provided by EACs nor provide the technical assistance ED has historically provided. Since the beginning of the current administration, ED has significantly decreased staffing in 16 of its 17 offices, reducing overall staffing across the agency by 40%, with more than 1200 career employees being terminated and more than 350 career employees being ostensibly

chased out.¹² Within several ED components, the staff reductions have been much higher. At OELA, staffing has decreased by 94%. OSERS reduction in staff was comparatively smaller, with the office losing at least 14% of its staff, but ED has subsequently moved to parcel out core responsibilities to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) through an [interagency agreement](#). The agreement explicitly indicates that technical assistance responsibilities will heavily move to HHS, an agency not equipped for and without institutional experience to provide technical assistance to school communities.

OCR's overall capacity, geographical presence, and availability for school communities has been eviscerated by this administration with a 58% reduction in staff. An office which once boasted a staff of 1100 has been reduced to around 250 staff members. ED has shuttered 7 of OCR's 12 regional enforcement offices, stripping the regional presence of OCR staff within the communities they serve. And ED has subsequently parceled out OCR's statutory obligations to DOJ, through an [interagency agreement](#). OCR's current lack of availability for school communities is well documented—in 2025, OCR reached 0 resolution agreements in 15 states; very few, if any, resolution agreements pertaining to sexual harassment, sexual violence, seclusion or restraint, racial harassment, or discriminatory school discipline; and OCR reached the fewest overall resolution agreements in at least 12 years.¹³ An office with staff decreased by more than half during this administration and at less than a quarter of its historical size, that is no longer physically present in the majority of regions it serves, and which has failed to meet its statutory complaint obligations is ill-equipped to provide the technical assistance it has for decades and even more ill-equipped to absorb the substantial capacity for technical assistance that would be lost without the EACs.

V. DOJ IS NOT DESIGNED TO MEET THIS NEED AND LACKS CAPACITY TO DO SO

Congress placed responsibility for Title IV enforcement with the Attorney General and responsibility for technical assistance with the Secretary of Education—intentionally and appropriately separating these functions. Within DOJ's Civil Rights Division, the Educational Opportunities Section (EOS) carries out Title IV enforcement. This includes representing the United States as a party in more than 120 school desegregation cases pending in federal court. In addition to enforcing Title IV, EOS also investigates and litigates against school districts under the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974, and Title II of the ADA, and enforces Title IX,

¹² U.S. Dep't of Educ., Off. of Inspector Gen., Review of U.S. Department of Education Changes in Staffing and Operations (June 2026), https://www.oversight.gov/sites/default/files/documents/reports/2026-06/FY26%20F25DC0245%20%286.22.26%29v100_508_SECURED.pdf.

¹³ S. Comm. on Health, Educ., Lab. & Pensions, Minority Staff Report, Justice Denied: How Trump's Office for Civil Rights Reached a 12-Year Low in Protecting Students from Discrimination (Apr. 28, 2026), https://www.sanders.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/04.24.26-Justice-Denied-How-Trumps-Office-for-Civil-Rights-Reached-a-12-Year-Low-in-Protecting-Students-from-Discrimination_FINAL.pdf.

Title VI, and Section 504 with respect to schools that receive financial assistance from DOJ, or upon a referral from another federal funding agency.

As an enforcement and litigating agency, EOS does not provide technical assistance to school districts; indeed, those districts would generally be the adverse party in litigation or potential litigation brought by DOJ. In school desegregation cases, for example, EOS is responsible for representing the United States and effectively enforcing compliance with desegregation orders—not providing technical assistance or support to school districts. For that reason, many school districts under desegregation orders have turned to EACs for confidential and expert support in complying with their obligations under DOJ consent decrees, with the goal of reaching full compliance with their orders. This division aligns with the framework that Congress designed in Title IV.

Even if EOS, or another component within the Civil Rights Division, were designed or intended to provide technical assistance to school districts, the office has never had capacity to do so, nor does it now, when its staff has diminished in both size and in civil rights expertise. More than 75 percent of the Civil Rights Division's staff departed in early 2025. EOS experienced comparable losses, including the departures of its entire complement of legal managers. While there has been some hiring into EOS and the Civil Rights Division more broadly, ED has provided no explanation for how the Division could feasibly add technical assistance to its current responsibilities, as well as new responsibilities anticipated under the recent Inter Agency Agreement.

VI. ED HAS NOT PROVIDED A REASONED JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PROPOSED RESCISSION

The supplemental information provided by ED proffers several bases in support of the proposed rescission of the Equity Assistance Center Program Regulations at 34 CFR Part 270. ED asserts that: (1) not rescinding the regulations conflicts with the administration's desire to jettison burdensome regulations that hinder effective government services; (2) rescission provides ED with greater flexibility to provide technical assistance; and (3) the regulations and/or the needs they address are obsolete or lack urgency. None of these bases are well-founded and none of them provide reasoned justification for the rescission.

The Equity Assistance Center Program Regulations, by setting up funding and support for EACs, do not create burden for anyone; instead, EACs substantially reduce burden on school districts and school communities, and they reduce the burden on OCR and DOJ enforcement efforts by preventing discrimination before it occurs. Eliminating the current EAC structure shifts the federal role from preventing civil rights issues to simply responding after problems arise. The technical assistance provided to schools by EACs is free and robust, and it comes only after a school has requested it or has entered into an agreement to resolve civil rights concerns or violations of civil rights law. The staff at EACs have significant experience working with school districts and supporting them with training, guidance, and other technical assistance that assists schools in furthering desegregation, eliminating discrimination, and remedying civil rights violations. Without this free support, school districts would face increased financial burden to secure expertise for training staff and supporting implementation of policies and practices. And that effort to contract for or otherwise purchase assistance would substantively burden schools,

both with the needed effort to search for and secure expertise and with the lack of guarantees that the individuals or organizations secured have any of the knowledge and experience housed within the staff across each EAC.

Rescinding the regulations does not provide ED with any previously unavailable flexibility to provide technical assistance—instead it eliminates capacity of ED to meet its technical assistance directive under Title IV and substantially hobbles overall capacity to provide technical assistance in furtherance of ED’s mission to ensure equal educational access for students. As discussed above, ED has furthered its mission, through the provision of technical assistance to school communities for decades across OCR, OELA, OSERS and other ED components. This technical assistance provided by ED staff took place in tandem with the assistance provided by EACs, which did not in any way constrain ED’s assistance. Eliminating the substantial capacity of EACs without any proposed replacement capacity, and while ED has been overall diminished, does not increase flexibility for technical assistance—it eliminates it.

ED provides no real support for its assertion that the needs served by EAC are obsolete or that they lack urgency. More than 120 school systems remain subject to desegregation orders in which DOJ is party, with additional districts operating under other court orders. Further, as explained above, Title IV extends beyond pending cases challenging *de jure* segregation; the statute encompasses equal protection violations based on race, national origin, sex and religion, in public elementary and secondary schools. Such violations, as ED itself has consistently noted, remain pervasive and urgent. In suggesting there is a lack of urgency, ED points out that during 2022, EACs provided intensive technical assistance to 24 state educational agencies, 222 local educational agencies, and 145 schools in 46 states and territories. The provision of intensive technical assistance to nearly half of the state educational agencies, nearly 400 separate school districts and schools—with positive impacts on the education of students in more than 70% of the states and territories in the U.S.—hardly makes the case for lack of urgency. Instead, this data is evidence of significant demand and significant impact. Since 2023, as one example, the Region II Equity Assistance Center has delivered technical assistance across 11 southern states and the District of Columbia, supporting educational communities servicing approximately 110,000 educators and approximately 1.48 million students. And for years, OCR and DOJ have referred school districts to EACs as part of resolving civil rights complaints and violation findings, providing further clear evidence that their services are not only not obsolete but are instead essential.

It is clear from the lack of reasoned justification, the clearly demonstrated value of EACs, and the continued need for their services, that ED’s recission would hamper its ability to meet Title IV’s directive, constrain ED’s ability to meet its mission, increase burden on schools, and decrease access to education for students. Recission of the Equity Assistance Center Program Regulations at 34 CFR Part 270 does not increase flexibility or eliminate burden—instead this a thinly veiled continuation of ED’s previous unlawful attempts to eliminate EACs and undermine necessary resources for school communities.¹⁴ The EAC Program is one of the federal government’s few

¹⁴ See *S. Educ. Found. v. U.S. Dep’t of Educ.*, No. 1:25-cv-01079-PLF (D.D.C.) (The Department of Education terminated SEF’s Equity Assistance Center-South grant in February

proactive civil rights investments in public education. And the work of the EACs comes at a bargain, making up only a fraction of a percent of ED's budget (i.e., .0085%). Rather than dismantling a proven regional technical assistance network, the Department should preserve and strengthen the EAC Program, which continues to help states and school districts proactively address educational inequities before they become civil rights violations. We strongly urge ED to immediately withdraw this proposed rule, and maintain the Equity Assistance Center Program Regulations.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Michael Pillera, Director of the Educational Opportunities Project, at mpillera@lawyerscommittee.org, or Shaheena Simons, Senior Advisor, Strategy & Programs, at ssimons@lawyerscommittee.org.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Michael Pillera

Michael Pillera, Director
Educational Opportunities Project
Lawyers' Committee

/s/ Shaheena Simons

Shaheena Simons, Senior Advisor
Strategy and Programs
Lawyers' Committee

/s/ Camille Young

Camille Young, Legal Intern
Educational Opportunities Project
Lawyers' Committee

SIGNERS

Advocating 4 Kids Inc
American Federation of Teachers
American Atheists
Asian American Advocacy Fund

2025, *see* Notice of Grant Termination, ECF No. 1-4 (Apr. 9, 2025); the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia granted SEF's motion for preliminary injunction on May 21, 2025, and ordered the Department to restore the foundation's Equity Assistance Center-South grant and reimburse all outstanding expenses, *see* Order Granting Mot. For Prelim. Inj., ECF No. 29 (May 21, 2025); the Department appealed the preliminary injunction order to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia on July 18, 2025, *see* Notice of Appeal, ECF No. 34 (July 18, 2025); the Court of Appeals dismissed the appeal after the Department motioned for the case's voluntary dismissal on September 19, 2025, *see* Order, *S. Educ. Found. v. U.S. Dep't of Educ.*, No. 25-05262 (D.C. Cir. Sept. 30, 2025); the District Court granted SEF's unopposed motion to dismiss the case without prejudice on November 6, 2025, *see* Order, *S. Educ. Found.*, No. 1:25-cv-01079-PLF (D.D.C. Nov. 6, 2025)); *Mid-Atl. Equity Consortium, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Educ.*, No. 1:25-cv-01407-PLF (D.D.C.) (The Department of Education abruptly terminated MAEC's program nationwide in February 2025, *see* Compl., ECF No. 1 (May 8, 2025); represented by the Legal Defense Fund, MAEC and the NAACP filed a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to challenge the decision, *see id.*; the District Court granted plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction on July 30, 2025, securing MAEC's program funding until FY 2025, *see* Order, ECF No. 42 (July 30, 2025).

Asian Americans Advancing Justice (AAJC)
Clearinghouse on Women's Issues
Coalition on Human Needs
ED-OCR Alumni Collective
Equal Justice Society
Equal Rights Advocates
Feminist Majority Foundation
Houston Immigration Legal Services Collaborative
Just Solutions
League of United Latino American Citizens (LULAC)
Learning Rights Law Center
National Action Network
National Alliance for Partnerships in Equity
National Education Association
National PLACE
National Women's Law Center
Rights CoLab
Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness
Southern Education Foundation
Stop Sexual Assault in Schools
Students Engaged in Advancing Texas (SEAT)
Union for Reform Judaism