Title

Undermining Primary Care: The Hidden Cost of Excluding Graduate Nursing From Loan Limits.

Journal

Advances in Nursing Science

ISSN

0161-9268

Authors

Biangone, Marianne
Dawson-Rose, Carol

Publication Date

2026-07-09

DOI

10.1097/ans.0000000000000679

Opinion Paper

Advances in Nursing Science®

OPEN

Undermining Primary Care

The Hidden Cost of Excluding Graduate Nursing From Loan Limits

Marianne Biangone, PhD, RN, FAAN; Carol Dawson-Rose, PhD, RN, FAAN

The United States healthcare system continues to face persistent shortages in primary care access, particularly in rural communities, federally designated shortage areas, and historically underserved populations. In response, advanced practice registered nurses (APRNs) have taken on an increasingly important role in delivering preventive care, managing chronic disease, and providing population-based health services. Workforce planning initiatives now consistently recognize APRNs as essential contributors to strengthening the nation's primary care infrastructure.[1]

Despite the growing reliance on APRNs, federal higher education policy has not kept pace with the realities of modern nursing practice. One notable example is the continued exclusion of nursing from professional degree loan classifications used to determine eligibility for higher federal student borrowing limits.

Although frequently framed as an administrative or fiscal policy issue, this matter reflects a broader misalignment between healthcare workforce priorities and federal education policy. This misalignment has occurred because educational policy shapes not only financing structures but also professional recognition, workforce sustainability, and ultimately access to care. If APRNs are increasingly central to national strategies aimed at strengthening primary care access, then federal education policy should align with and support that reality.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ALIGNING WORKFORCE AND EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Federal educational policy functions not only as a financing mechanism; it serves as an explicit statement regarding which professions are recognized as essential public investments. Professional degree classifications implicitly acknowledge fields that require advanced clinical preparation, require substantial societal responsibility, and address long-term workforce needs. Yet, contemporary healthcare delivery increasingly depends upon APRNs to meet national primary care demands without granting them corresponding recognition within federal educational policy.

Statements of Significance

What is known or assumed to be true about this topic?
The United States faces a persistent and worsening primary care provider shortage, especially in rural, low-income, and other underserved communities. Advanced practice nurses, particularly nurse practitioners, are already essential to primary care delivery and represent one of the most immediate pathways for expanding access to care. What may be assumed, but is often left insufficiently examined, is that federal student loan policy is not merely a financing issue for individual learners; it is a structural workforce issue with direct implications for patient access, health equity, and the future supply of nurse faculty and advanced practice clinicians.

What this article adds:
In this article, we argue that excluding graduate nursing education from higher federal loan limits available to other professional degree programs is not simply a matter of classification; it is a policy decision that may constrain one of the nation's most practical responses to the primary care provider shortage. We show how this financing change has implications not only for individual nurses seeking advanced education but also for the broader healthcare workforce pipeline, particularly in California and other regions that rely heavily on advanced practice nurses to meet primary care needs. We also extend the discussion by positioning graduate nursing education as a workforce, equity, and academic capacity issue, demonstrating that reduced access to affordable education financing may weaken the preparation of both future primary care providers and the faculty needed to educate them.

Author Affiliations: *School of Nursing, Department of Community Health Systems, University of California, San Francisco, CA (Drs Biangone and Dawson-Rose).*

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Correspondence: *Marianne Biangone, PhD, RN, FAAN, School of Nursing, Department of Community Health Systems, University of California, Box 0604, 490 Illinois Street, Floor 9, San Francisco, CA 94143 (marianne.biangone@ucsf.edu).*

Advances in Nursing Science (2026) XXX:(e679)

Received: 1 May 2026; Accepted: 4 June 2026

Published online 9 July 2026

DOI: 10.1097/ANS.0000000000000679

This misalignment is critical because workforce policy and educational policy are inherently interconnected. Federal and state governments continue to prioritize expansion of primary care access, reduction of health disparities, and strengthening of preventive health services. Simultaneously, existing educational financing structures create artificial barriers that affect one of the very professions most heavily relied upon to meet these public health goals. APRNs serve as primary care providers across community-based clinics, rural health centers, federally qualified health centers, and other safety-net settings that disproportionately serve medically underserved populations. In many regions, APRNs are not supplemental providers within physician-led systems; they represent the primary mechanism through which healthcare access is maintained.

Contemporary APRN preparation reflects this high level of clinical responsibility. Graduate nursing programs include advanced coursework in pathophysiology, pharmacology, diagnostics, population health, evidence-based practice, and complex clinical decision-making. APRNs complete extensive supervised clinical training and satisfy rigorous national certification and state licensure requirements. According to DePriest et al,[2] nurse practitioners diagnose and manage acute and chronic conditions and may practice independently in states that grant full practice authority. Furthermore, contemporary workforce analyses continue to identify APRNs as one of the fastest-growing segments of the primary care workforce, particularly within underserved communities.[3]

Despite these structural realities, nursing remains excluded from professional degree loan classifications traditionally granted to other clinically intensive health professions. This exclusion indicates that educational policy has not kept pace with healthcare workforce transformations. More importantly, it raises questions regarding whether federal policy appropriately recognizes and supports the professions most essential to maintaining the nation's primary care infrastructure.

IMPLICATIONS FOR HEALTH EQUITY

The implications of this policy misalignment are significant for healthcare equity. Workforce research consistently demonstrates that healthcare access remains unevenly distributed across geographic and socioeconomic contexts.[4] Communities already experiencing structural inequities are often those most dependent upon APRNs for accessible primary care services.[1] Nurse practitioners are highly represented in rural clinics, community health centers, and safety-net settings where physician recruitment and retention remain persistently difficult.[5]

Educational policy has downstream consequences extending beyond institutions and individual learners. Policies that fail to fully recognize and support educational pathways into advanced nursing practice may ultimately affect the stability of the primary care workforce in communities already experiencing limited healthcare access. The issue is not simply whether nursing students receive equitable treatment relative to other health professions; rather, it is whether healthcare policy adequately supports the workforce infrastructure necessary to address persistent disparities in care.

This discussion should not be reduced solely to debates regarding educational cost containment. Policymakers supporting restrictions on graduate borrowing have argued that limiting federal loan access may encourage institutions to moderate tuition growth. However, such arguments oversimplify the relationship between educational financing and workforce development. The preparation of primary care clinicians, including APRNs, requires extensive clinical partnerships, intensive faculty oversight, sophisticated simulation resources, and competency-based training environments designed to support increasingly complex healthcare systems.

SHARED RESPONSIBILITY FOR POLICY ALIGNMENT

Alignment between workforce priorities and educational policy cannot rest solely with nursing organizations or educational institutions. Responsibility also belongs to federal policymakers, workforce planners, accrediting bodies, and healthcare systems that increasingly depend upon APRNs to sustain primary care delivery. If APRNs are central to national workforce strategies, then educational policy must reflect that reality.

Critics of expanding professional degree designations to nursing may argue that federal loan policy should avoid privileging one discipline over another and that restricting borrowing capacity could encourage institutions across graduate education to moderate tuition growth. Others may contend that nursing differs fundamentally from traditionally designated professional fields because of its multiple educational entry pathways and longstanding emphasis on collaborative practice models. However, these arguments overlook the extent to which advanced nursing practice has evolved in response to contemporary healthcare needs. Graduate APRN education prepares clinicians for highly autonomous roles involving diagnostic reasoning, prescribing authority, chronic disease management, and primary care delivery across complex healthcare environments.[6]

More importantly, the question is not whether nursing should replicate the organizational structures of other professions. Rather, the issue is whether educational policy appropriately reflects the realities of today's healthcare workforce. Policies that fail to recognize the central role of APRNs in expanding access to care risk reinforcing outdated professional assumptions while simultaneously undermining national efforts to strengthen primary care capacity.

Alignment also requires nursing leadership within policy conversations. Nursing organizations, academic leaders, healthcare systems, professional associations, and politicians who are policymakers all play important roles in ensuring that workforce evidence informs educational policy development. If APRNs are consistently identified as essential to improving healthcare access and reducing disparities, then nursing and other healthcare leaders must continue to advocate for policy structures reflecting those workforce realities.

CONCLUSION

Reconsidering professional degree loan classifications offers a crucial opportunity to align educational policy

with contemporary healthcare realities. Such alignment would acknowledge the increasingly central role of APRNs in primary care delivery while supporting broader national goals related to healthcare access, workforce sustainability, and health equity.

As the United States continues to confront worsening primary care shortages and widening disparities in healthcare access, APRNs will remain indispensable to healthcare delivery across settings. Educational policy should therefore evolve in ways that recognize the contemporary scope, complexity, and societal importance of advanced nursing practice. The continued exclusion of nursing from professional degree loan classifications may appear administrative in form, but its implications extend directly into workforce sustainability, professional recognition, and patient access to care. In this context, alignment between workforce priorities and educational policy is not simply a matter of financing; it is essential to the future stability of the nation's health.

REFERENCES

1. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. *The Future of Nursing 2020–2030: Charting a Path to Achieve Health Equity*. National Academic Press; 2021. doi: 10.17226/25982
2. DePriest K, D'Aoust R, Samuel L, Commodore-Mensah Y, Hanson G, Slade EP. Nurse practitioners' workforce outcomes under implementation of full practice authority. *Nurs Outlook*. 2020;68(4):459-467. doi: 10.1016/j.outlook.2020.05.008
3. Stanik-Hutt J, Pittman P, Squires A. Advanced practice nursing and the expanding primary care workforce. *Nurs Outlook*. 2022;70(6):1021-1028. doi: 10.1016/j.outlook.2022.08.002
4. Spetz J, Skillman SM, Andrilla CHA. Nurse practitioner autonomy and satisfaction in rural settings. *Med Care Res Rev*. 2016;74(2):227-235. doi: 10.1177/1077558716629584
5. Ortiz J, Hofler R, Bushy A, Lin YL, Khanijahani A, Bitney A. Impact of nurse practitioner practice regulations on rural population health outcomes. *Healthcare (Basel)*. 2021;9(5):594. doi: 10.3390/healthcare9050594
6. Poghosyan L, Norful AA, Martsolf GR. Primary care nurse practitioner practice characteristics: barriers and opportunities for interprofessional teamwork. *J Ambul Care Manage*. 2021;44(2):122-131. doi: 10.1097/JAC.0000000000000363