# Funding DA

#### A. Uniqueness: Federal funding for colleges and universities is growing now and has been increasing for several years

Camera 16 [Lauren Camera, education reporter at US News, “Federal Education Funding: Where Does the Money Go?” US News, Jan. 14, 2016, <http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/data-mine/2016/01/14/federal-education-funding-where-does-the-money-go>] JW

Government spending on education has surged over the last decade and a half, with money being funneled to federal programs for low-income students, students with disabilities and a slate of competitions that the Obama administration launched through the economic stimulus package. Since 2002, federal funding for education has increased by 36 percent, from $50 billion to $68 billion, according to an analysis by the Committee for Education Funding, a District of Columbia-based advocacy organization. It peaked in 2009 at $97 million, thanks to an injection of dollars from the economic stimulus, most of which went to staving off teacher layoffs. By far, the biggest amount of federal education dollars goes toward funding the Pell Grant program, a tuition assistance initiative for low-income students. In fiscal 2016, the government is spending $22 billion to fund Pell Grants, twice what was spent in 2002, when the program garnered a little more than $11 billion. The explosion in the tuition assistance program was a result of more people qualifying for the grant, in part because of the Great Recession and in part because the Obama administration lowered the income threshold to qualify. The next-largest slice of overall education spending is going toward a grant program for school districts with large numbers of low-income students, known as Title I. Funding for the program also saw a big increase since 2002, going from $10.4 billion to $14.9 billion this year, an increase of 43 percent.

#### B. Title IX requires colleges to restrict constitutionally protected speech or lose federal funding.

Fire 16, Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, Department of Justice: Title IX Requires Violating First Amendment, 2016, https://www.thefire.org/department-of-justice-title-ix-requires-violating-first-amendment/

WASHINGTON, April 25, 2016—The Department of Justice now interprets Title IX to require colleges and universities to violate the First Amendment. In an April 22 findings letter concluding its investigation into the University of New Mexico’s policies and practices regarding sex discrimination, the Department of Justice (DOJ) found the university improperly defined sexual harassment. DOJ flatly declared that “[u]nwelcome conduct of a sexual nature”—including “verbal conduct”—is sexual harassment “regardless of whether it causes a hostile environment or is quid pro quo.” To comply with Title IX, DOJ states that a college or university “carries the responsibility to investigate” all speech of a sexual nature that someone subjectively finds unwelcome, even if that speech is protected by the First Amendment or an institution’s promises of free speech. “The Department of Justice has put universities in an impossible position: violate the Constitution or risk losing federal funding,” said Foundation for Individual Rights in Education ([FIRE](https://www.thefire.org/)) President & CEO Greg Lukianoff. “The federal government’s push for a national speech code is at odds with decades of legal precedent. University presidents must find the courage to stand up to this federal overreach.”

#### Federal funding is critical for college operations, especially financial aid

Pew 15 (The Pew Charitable Trusts – compiles evidence and non-partisan analysis to inform the public and create better public policy, “Federal and State Funding of Higher Education: A Changing Landscape”, http://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/issue-briefs/2015/06/federal-and-state-funding-of-higher-education)

States and the federal government have long provided substantial funding for higher education, but changes in recent years have resulted in their contributions being more equal than at any time in at least the previous two decades. Historically, states have provided a far greater amount of assistance to postsecondary institutions and students; 65 percent more than the federal government on average from 1987 to 2012. But this difference narrowed dramatically in recent years, particularly since the Great Recession, as state spending declined and federal investments grew sharply, largely driven by increases in the Pell Grant program, a need-based financial aid program that is the biggest component of federal higher education spending. Although their funding streams for higher education are now comparable in size and have some overlapping policy goals, such as increasing access for students and supporting research, federal and state governments channel resources into the system in different ways. The federal government mainly provides financial assistance to individual students and specific research projects, while state funds primarily pay for the general operations of public institutions.

#### C. Benefactors will quit funding colleges if all speech is protected

MacDonald 05, G. Jeffrey MacDonald Correspondent of The Christian Science Monitor. Donors: too much say on campus speech? ; Colleges feel more pressure from givers who want to help determine who'll be speaking on campus. The Christian Science Monitor [Boston, Mass] 10 Feb 2005: 11. [Premier]

According to Hamilton President Joan Hinde Stewart, **angry benefactors threatened to quit giving if the** Clinton, N.Y., **college were to give a podium to** the University of Colorado **professor who had likened** World **Trade Center workers to Nazis** in a 2001 essay. In doing so, **they employed an increasingly popular tactic used at colleges** in Utah, Nevada and Virginia with mixed degrees of success last fall in attempts to derail scheduled appearances by "Fahrenheit 9-11" filmmaker Michael Moore. Although demanding givers are nothing new, observers of **higher** education see in recent events signs of **mounting clout for private interests to determine which ideas get a prominent platform** on campus and which ones don't. Faced with such pressures, administrators say they're trying to resist manipulation. Mr. Hamilton canceled Mr. Churchill's speech, Stewart said, only after a series of death threats pushed the situation "beyond our capacity to ensure the safety of our students and visitors." Yet in an age whenfinanciers increasingly want to set the terms for how their gifts are to be used, those responsible for the presentation of ideas and speakers seem to be approaching them much like other commodities on campus. "**People** are **want**ing **their values portrayed and want**ing **institutions to do exactly what they want them to do**," said Dr. Wes Willmer, vice president of university advancement at Biola University in La Miranda, Calif., and a frequent writer on the topic of university fundraising. "They're not giving for the common good. They're giving because they want to accomplish something, and that plays out in the speaker realm as well." Pressure to reshape the landscape of ideas is coming from various corners. At the University of Nevada, Reno, **seven-figure donor** Rick Reviglio **threatened** this fall **to stop giving** altogether unless the university, which had invited Mr. Moore, would instead arrange for the filmmaker to debate a prominent conservative. The university declined his $100,000 offer to stage the event. In California and Virginia, state lawmakers helped persuade presidents at California State University San Marcos and George Mason University, respectively, that upwards of $30,000 for Moore's appearance would constitute an "inappropriate" use of state funds on the eve of an election. The San Marcos campus hosted the event anyway, however, after a student group raised its own money to sponsor it. In the case of Mr. Churchill, the controversy rages on. Since Hamilton's decision, administrators have nixed Mr. Churchill's scheduled appearances at Wheaton College (Mass.), Eastern Washington University and even his own institution, the University of Colorado at Boulder. Security concerns were officially to blame in each case, although activists who opposed Churchill's message have offered another explanation. "**Everything comes back down to money,** and they were worried about funding at Hamilton College," says Bill Doyle, outreach director for the World Trade Center United Families Group. He said survivors who lost loved ones in the 9/11 attacks had lobbied Hamilton's four largest corporate donors to withhold future gifts if Churchill were allowed to speak. "**You have all these rich corporations throughout the world and the country. Perhaps they'll take a look at what they're funding,**" says Doyle, **especially** in terms of **paid speakers who "promote hate.**"

#### D. Impact

#### Cuts to funding for higher ed and financial aid hampers college access, especially for students from low-income or minority backgrounds. This is a huge economic blow because college degrees reduce poverty, crime and a laundry list of impacts.

Mitchell et al 16 (Report published by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities; authors were Michael Mitchell (State Budget and Tax), Michael Leachman (State Budget and Tax), and Kathleen Masterson, “Funding Down, Tuition Up: State Cuts to Higher Education Threaten Quality and Affordability at Public Colleges”, http://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/funding-down-tuition-up,

Years of cuts in state funding for public colleges and universities have driven up tuition and harmed students’ educational experiences by forcing faculty reductions, fewer course offerings, and campus closings. These choices have made college less affordable and less accessible for students who need degrees to succeed in today’s economy. Though some states have begun to restore some of the deep cuts in financial support for public two-and four-year colleges since the recession hit, their support remains far below previous levels. In total, after adjusting for inflation, funding for public two-and four-year colleges is nearly $10 billion below what it was just prior to the recession. As states have slashed higher education funding, the price of attending public colleges has risen significantly faster than the growth in median income. For the average student, increases in federal student aid and the availability of tax credits have not kept up, jeopardizing the ability of many to afford the college education that is key to their long-term financial success. States that renew their commitment to a high-quality, affordable system of public higher education by increasing the revenue these schools receive will help build a stronger middle class and develop the entrepreneurs and skilled workers that are needed in the new century. Of the states that have finalized their higher education budgets for the current school year, after adjusting for inflation: Forty-six states – all except Montana, North Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming – are spending less per student in the 2015-2016 yeah than they did before the recession. States cut funding deeply after the recession hit. The average state is spending $1,598, or 18 percent, less per student than before the recession. Per-student funding in nine states – Alabama, Arizona, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina – is down by more than 30 percent since the start of the recession. In 12 states, per-student funding fell over the last year. Of these four states – Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, and Vermont – have cut per-student higher education funding for the last two consecutive years. In the last year, 38 states increased funding per student. Per-student funding rose $199, or 2.8 percent, nationally. Deep state funding cuts have had major consequences for public colleges and universities. States (and to a lesser extend localities) provide roughly 54 percent of the costs of teaching and instruction at these schools. Schools have made up the difference with tuition increases, cuts to educational or other services, or both. Since the recession took hold, higher education institutions have: Increased tuition. Public colleges and universities across the country have increased tuition to compensate for declining state funding and rising costs. Annual published tuition at four-year public colleges has risen by $2,333, or 33 percent, since the 2007-08 school year. In Arizona, published tuition at four-year schools is up nearly 90 percent, while in six other states – Alabama, California, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, and Louisiana – published tuition is up more than 60 percent. These sharp tuition increases have accelerated longer-term trends of college becoming less affordable and costs shifting from states to students. Over the last 20 years, the price of attending a four-year public college or university has grown significantly faster than the median income. Although federal student aid and tax credits have risen, on average they have fallen short of covering the tuition increases. Diminished academic opportunities and student services. Tuition increases have compensated for only part of the revenue loss resulting from state funding cuts. Over the past several years, public colleges and universities have cut faculty positions, eliminated course offerings, closed campuses, and reduced student services, among other cuts. A large and growing share of future jobs will require college-educated workers. Sufficient public investment in higher education to keep quality high and tuition affordable, and to provide financial aid to students who need it most, would help states develop the skilled and diverse workforce they will need to compete for these jobs. Sufficient public investment can only occur, however, if policymakers make sound tax and budget decisions. State revenues have improved significantly since the depths of the recession but are still only modestly above pre-recession levels. To make college more affordable and increase access to higher education, many states need to supplement that revenue growth with new revenue to fully make up for years of severe cuts. But just as the opportunity to invest is emerging, lawmakers in a number of states are jeopardizing it by entertaining tax cuts that in many cases would give the biggest breaks to the wealthiest taxpayers. In recent years, states such as Wisconsin, Louisiana, and Arizona have enacted large-scale tax cuts that limit resources available for higher education. And in Illinois and Pennsylvania ongoing attempts to find necessary resources after large tax cuts threaten current and future higher education funding. State and local tax revenue is a major source of support for public colleges and universities. Unlike private institutions, which rely more heavily on charitable donations and large endowments to help fund instruction, public two-and four-year colleges typically rely heavily on state and local appropriations. In 2015, state and local dollars constituted 54 percent of the funds these institutions used directly for teaching and instruction. While states have begun to restore funding, resources are well below what they were in 2008 – 18 percent per student lower – even as state revenues have returned to pre-recession levels. (See Figures 1 and 2.) In the states that have finalized their higher education budgets for the current 2015-16 school year compared with the 2007-08 school year, when the recession hit, adjusted for inflation: States spending on higher education nationwide is down an average $1,598 per student, or 18 percent. In only four states – Montana, North Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming – is per-student funding now above its 2008 pre-recession levels. 26 states have cut funding per student by more than 20 percent. Nine states have cut funding per student by more than 30 percent. Arizona and Illinois have cut funding by more than half. Over the past year, most states increased per-student funding for their public higher education systems. (See Figures 3 and 4.) Thirty-eight states are investing more per student in the 2015-16 school year than they did in 2014-15. Nationally, spending is up an average of $199 per student, or 2.8 percent. The funding increases vary from $13 per student in Missouri to $1,730 in Wyoming. 15 states increased per-student funding by more than 5 percent. Five states – Colorado, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming – increased funding by more than 10 percent. But this trend is far from universal. In 12 states, per-student funding fell over the last year – declining, on average, 8.8 percent or by more than $516 per student. Funding cuts vary from $20 per student in New Jersey to $1,746 in Illinois. Six states – Alaska, Arizona, Illinois, Oklahoma, West Virginia and Wisconsin – cut funding by more than $250 per student over the past year. Four states – Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, and Vermont – have cut per-student higher education funding for the last two years. Reductions in support for public colleges reflect in part the strategy that many states chose during the deep national recession and slow recovery. State tax revenues fell sharply during the Great Recession. The recession of 2007-09 led to record-breaking declines in state revenues, and the slow recovery continues to affect them. High unemployment and a slow recovery in housing values left people with less income and less purchasing power. As a result, states took in less from income tax and sales tax, their main sources of revenue for funding education and other services. By the fourth quarter of 2015, eight years after the recession hit, total state tax revenues were just 6.4 percent greater than they were at the start of the recession after adjusting for inflation. Many states chose to close their budget deficits through sizeable budget cuts rather than a more balanced mix of spending reductions and revenue increases. States relied disproportionately on damaging cuts to deal with declining revenue over the course of the recession Between fiscal years 2008 and 2012, states made up 45 percent of the loss in revenue through reducing support for public services – and only 16 percent through increases in taxes and fees. (They closed the remainder of their shortfalls with federal aid, reserves, and various other measures.) States would have lessened the deep cuts to higher education if they had been more willing to raise additional revenue. Meanwhile, college enrollment has risen. Public higher education institutions must educate more students, raising costs. Enrollment in public higher education was up by nearly 900,000 full-time-equivalent students, or 8.6 percent, between the beginning of the recession and the 2013-14 academic year (the latest year for which there are actual data). The recession played a large role in swelling enrollment numbers, particularly at community colleges, as many high school graduates chose college over dim employment prospects and older workers returned to retool and gain new skills. Other areas of state budgets also are under pressure. For example, an estimated 803,000 more K-12 students are enrolled in the current school year than in 2008. Long-term growth in state prison populations – with state facilities now housing nearly 1.56 million inmates – also continues to put pressure on state spending. In recent years states have modestly increased investment in two-and four-year colleges from their recession lows. As such, tuition hikes have been much smaller than they wee in the worst years of the recession. Published tuition – the “sticker price” – at public four-year institutions increased in 34 states over the past year, but only modestly. Average tuition increased $254, or 2.8 percent. Between last year and this year: Louisiana increased average tuition across its four-year institutions more than any other state, hiking it by more than 7 percent, or roughly $540. Nine states raised average tuition by more than 5 percent. In Washington State, tuition actually fell by nearly 4 percent. Nevertheless, tuition remains much higher than it was before the recession in most states. Since the 2007-08 school year, average annual published tuition has risen by $2,333 nationally, or 33 percent. (See Figures 5 and 6.) Steep tuition increases have been widespread, and average tuition at public four-year institutions, has increased by: more than 60 percent in seven states; more than 40 percent in 14 states; and more than 20 percent in 39 states. In Arizona, the state with the greatest tuition increases since the recession hit, tuition has risen 87.8 percent, or $4,978 per student. Average tuition at a four-year Arizona public university is now $10,646 a year. Tuition increases, while substantial in most states, have fallen far short nationally of fully replacing the per-student support that public colleges and universities have lost due to state funding cuts. In nearly half of the states, tuition increases between 2008 and 2015 have not fully offset cuts to state higher education funding. Because tuition increases have not fully compensated for the loss of state funding, and because most public schools do not have significant endowments of other sources of funding, many public colleges and universities have simultaneously reduced course offerings, student services, and other campus amenities. Data on spending at public institutions of higher learning in recent years are incomplete, but considerable evidence suggest that these actions by many public colleges and universities likely reduced the quality and availability of their academic offerings. For example, since the start of the recession, colleges and university systems in some states have eliminated administrative and faculty positions (in some instances replacing them with non-tenure-track staff), cut courses or increased class sizes, and in some cases, consolidated or eliminated whole programs, departments, or schools. Public colleges and universities continue to make these types of cuts, even as states have begun to reinvest in higher education. For example: The University of Alaska Fairbanks eliminated six degree offerings – including engineering management, science management, and philosophy. The University of Arizona cut 320 positions from its budget including layoffs, firings, and resignations, and increased class seizes for core undergraduate courses. In addition to laying off over 200 employees the University of Akron in Ohio eliminated its school baseball team. Facing large state funding cuts, the University of Wisconsin-Madison laid off or reduced staff and faculty vacancies by 400 slots and held faculty salaries level. Nationwide, employment at public colleges and universities has grown modestly since the start of the recession, but proportionally less than the growth in the number of students. Between 2008 and 2014, the number of full-time-equivalent instructional staff at public colleges and universities grew by about 7 percent, while the number of students at these institutions grew by 8.6 percent. In other words, the number of students per faculty member rose nationwide. Over time, students have assumed much greater responsibility for paying for public higher education. That’s because during and immediately following recessions, state and local funding for higher education has tended to fall, while tuition has tended to grow more quickly. During periods of economic growth, funding has tended to recover somewhat while tuition has stabilized at a higher level as a share of total higher educational funding. (See Figure 7.). In 1988, public colleges and universities received 3.2 times as much revenue from state and local governments as they did from students. They now receive about 1.2 times as much from states and localities as from students. Nearly every state has shifted costs to students over the last 25 years – with the most drastic shift occurring since the onset of the Great Recession. In 1988, average tuition amounts were larger than per-student state expenditures in only two states, New Hampshire and Vermont. By 2008, that number had grown to ten states. By 2008, that number had grown to ten states. In 2015 (the latest year for which there is data), tuition revenue was greater than state and local government funding for higher education in 22 states, with six – Colorado, Delaware, Michigan, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Vermont – requiring students and families to shoulder higher education costs by a ration of at least 2- to -1. The cost shift from states to students has happened over a period when absorbing additional expenses has been difficult for many families because their incomes have been stagnant or declining. In the 1970s and early-to mid-1980s, tuition and incomes both grew modestly faster than inflation; by the late 1980s, tuition began to rise much faster than incomes. (See Figure 8.) Since 1973, average inflation-adjusted public college tuition has increased by 274 percent while median household income has grown by only 7 percent. Over the past 40 years, the incomes of the top 1 percent of families have grown by almost 170 percent. This means that public college tuition has outpaced income growth for even the highest earners. The sharp tuition increases states have imposed since the recession have exacerbated the longer-term trend. Tuition jumped nearly 30 percent between the 2007-08 and 2014-15 school years, while real median income fell roughly 6.5 percent over the same time period. Rapidly rising tuition at a time of weak or declining income growth has damaging consequences for families, students, and the national economy. Tuition costs deter some students from enrolling in college. While the recession encouraged many students to enroll in higher education, the large tuition increases of the past few years may have prevented further enrollment gains. Rapidly rising tuition makes it less likely that students will attend college. Research has consistently found that college price increases result in declining enrollment. While many universities and the federal government provide financial aid to help students bear the price, research suggests that a high sticker price can dissuade students from enrolling even if the net price, including aid, doesn’t rise. Rising tuition may be harming students of color and reducing campus diversity. New research finds that rising tuition and fees jeopardize campus diversity at public four-year colleges as students of color are less likely to enroll as the cost of tuition goes up. “All else equal, a $1000 tuition increase for full-time undergraduate students is associated with a drop in campus diversity of almost 6 percent,” New York University researchers found in a 2015 study. Another study, which examined tuition policy changes in Texas in the early 2000s, concluded that rising tuition rates limited enrollment gains for Hispanic students in the state. The share of students coming from communities of color at public two-and four-year colleges had risen significantly in the years leading up to these tuition increases. State cuts to higher education, made up for with higher tuition rates, jeopardize this trend. Tuition increases likely deter low-income students, in particular, from enrolling. College cost increases have the biggest impact on students from low-income families, research further shows. For example, a 1995 study by Harvard University researcher Thomas Kane concluded that states with the larges tuition increases during the 1980s and early 1990s “saw the greatest widening of the gaps in enrollment between high-and low-income youth.” The relative lack of knowledge among low-income families about the admissions and financial aid process may exacerbate these damaging effects. Students from families that struggle to get by – including those who live in communities with lower shares of college-educated adults and attend high schools that have higher student-to-counselor ratios tend to overestimate the true cost of higher education more than students from wealthier households in part because they are less aware of the financial aid for which they are eligible. These effects are particularly concerning because gaps in college enrollment between higher-and lower-income youth are already pronounced. In 2012, just over half of recent high school graduates from families with income in the lowest 20 percent enrolled in some form of postsecondary education, as opposed to 82 percent of students from the top 20 percent. Significant enrollment gaps based on income exist even among prospective students with similar academic records and test scores. Rapidly rising costs at public colleges and universities may widen these gaps further. Tuition increase may be pushing lower-income students toward less-selective public institutions, reducing their future earnings. Perhaps just as important as a student’s decision to enroll in higher education is the choice of which college to attend. A large share of high-achieving students from struggling families fail to apply to any selective colleges or universities, a 2013 Brookings Institution study found. Even here, research indicates that financial constraints and concerns about cost push lower-income students to narrow their list of potential schools and ultimately enroll in less-selective institutions. Another 2013 study found evidence that some high-achieving, low-income students are more likely to “undermatch” in their college choice in part due to financial constraints. Where a student decides to go to college has broad economic implications, especially for economically disadvantaged students and students of color. Students who had parents with less education, as well as African American and Latino students, experienced higher postgraduate earnings by attending more elite colleges relative to similar students who attended less-selective universities, a 2011 study by Stanford University and Mathematica Policy Research found. As tuition soared after the recession, federal financial aid also increased.  The Federal Pell Grant Program ― the nation’s primary source of student grant aid ― increased the amount of aid it distributed by just over 80 percent between the 2007-08 and 2014-15 school years.  This substantial boost has enabled the program not only to reach more students ― 2.7 million more students received Pell support last year than in 2008 ― but also to provide the average recipient with more support.  The average grant rose by 21 percent — to $3,673 from $3,028.[44] The increase in federal financial aid has helped many students and families cover recent tuition hikes.  The College Board calculates that the annual value of grant aid and higher education tax benefits for students at four-year public colleges nationally has risen by an average of $1,410 in real terms since the 2007-08 school year, offsetting about 61 percent of the average $2,320 tuition increase.  For community colleges, increases in student aid have more than made up the difference, leading to a drop in net tuition for the average student.[45] Since the sticker-price increases have varied so much from state to state while federal grant and tax-credit amounts are uniform across the country, students in states with large tuition increases ¾ such as Arizona, Georgia, and Louisiana ¾ likely still experienced substantial increases in their net tuition and fees, while the net cost for students in states with smaller tuition increases may have fallen. Financial aid provided bystates, however — which was far less than federal aid even before the recession — hasfallen on average.  In the 2007-2008 school year, state grant dollars equaled $740 per student.  By 2014, the latest year for which full data is available, that number had fallen to $710, a drop of roughly 4 percent.[46] Federal financial aid has certainly lessened the impact of tuition and fee increases on students from families with low incomes.  However, the overall average cost of attending college has risen for these students, because room and board costs have increased, too.  As a result, the net cost of attendance at four-year public institutions for low-income students increased 12 percent from 2008 to 2012.  For those at public community colleges, the increase over the same time period was 4 percent.[47] Because grants and tax credits rarely cover the full cost of college attendance, most students — students of color and low-income students in particular — borrow money.  In 2012, 79 percent of students from families whose incomes are in the lowest 25 percent graduating with a bachelor’s degree had student loans (compared with 55 percent of graduating students from families whose incomes are in the higher 25 percent).[[48]](http://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/funding-down-tuition-up" \l "_ftn48) In the same year, more than four of every five African American students borrowed at public institutions (compared with 64 percent of graduating students overall).[49] Further, the overall share of students graduating with debt has risen since the start of the recession.  Between the 2007-08 and 2013-14 school years, the share of students graduating with debt from a public four-year institution increased from 55 percent to 60 percent.  At the same time, the average amount of debt incurred by the average bachelor’s degree recipient with loans at a public four-year institution grew to $25,500 from $21,200 (in 2014 dollars), an increase of $4,300, or 18 percent.  By contrast, the average level of debt incurred had risen only about 1 percent in the six years prior to the recession.[50] In short, at public four-year institutions, a greater share of students are taking on larger amounts of debt.  By the fourth quarter of 2015, students held $1.23 trillion in student debt — more than car loans and credit card debt combined.[51] Yet, while college loan burdens have increased significantly for students at public four-year institutions, the significant run-up in debt levels has been driven in large part by a growing share of students attending private for-profit institutions — such as Corinthian and the University of Phoenix — and two-year community colleges.  In 2000, borrowers entering repayment on student loans from for-profit and two-year institutions made up roughly 30 percent of all borrowers overall, a study from the U.S. Treasury Department and Stanford University researchers found.  By 2011, these borrowers represented nearly half of all federal student loan borrowers entering repayment.  In fact, for-profit institutions have been such a driving force that in 2014, eight of the top ten and 13 of the top 25 institutions whose students owe (collectively) the most in federal student loan debt were for-profit institutions.  (See Table 1.)  In 2000, only one for-profit made the top 25 (the rest were either four-year public or private non-profit institutions).[52] The reduced college access and graduation rates that research finds likely result from decreased state support for college hurt more than just students, because college attainment has grown increasingly important to long-term state and national economic outcomes. A college degree is increasingly a pre-requisite for professional success and for entry into the middle class or beyond. A young college graduate earns $12,000 a year more than someone who did not attend college. The benefits of academic attainment extend beyond those who receive a degree. Entire communities benefit when more residents have college degrees. For instance, higher educational attainment has been connected with lower rates of crime, greater levels of civic participation, and better health. Areas with highly educated residents tend to attract strong employers who pay their employees competitive wages. Those employees, in turn, buy goods and services from others in the community, broadly benefitting the area’s economy. As a result, the wages of workers at all levels of education are higher in metropolitan areas with high concentrations of college-educated residents, economist Enrico Moretti of the university of California at Berkeley finds. This implies that – even though not all good jobs require a college degree – having a highly educated workforce can boost an area’s economic success. The economic importance of higher education will continue to grow. In a 2013 report, researchers from the Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce projected that by 2020, nearly two-thirds of all jobs will require at least some college education, up from 59 percent in 2007. The Georgetown Center further projects that, based on current trends – without significant new investment in capacity – the nation’s education system will not keep pace with the rising demand for educated workers. By 2020, the country’s system of higher education will produce 5 million fewer college graduates than the labor market will need. The increase in student debt in recent years also has important implications for the broader economy, most explicitly for students who incur the college debt but do not graduate. While debt is a crucial tool for financing higher education, excessive debt can impose considerable costs on both students and society as a whole. Research finds that higher student debt levels are associated with lower rates of homeownership among young adults; can create stresses that reduce the probability of graduation, particularly for students from lower-income families; and reduce the likelihood that graduates with majors in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics will go on to the further academic study that is often needed to obtain advanced positions in those fields. There is also growing concern that rising debt levels may be preventing some young adults from starting businesses. Many entrepreneurs rely heavily on personal debt to help launch their small businesses, and rising levels of student loan debt may make it more difficult to obtain loans or other lines of credit necessary for launching a startup. Looking at the period from 2000 to 2010, researchers from the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia found that as student loan debt rose, net business formation of the smallest businesses – those employing four or fewer people – fell. These findings mean states should strive to expand college access and increase college graduation rates to help build a strong middle class and develop the entrepreneurs and skilled workers needed to compete in today’s global economy.  They suggest further that the severe higher education funding cuts that states have made since the start of the recession will make it more difficult to achieve those goals
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# 2NR frontlines Title IX

## AT Can just investigate but not ban

Bernstein 3 (David E. Bernstein – George Mason University Foundation Professor of Law with a focus on constitutional history, “You Can’t Say That: The Growing Threat to Civil Liberties From Antidiscrimination Laws”, “Censoring Campus Speech”, pg. 60-61,)

Given these constitutional barriers, public university speech codes were on the way out until the federal Department of Education revived them in 1994. Male students at Santa Rosa Community College had posted anatomically explicit and sexually derogatory remarks about two female students in a discussion group hosted by the college’s computer network. Several aggrieved students filed a complaint against the college with the DOE’s Office for Civil Rights. The DOE found that the messages probably created a hostile educational environment on the basis of sex for one of the students. University toleration of such offensive speech, the government added, would violate Title IX, the law banning discrimination against women by education institutions that receive federal funding. Under this standard, to avoid losing federal funds, universities must proactively ban offensive speech by students and diligently punish any violations of that ban.

## AT Funding Low Now

1. misses the point- DA impact is scalar. Funding can clearly get worse which means less students on financial aid-even if there aren’t enough now, dropping all federal funding will make it much worse.
2. Pew 15 says that even if overall funds are low- federal loans are high and growing. The aff kills that- significantly decreasing the amount of overall funding.

### Ghill Mitchell 8/5 Ev

1. No link: card doesn’t refer to federal funding only state funding which is what the impact of the DA is about

## AT Aff leads to amending Title IX

1. aff doesn’t change hearts and minds- status quo has tons of people demanding speech codes. That is why so many universities have them. Allowing protests does nothing to change people’s minds on what they think about free speech. They will continuing demanding for speech codes and will hope Title IX pressures the college into reversing.

## AT Won’t Defund Every University

1. Regulators have no choice but to cut federal funding. It is a contractual obligation that is part of how Title IX works. It’s too late to change the law.
2. Regulators would because giving these universities a pass would kill Title IX effectiveness- the regulators know their amendment would be nothing if they didn’t follow through on their threat. Other colleges will see they can ignore Title IX with no consequence.

## AT Pen 16/Vague aff Clarifies

1. This ev is miscut- it is about how the Department of Education should reclairfy its views. Not that it will. Doing the aff is universities changing their views not the DOE, which means you don’t solve.
2. This evidence just says the DOE should clarify which types of speech are protected and what is not. That means it concedes harassment and very vile hate speech still violates title IX in the aff world- triggering the impact.

## AT Counter Speech

1. misses the boat- the link is procedural not consequential. Title IX has a rule that campuses MUST censor this speech otherwise they are implicitly endorsing it. The refusal to censor is what the link is about, not about overall discrimination on campus.
2. Is/ought fallacy- this just shows that title IX regulators ought not have this rule, but that doesn’t change that it is a rule and colleges will be defunded if they violate it.

## AT won’t investigate/enforce

Violations of Title IX lead to investigation- if they blatantly violate like the aff they will lose funding. 246 cases in squo prove

Simon 16,CECILIA CAPUZZI, Fighting for Free Speech on America’s Campuses, 2016, https://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/07/education/edlife/fire-first-amendment-on-campus-free-speech.html

Universities investigated for violations of Title IX, or those that do not adequately investigate charges of sexual assault or harassment, face lengthy and expensive investigations — [246 cases](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/title-ix-investigations-sexual-harassment_us_575f4b0ee4b053d433061b3d)are currently under investigation at 195 campuses. Those found guilty, public or private, could lose federal funding. Understanding Title IX, Mr. Lukianoff said, “is not sexy and it’s complicated, but it is the secret engine as to why universities overreact” in creating and enforcing speech codes and in charges of harassment or sexual assault. “When people say, ‘Look how crazy our universities have gotten,’ they need to understand that they are being pushed with a very scary threat,” he said. “They’re not just scared of loss of funding. They’re scared of the investigations.” Colleges and universities, he said, are being “asked to do the impossible.”

## AT Trump will Solve Link

1. Next president will trigger impact- just buys 4 years
2. Trump won’t eliminate Title IX- worst-case scenario he scales back funding

New 16, Jake, Campus Sexual Assault in a Trump Era, 2016, https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/11/10/trump-and-gop-likely-try-scale-back-title-ix-enforcement-sexual-assault

Eliminating the Office for Civil Rights would not be easy, as it was formed through the Department of Education Organization Act in 1979, the same federal law that created the Education Department. While OCR’s handling of Title IX has its share of critics in the House of Representatives and Senate, there has been little indication of either chamber broadly supporting the complete abolition of OCR, even with a Republican majority and president. But if the office remains intact, there’s little chance its level of funding will remain or increase. Many experts on Title IX have predicted that a Trump administration would cut OCR’s budget, effectively limiting the number of investigations it could conduct at a time when the office already struggles to keep pace with the number of cases it has opened. As of last year, it took OCR, on average, [940 days to complete a sexual assault investigation](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/05/06/ocr-letter-says-completed-title-ix-investigations-2014-lasted-more-4-years" \t "_blank).

That doesn’t solve the DA because a. it’s an open and shut case- they clearly violate and b. it will still have enough funding to investigate a lot of universities.

## AT Trump Thumper

1. Empirically denied: Trump has promised but hasn’t acted

2. In the squo, Trump’s ability to leverage promises has diminished means there’s no link turns: implementing the wall, the muslim ban, and his cabinet confirmations means his pol cap’s exhausted

3. Trump can’t act alone and electoral incentives ensure that no one in congress cooperates with him

## AT Title IX Not CPS

1. Extend FIRE 16: the Department of Justice has ruled Title IX must be enforced even if it runs in contradiction to the First Amendment

## AT Title IX Low and only women

#### 1. turn: Title IX impacts billions of dollars of federal funding and applies to groups besides women. North Carolina bathroom laws prove

Doran 16 [Will Doran, “Gov. Pat McCrory: No Title IX threat to billions in federal funding after controversial new LGBT law,” Politifact, March 28, 2016, <http://www.politifact.com/north-carolina/statements/2016/mar/28/pat-mccrory/gov-pat-mccrory-no-title-ix-threat-billions-federa/>] JW

One of the biggest questions in the ongoing debate over North Carolina’s new statewide law invalidating local LGBT protections is the status of $4.5 billion in federal education funding via Title IX. Title IX is a 1972 law that requires educational institutions to treat men and women equally. It has been used to punish schools for not taking sexual assault seriously, or for not offering women chances to play sports. The federal government has begun arguing in recent years that Title IX protections extend to transgender students, and a 2014 Department of Education memo formalized that position. "All students, including transgender students and students who do not conform to sex stereotypes, are protected from sex-based discrimination under Title IX," the memo reads. "Under Title IX, a recipient generally must treat transgender students consistent with their gender identity in all aspects of the planning, implementation, enrollment, operation, and evaluation of single-sex classes." Transgender people are those who don’t identify with the gender on their birth certificate. Even if they have one gender’s anatomy, they live life as the other gender and consider themselves to truly be that gender. One widely cited study in 2011 estimated that 0.3 percent of adults are transgender. North Carolina’s new law specifically prohibits schools from allowing transgender students to use bathrooms consistent with their gender identity. The law says schools may only permit a student to use the restrooms, locker rooms or other such facilities of the gender listed on the student’s birth certificate. The ACLU and some Democratic legislators say that contradiction between the state law and the federal guidance could cost billions. North Carolina is scheduled to receive an estimated $4.58 billion from the federal government in 2016 for education funding, which could be at risk with a Title IX violation. Those funds are largely for Pell Grants and student loans but also go toward K-12 programs for homeless students, rural schools, adult literacy and more. Republicans thoroughly disagree that the funding is at risk, and it was one of 18 points Gov. Pat McCrory made in a press release over Easter weekend which he dubbed "Facts vs. Myths."

# 2NR Frontlines Donors

## AT Funding Low Now

1. misses the point- DA impact is scalar. Funding can clearly get worse which means less students on financial aid-even if there aren’t enough now, dropping all federal funding will make it much worse.
2. Pew 15 says that even if overall funds are low- federal loans are high and growing. The aff kills that- significantly decreasing the amount of overall funding.

## AT Counter Speech

1. misses the boat- the link is procedural not consequential. Donor’s don’t want to support an institution that they view as inviting hateful speakers or tolerating that speech. It is what the institution endorsees because that is who is receiving the money, not the students.

## AT size of link too small

Survival for most public colleges relies on donor support.

Vise ’11, Daniel de, – Author and Journalist at Washington Post. “Public colleges tap private funds as state support dwindles.” Washington Post. July 2, 2011. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/public-colleges-tap-private-funds-as-state-support-dwindles/2011/06/29/AGHiWQvH_story.html?utm_term=.c4f99cada77a>

As state subsidies for higher education are dwindling, public colleges in the Washington region and elsewhere are learning they must tap private funds to survive. Fundraising by George Mason University rose from $3 million in 1990 to $32 million in 2010, according to an industry survey by the Council for Aid to Education. After adjusting for inflation, that amounts to a nearly four-fold increase. The survey showed donations to the University of Maryland Baltimore County surged from about $1 million to $8 million in that span. Towson University’s fundraising climbed from $1 million to $6 million. Such fundraising campaigns, echoed in other states, come as legislatures across the nation are cutting higher education budgets. Per-student state funding has dwindled from $8,035 in 2000 to $6,451 in 2010 nationwide, in inflation-adjusted dollars, according to the State Higher Education Executive Officers. The trend has spawned dark humor. Public colleges, some in the field say, have evolved from state-supported to state-assisted to state-located. “We are at, in the current fiscal year, the lowest funding level in 30 years. And it’s clearly going to get worse,” said Dan Hurley, director of state relations and policy analysis at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Young, ambitious state institutions such as George Mason are playing a desperate game of catch-up against an elite group of older universities with billion-dollar endowments and a long tradition of giving. Johns Hopkins University, Georgetown University and the University of Virginia each raise hundreds of millions of dollars a year. Even the flagship University of Maryland, a relative upstart, took in $87 million in fiscal year 2010. Legislatures are shifting the cost of college to students: public university tuition has nearly doubled nationwide in the past decade. Most public colleges have relied on state funding and student tuition for nearly all their revenue. Now, they are looking to build other funding sources, turning to private donors with unprecedented vigor. Flagship public universities are insulated against the state funding losses, partly on the strength of massive fundraising operations. Even before the decline in state funding, the University of Virginia drew only one quarter of its revenue from Richmond. Other state institutions are more vulnerable. State cuts drove Virginia Commonwealth University to an unprecedented 24 percent tuition increase in 2010. George Mason hasn’t raised faculty salaries in three years. Around the region, state universities are hiring fewer tenure-track professors, allowing class sizes to grow and pressing student lounges into use as teaching spaces. George Mason, a onetime U-Va. branch campus that gained independence in 1972, relied on the state for 60 percent of its operating budget as recently as a decade ago. Today, that share has fallen below 30 percent. Per-student state funding has dropped from $5,319 in 2001 to $3,238 in 2011, in constant dollars. Twenty years ago, “fundraising in any aggressive way was simply not on the radar screen” of regional state universities and younger research universities, said Gary Rubin, vice president for university advancement at Towson. The typical college raises private dollars largely from a small group of wealthy and older alumni. Plaques on ancient campus buildings bespeak the tradition of giving.

## AT Not Used for Tuition

#### Empirically denied: Schools with large endowments are able to recruit more low-income students

Freedman 13 [Josh Freedman, policy analyst in the Economic Growth Program at the New America Foundation, “Why American Colleges Are Becoming a Force for Inequality,” The Atlantic, May 16, 2013, <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/05/why-american-colleges-are-becoming-a-force-for-inequality/275923/>] JW

Not all colleges, however, would need to raise tuition drastically to pay for a larger number of low-income students. Schools with large endowments can cover the shortfall in tuition by drawing money from these reserves. But keeping tuition constant and paying more from the endowment is only an option for schools with monstrous endowments. Many writers cite Amherst College as a success story, which has "aggressively recruited poor and middle-class students in recent years" and has increased its share of low-income students. But Amherst has a very large endowment for the size of its student body. Its strategy is only viable when backed with an endowment of more than three quarters of a million dollars per student from which it can draw additional funds to cover its costs while remaining competitive in its levels of spending. Amherst is better than others, however. Some schools that already do have sizable endowments and could increase aid are instead decreasing it. Cornell, which has an endowment of about $5 billion, took $35 million from its endowment in 2009-2010 to fund financial aid. It is now changing its policy to draw less from the endowment, which includes lowering its financial aid policies. For GW, with $1.33 billion in its endowment (about 1/18 of Amherst's per student), it's more difficult to use the endowment as a primary backstop. GW only has around 11.7 percent of its endowment, or $155 million, available for student aid. As such, GW - and most selective schools - would only be able to preserve student revenues by raising tuition.