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### Notes

The current “fed key” warrant is lacking – the arguments in the scholarship don’t account for negative fiat’s power to increase state innovation and condition funding. To make this viable, this aff needs an advantage premised solely on why the Charter School Program should not support and fund segregation. It needs an advantage based on student performance or democratic participation, or something based on a federal signal. The aff also needs to overturn Milliken or have some Supreme Court element, both for solvency and for a fed key warrant.
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### 1AC—Segregation

#### Charter school segregation is even worse than public schools – white parents lock out underprivileged families.

Siegel-Hawley and Frankenberg 16 – Genevieve Siegel-Hawley, research affiliate for UCLA Civil Rights Project, Ph.D. in urban schooling, University of California, Los Angeles, M.Ed. in education policy and management, Harvard University, M.A.T. in secondary social studies, Johns Hopkins University, B.A. in history/sociology, University of Virginia, received the VCU School of Education Distinguished Junior Faculty Award in 2015, received the VCU Presidential Research Quest Fund Grant Award for 2014-15, and Erica Frankenberg, assistant professor at Pennsylvania State University, Ed. D. from Harvard University, former Research and Policy Director for the Initiative on School Integration at the Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles at UCLA, 2016 (“Re v i e w o f The Integration Anomoly: Comparing the Effect of K-12 Education Delivery Models on Segregation in Schools,” January, *National Education Policy Center,* Available Online At <http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/ttr_siegel-hawley-frankenberg_integration_0.pdf>, Accessed 7-30-2017)Worldwide evidence links certain kinds of choice to stratification.14 In the U.S., open enrollment, or the unrestricted choice of public schools within or across districts, is allowed in many communities.15 Constraints such as a lack of information or providing free transportation often prevent families from taking advantage of the policy, however, and white, advantaged or higher-performing students are much more likely to utilize choice in ways that exacerbate segregation.16

Similar findings extend to charter schools, where evidence of white segregation emerges alongside minority segregation.17 In fact, The Integration Anomaly’s description of the charter school literature pertaining to segregation is woefully inadequate. This is especially noteworthy as charter schools are largely unregulated in terms of their impact on segregation.18 Though the report indicates that mixed findings emerge in well-designed research, it only cites two analyses. It then misleadingly suggests findings from those studies differ when both find that black students transfer to more segregated charter schools. The report also ignores research confirming and expanding on those trends for different states and for other groups of students besides African-American students.19 Simply put: on virtually every measure and at each level of geography, research shows that charter schools are more segregated than our already increasingly segregated traditional public schools. 20

How and why parents choose schools

The report unnecessarily relies on speculation and simulation to construct models of how families choose neighborhoods and schools. Contrary to assertions and recommendations in the report, qualitative studies of white, affluent parents find they choose schools based on word-of-mouth information closely tied to the racial/ethnic and socioeconomic makeup of the school, not through actual visits or a nuanced reading of publicly available education data.21 In other words, advantaged parents often make decisions about schools and districts based on the “good” or “bad” reputation that friends and acquaintances pass on. Quantitative evidence also shows that white families are more likely to exit traditional public schools or school zones with higher proportions of nonwhite students.22 Moreover, this type of sorting extends to private schools. Highly educated white, advantaged families who either went to private schools as students or who were concerned with maintaining social advantage were more likely to opt in to private school settings.23

What all of these studies have in common is that they examine the behavior of the advantaged parent groups who do engage with unrestricted choice—the policy prescription at the heart of this report—and find that their behavior often exacerbates stratification. Schools competing to attract families and students with the most concentrated advantages will need to serve very high proportions of advantaged students, effectively locking out the families and students who most need quality school choices.

#### Charter school discrimination is even worse than public schools – it cements achievement gaps by giving white wealthy families more bargaining power.

Mathis and Welner 16 -- William J. Mathis, managing director of the National Education Policy Center at the University of Colorado Boulder, former superintendent of schools for the Rutland Northeast Supervisory Union in Brandon, Vermont, former National Superintendent of the Year finalist, Vermont Superintendent of the Year serves on the Vermont State Board of Education, and Kevin G. Welner, professor at the University of Colorado Boulder, School of Education, director of the National Education Policy Center (NEPC), earned both his J.D. (1988) and Ph.D. (1997) from UCLA, received the Rockefeller Foundation's Bellagio Residency and the Post-Doctoral Fellowship awarded by the National Academy of Education and the Spencer Foundation, recognized by the American Educational Research Association (AERA) as a Fellow and been given the AERA's Early Career Award (in 2006) and Palmer O. Johnson Award, 2016 (“Do Choice Policies Segregate Schools?” March, *National Education Policymaking Center,* Available Online At <http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/publications/Research-Based%20Options%20for%20Education%20Policymaking%202016_0.pdf>, Accessed 7-30-2017)

While some choice school enrollments are genuinely integrated, the overall body of the research literature documents an unsettling degree of segregation—particularly in charter schools—by race and ethnicity, as well as by poverty, special needs and English-learner status.7

• Race –“At the national level, seventy percent of black charter school students attend intensely segregated minority charter schools (which enroll 90-100% of students from under-represented minority backgrounds), or twice as many as the share of intensely segregated black students in traditional public schools. Some charter schools enrolled populations where 99% of the students were from under-represented minority backgrounds.”8 In a detailed case study of Indianapolis charter schools, Stein found “higher degrees of racial isolation and less diversity.”9

• Poverty – The effects of choice plans on segregation of children eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunch shows a similar pattern. Gary Miron and his colleagues found that economically challenged students attending charter schools operated by charter corporations (educational management organizations or EMOs) are stratified between schools. Seventy percent of EMO-managed charter schools studied were found to be very segregated by high income or low income.10 Examining Pennsylvania transfers, Kotok et al. confirmed the same segregative pattern.11

• Dual Language Learners (DLL) – DLL students, also sometimes termed “English language learners,” were also under-represented in charter schools. One-third of the nation’s EMO-run charter schools had a population similar to the host district, but this distribution was highly skewed, with well over half the schools being segregated. These students were also generally under-enrolled; DLLs represented 11% of public school students while EMO-operated charter schools only enrolled 4.4%.12

• Students with Disabilities – Charter schools claim they serve similar percentages of students with disabilities.13 Yet, the GAO reports that charter schools enroll a lesser proportion of such children than do traditional public schools (8% versus 11%).14 Miron’s examination of EMO-operated charters reports the same trend, but with a larger difference (7% vs 13%).15 Furthermore, charter schools tend to serve less severe and less costly disabilities.16 These patterns arise for various reasons. Some charter schools have an admirable mission to serve specific populations of disabled children and thus are segregative by definition.17 A study of Denver’s charter elementary schools suggests that such stratification trends may be at least partly due to the disproportionate movement of non-special-needs students into charter schools, rather than students with disabilities moving out.18 Other patterns and practices point to access issues at both pre-enrollment and post-enrollment stages.19 Market forces themselves can drive segregated environments.20

Some research studies in this area compare the enrollment in the choice school to the enrollment of the district within which the school is located;21 other, more fine-grained analyses examine patterns of movement between choice schools and public schools by tracking individual students as they move from traditional public schools to charter schools. With some variation in detail, they report a general pattern of increased racial isolation and growth of the achievement gap.22

Parents with greater formal education and who are more affluent are more adept at maneuvering within the choice system. Because wealth and education are so strongly correlated with race, ethnicity and English-learner status, all of these forms of stratification are facilitated and exacerbated by choice. These more advantaged families are able to tap into social networks, to provide transportation, and to provide the ancillary financial and parental supports sometimes required by choice schools.

#### Scenario 1 is Racism.

#### Intentionally diverse charter schools break down prejudices against minorities.

Medler et al. 17 — (Dianne PichÉ, Nora Kern, Alex Medler, 2-13-17, "Opinion: Now More Than Ever, Diverse Charter Schools Are Essential," The74, https://www.the74million.org/article/opinion-now-more-than-ever-diverse-charter-schools-are-essential, Accessed 6-25-2017, JWS)

America grows more diverse every day. In the future, today’s young people will need to be able to thrive amid a multiplicity of nationalities, perspectives and practices; our society and economy count on it. But too many of our public schools continue to isolate students from peers and adult role models of different backgrounds. One promising strategy to better prepare students comes from a group of “intentionally diverse” charter schools designed to attract and effectively serve students from different racial, economic, cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The National Charter School Resource Center describes how leaders of these schools pursue their vision. Educators have created a new national organization, the National Coalition of Diverse Charter Schools, to help support the model. Intentional diversity requires being intentional about elements of school life that may be unaddressed in traditional settings. It takes broad outreach to bring together a diverse student body The recruitment and admissions process is critical. School leaders use strategies such as online and print marketing, door-to-door recruitment, neighborhood information sessions, school fairs, partnering with community and cultural organizations, and providing translators and materials in other languages. Voice Charter School, which serves students in grades K-8 in Long Island City, N.Y., direct-mails every student in its district eligible for grades K-8 — about 25,000 homes, from which the school generates about 2,000 applications. Voice also places ads in neighborhood newsletters and free non-English newspapers, presents at community forums and has a booth at citywide student recruitment fairs. To support home language needs beyond English and Spanish, the school uses translators available through the New York City Department of Education speaking more than 100 languages. All these efforts promote the school in many communities. A diverse school culture values all students There are schoolwide and classroom-level instructional methods that can help ensure the school’s overall diversity is also reflected in the classroom. For example, student-centered approaches to teaching and professional development for instructors can incorporate a multicultural perspective to promote achievement and a sense of well-being about the individual’s cultural place in the world. Diverse charter schools are also rethinking or avoiding tracking, which separates students by achievement levels, and proactively employing academic supports like targeted remediation and mentoring, helping to foster integration within classrooms. Truly effective differentiated instruction requires thorough preparation and high-quality practice, and teachers in diverse schools organize their instruction to incorporate multiple cultures, as well as to meet the needs of English-language learners, students with disabilities and students seeking advanced coursework within the same classroom. Valor Collegiate Academies, a charter management organization in Nashville, emphasizes full inclusion (including for students receiving English-language instruction and students with disabilities), along with differentiated instruction, in its two schools of fifth- through eighth-graders. Valor students who perform below grade level receive intensive instruction through push-in and pull-out remediation during their fifth- and sixth-grade years. The goal is to close the preparation gap to a level where teachers can effectively differentiate instruction while addressing student needs in the general classroom. If the remediation is successful, students are educated in the general classroom, with small group instruction and push-in supports, as necessary, during their seventh- and eighth-grade years. This strategy has been particularly effective with English-language-learner students, who represent 24 percent of Valor Academies’ student body. Valor schools had the highest academic results in 2014–15 for ELL students among Metro Nashville Public Schools. Why undertake the exhaustive effort necessary to establish and maintain an intentionally diverse charter school? Because the results are compelling. Research finds that intentionally diverse schools benefit students from low-income families as well as their more-affluent peers in building academic and cultural competency. All students in diverse settings benefit from cross-racial and cross-cultural understanding, breaking down stereotypes, and decreasing bias and prejudice. Students from low-income families benefit from working alongside children from middle-income families, where parents are likely to have larger vocabularies, have time and resources to be more involved in school and set higher expectations for their children. Students from middle-income families who are educated with less-affluent peers work more effectively with diverse groups throughout adulthood.

#### Charters are key – they spill over into traditional public schools.

Klein 16 — (Rebecca Klein, 4-12-2016, "Are Charter Schools The Future Of School Desegregation?," HuffPost, <span class="skimlinks-unlinked">http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/charter-school-desegregation\_us\_56faf0e6e4b083f5c605eae5</span>, Accessed 6-26-2017, JWS)

The fifth-grader may not know that her friend is not an exception, but rather the norm in the Big Apple. In New York City — one of the most segregated school districts in the country — schools are highly isolated by race. In the country as a whole, many public schools have become increasingly re-segregated in the past few decades. Charter schools — which are publicly funded but independently operated — are no exception, and researchers from Pennsylvania State University and University of California Los Angeles have found that in some states, these schools are more segregated than traditional public schools. Community Roots is one of eight charter schools or charter school networks that has a deliberate balance of students from a range of socioeconomic backgrounds, according to a February report from The Century Foundation, a progressive think tank. This number is small, but reflects a growing conversation in the charter school sector about the need for schools to reflect more racial and socioeconomic diversity. The Charter School Divide For all the benefits of attending a charter school, exposure to students of different races and economic backgrounds typically isn’t one of them. The number of students attending charter schools has exploded in recent years, with kids attending these institutions in 43 states and the District of Columbia. In 15 of these states, nearly 70 percent of black students are attending intensely segregated schools, where an overwhelming majority of students identify as minorities, according to 2009 research. By comparison, researchers found, only 36 percent of black students in traditional public school attended schools where at least 90 percent of students were of color. Desegregated schools provide a number of tangible and intangible benefits. The ability to interact with diverse groups of people can help kids down the line as they enter the workforce. Desegregated schools tend to boast better material resources. “We have over 60 decades of evidence documenting why separate schools continue to be unequal schools,” said Genevieve Siegel-Hawley, an assistant professor of educational leadership at Virginia Commonwealth University. The reasons for this stratification make sense. Many charter schools do not provide transportation, so kids are forced to go to institutions in their communities. Some schools are placed in certain neighborhoods specifically to serve low-income students who have limited educational options. “There are some who would argue that charter schools are leading to the hyper-segregation of education, but if you’re going to communities that need options, and you’re serving kids in the community, that’s what you want schools to be doing,” said a representative from the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. “It’s not a charter school problem, it’s an American society problem. It is a housing problem.” How One Brooklyn School Found A Fix Community Roots Charter School in Fort Greene, Brooklyn, was founded a decade ago. At first, it was able to create a diverse population of students simply by drawing from local families who applied for the school’s lottery, which randomly selects school applicants for admission. But as the neighborhood gentrified, affluent families began flooding the school’s lottery. The most needy students were getting cut out of the school’s offerings. For the school’s co-founder and co-director, Allison Keil, the population changes were unjust. To offset the gentrification, the school tweaked its lottery to reserve 40 percent of seats for children living in nearby public housing. The school is now nearly 40 percent African-American, 40 percent white and over 10 percent Hispanic. But the school takes its commitment to diversity a step beyond just getting a range of races in the classroom. Issues of equity and social justice are heavily incorporated in every level of curriculum at the K-8 school. A director of community development works to make sure that parents — not just students — from different backgrounds are mixing and getting to know one another. The school thinks deliberately about “creating small intimate spaces where families can come together and can make connections,” Keil told The Huffington Post. “We don’t have a community that all goes to the same playgrounds or stores or restaurants.” The school holds regular family sports and music nights so that all groups can mingle. There is an adult book club. A parent-initiated program plans events for families to meet outside of school. “Our feeling is race relations is in a pretty dismal place,” said Keil. “We are incredibly optimistic with the kids going to school here, that is going to change for them and because of them.” Beyond Brooklyn There is hope that charter schools can move the needle in increasing school desegregation around the nation. “Because charters are allowed increased flexibility in curriculum and admissions procedures, and because charters typically accept students from multiple school zones or neighborhoods, they are well positioned — in theory — to facilitate student integration through weighted lottery systems and targeted outreach,” notes the February report from The Century Foundation. In recent years, it has gotten easier for charter schools to create deliberately diverse classrooms. In 2014, the U.S. Department of Education released new federal guidance that allows charter schools receiving federal grants to use a weighted lottery system that favors disadvantaged students, so long as their state allows it. Most states don’t have explicit rules about whether or not weighted lotteries are prohibited, but a few specifically allow them. M. Karega Rausch, the vice president for research and evaluation at the National Association of Charter School Authorizers, said he thinks there has been an increase in the number of charter schools that are “intentionally trying to pursue diversity.” “Pursuing school integration has been a public ideal for a large period of time. It’s not all that surprising we’re seeing a lot of operators who want to use their flexibility to create more diverse kinds of schools,” said Rausch, although he also praised schools that have mostly “a low-income student population that have also produced some great results for kids.”

#### Reject every instance of racism in the school system – it undermines a student of color’s ability to live their life.

Ngo 17 — (Madeleine Ngo, 2-4-17, "To Combat Racism, Start with the School System," Study Breaks, https://studybreaks.com/2017/02/04/combat-racism/, Accessed 6-12-2017, JWS)

Although the classroom has traditionally been viewed as a place where students should be open-minded and encouraged to express their perspectives, many minorities often feel alienated in school systems due to the plague of institutionalized racism. The feeling of isolation stems from a lack of racial discussion and discriminatory stereotypes perpetuated by their peers. Many educators and school boards across the country have refused to integrate race-based courses into the classroom, arguing they incite anti-white sentiment. However, the effects of racism in academia reach far beyond high school or college. The achievement gap is typically recognized as the performance difference between whites and minorities, especially African American and Hispanic students, on standardized tests scores, dropout rates and grades. According to “The Nation,” Emma K. Adam, a professor of human development and social policy at Northwestern University, has found that Latino and black students have made substantial progress since the 1970s, yet they still generally lag two to three grades behind their white classmates. Lack of opportunity to succeed in school often leads to lifetime effects, such as income disparity and job prospects. Although progress is being made as a society, minorities are still clearly at a disadvantage compared to their white peers. Throughout a “New Yorker” article titled “MFA vs POC,” acclaimed author Junot Diaz illustrates his isolation as a Latino-American in the MFA program at Cornell University. Diaz vividly describes how race was hardly ever addressed through students’ writing. He recalls his white classmates making offensive remarks when the topic of race was addressed. Diaz said, “I was a person of color in a workshop whose theory of reality did not include my most fundamental experiences as a person of color—that did not, in other words, include me.” The lack of diversity and the inability to freely discuss race causes minorities, much like Diaz, to feel as if their story and perspectives don’t matter. How is America supposed to be a nation built on diversity and multiculturalism if Americans allow racism to spread throughout school systems? A person’s race is a part of them; it’s who they are, and race represents years of historical background and cultural traditions. By refusing to discuss race, students of color are essentially unable to express their lives and stories. Many minorities find themselves changing their identity, striving to achieve white culture to “fit in.” Students of color often change their outer appearance and attitudes at school since they believe they’ll be viewed differently if they don’t. In a video series titled “Voices” by NBC Asian America, several Asian Americans are asked if they’ve ever had a “lunchbox moment.” The phrase refers to a moment when Asian Americans are ridiculed by their peers for the unconventional, culturally-diverse food their parents pack for their lunch. Without further explanation, the individuals know exactly what the interviewer is referring to. One of the individuals said, “In some ways it made me feel a little bit like an outsider because I did not have a peanut butter and jelly sandwich.” The other interviewees reflect on their experience, recalling that they were discouraged from bringing their cultural food to school because they were afraid of what their classmates would say. Although the “lunchbox moment” is a minor example of institutionalized racism in school systems, it’s one that resonates with many minorities, including myself. Small instances have lasting impacts. Instances like the “lunchbox moment” make students afraid to embrace their cultural background and who they are. A person’s culture is something an individual should be proud of, not ashamed or embarrassed by. Despite academic research and articles supporting the existence of institutionalized racism, discrimination continues to persist. Racism in academia is primarily the result of teachers and educators striving to preserve an unbiased, colorblind environment. Although the concept may initially appear to be beneficial for students of color, the implementation consistently results in classrooms lacking discussion of cultural differences. White students are easily given the opportunity to learn more about their cultural history, yet minorities are deprived of it. If students are restricted from learning about their own cultural history, how will they effectively formulate their own perspectives and beliefs? Ignoring the issue is simply not the same as acknowledging and taking action to resolve it. Since September 2014, minorities constituted the majority of K-12 students in the United States. Especially in today’s society, people must recognize race as a powerful, and too often, divisive force. However, each individual has a choice; Americans must not allow institutionalized racism to plague school systems. Each student has a cultural background that should be celebrated, not used as a tool to discriminate against one another. Opponents of institutionalized racism may claim not all students of color are victims; often, students find the courage to succeed and not let social constructs dictate their lives. There are numerous minorities who find success despite barriers, ranging from Hispanic Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor, to the first African-American president, Barack Obama. Diaz himself became a world-renowned author, worked at two MFA programs and created his own writing workshop that helps promote the discussion of race. While there are many silver linings, American society is not “post-racial.” Institutionalized racism continues to leave many minorities feeling estranged, creating life-long effects. The future leaders of the next generation shouldn’t be taught that it’s acceptable to treat others differently based on how they look, no matter how small or seemingly insignificant the stereotype is. Bold leaders promote compassion and acceptance. A student’s academic life—whether education extends beyond high school or college—is a defining experience. It’s a time in which students are able to discover their passions, openly discuss their beliefs and ultimately be themselves. Especially in the state America is in right now, there needs to be more compassion; isolation essentially creates a regressive society. Strong nations build bridges, not exclude individuals based on superficial factors, like what they look like or what ethnicity they are. Allowing institutionalized racism to persist would be a crime against students of color and America as a whole.

#### Challenging institutional racism is a prior ethical question— it makes violence structurally inevitable and foundationally negates morality making defenses of utilitarianism incoherent

Memmi, 2k --- Professor Emeritus of Sociology @ U of Paris, Naiteire (Albert, Racism, Translated by Steve Martinot, p. 163-165)

The struggle against racism will be long, difficult, without intermission, without remission, probably never achieved. Yet, for this very reason, it is a struggle to be undertaken without surcease and without concessions. One cannot be indulgent toward racism; one must not even let the monster in the house, especially not in a mask. To give it merely a foothold means to augment the bestial part in us and in other people, which is to diminish what is human. To accept the racist universe to the slightest degree is to endorse fear, injustice, and violence. It is to accept the persistence of the dark history in which we still largely live. it is to agree that the outsider will always be a possible victim (and which man is not himself an outsider relative to someone else?. Racism illustrates, in sum, the inevitable negativity of the condition of the dominated that is, it illuminates in a certain sense the entire human condition. The anti-racist struggle, difficult though it is, and always in question, is nevertheless one of the prologues to the ultimate passage from animosity to humanity. In that sense, we cannot fail to rise to the racist challenge. However, it remains true that one’s moral conduit only emerges from a choice: one has to want it. It is a choice among other choices, and always debatable in its foundations and its consequences. Let us say, broadly speaking, that the choice to conduct oneself morally is the condition for the establishment of a human order, for which racism is the very negation. This is almost a redundancy. One cannot found a moral order, let alone a legislative order, on racism, because racism signifies the exclusion of the other, and his or her subjection to violence and domination. From an ethical point of view, if one can deploy a little religious language, racism is ‘the truly capital sin. It is not an accident that almost all of humanity’s spiritual traditions counsels respect for the weak, for orphans, widows, or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical morality and disinterested commandments. Such unanimity in the safeguarding of the other suggests the real utility of such sentiments. All things considered, we have an interest in banishing injustice, because injustice engenders violence and death. Of course, this is debatable. There are those who think that if one is strong enough, the assault on and oppression of others is permissible. Bur no one is ever sure of remaining the strongest. One day, perhaps, the roles will be reversed. All unjust society contains within itself the seeds of its own death. It is probably smarter to treat others with respect so that they treat you with respect. “Recall.” says the Bible, “that you were once a stranger in Egypt,” which means both that you ought to respect the stranger because you were a stranger yourself and that you risk becoming one again someday. It is an ethical and a practical appeal—indeed, it is a contract, however implicit it might be. In short, the refusal of racism is the condition for all theoretical and practical morality because, in the end, the ethical choice commands the political choice, a just society must be a society accepted by all. If this contractual principle is not accepted, then only conflict, violence, and destruction will be our lot. If it is accepted, we can hope someday to live in peace. True, it is a wager, but the stakes are irresistible.

#### Scenario 2 is Student Performance.

#### Charter schools exclude minorities – high admissions barriers for charter schools make it more difficult for disadvantaged students to gain access.

Simon 13 – Stephanie Simon, managing director at STAT, 2013 (“Special Report: Class Struggle - How charter schools get students they want,” February 15th, *Reuters,* Available Online At <http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-charters-admissions-idUSBRE91E0HF20130215>, Accessed 7-30-2017)

Though admissions barriers most directly affect individual students, the stakes are high for public education nationwide. Funding for charter schools comes primarily from the states, so as charters expand, less money is left for traditional public schools. Teachers unions have fought the proliferation of charters because they see the schools, which typically employ non-union teachers, as a drain on traditional public schools.

Charter-school advocates say the shift in resources is warranted because charters often excel where traditional schools have failed, posting stellar test scores even in impoverished neighborhoods with little history of academic success.

But a growing number of education experts - including some staunch fans of charter schools - see that narrative as flawed. They point to application barriers at some charter schools and high expulsion rates at others as evidence that the charter sector as a whole may be skimming the most motivated, disciplined students and leaving the hardest-to-reach behind.

That, in turn, can drive down test scores and enrollment at traditional public schools. In Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, Chicago and other cities, officials have cited just such trends as justification for closing scores of neighborhood schools to make way for still more charters.

"At some point, the slow leak of the most motivated students and families can put traditional schools in a downward spiral they can't recover from," said Jeffrey Henig, an education professor at Teachers College at Columbia University in New York.

Even when charter schools use simple applications, the fact that parents must submit them months before the start of school means that "these students are in some ways more advantaged, come from more motivated families" than kids in nearby district schools, education analyst Michael Petrilli said.

"We're talking about different populations," said Petrilli, executive vice president at the conservative Thomas B. Fordham Institute and longtime advocate of charter schools.

A federal report released last summer found that charter schools across the United States enroll significantly fewer special-needs students than district schools.

In New York City and Newark, New Jersey, high-achieving charter networks enroll markedly fewer poor, severely disabled and English-as-a-second-language students than district schools, according to an analysis by Bruce Baker, an education professor at Rutgers University.

Study in Contrasts

Such differences are visible in San Francisco, at a charter school and a district school less than a mile apart.

At Gateway High, a well-regarded charter, 36 percent of students qualify for subsidized lunch because of low income. At the district high school, 66 percent do, according to state data. Just 5 percent of Gateway's students are still learning English, compared with 14 percent at the district high school. And the parents at Gateway are better educated: Nearly half are college graduates, compared to 29 percent at the nearby school.

Gateway requires applicants and their parents to answer four pages of questions, responding to prompts such as "My best qualities are ..." and "When I graduate from high school, I hope ..."

Gateway's executive director, Sharon Olken, said the point is to get families thinking about whether the school is right for them; applicants are not judged by their writing skills or even the content of their essays. The application does not explain that, however, and even though they're allowed to write in their native language, some families with limited English skills are intimidated.

"Oh my God, it was a nightmare!" said Daisy Hernandez, a native Spanish speaker who made it through the forms only with help from her son, who was determined to apply. He got in.

The school's authorizer, the San Francisco Unified School District, has reviewed the application and is confident Gateway "maintains a consistent effort to reach and serve a diverse population," spokeswoman Gentle Blythe said.

It can be hard, however, to assess with any rigor whether application barriers deter students from applying. Education lawyers in several cities said parents shut out of the process rarely go public with their complaints out of concern for their children's privacy. Others see obstacles as deeply frustrating - but hardly a reason to file a lawsuit or lodge a formal protest with the state.

When Heather Davis-Jones sought to enroll her eight-year-old daughter, Shakia, in a charter school in Philadelphia last year, she found it much harder than she expected to get into admissions lotteries.

One school made its application available just one night a year; Davis-Jones had to leave work early, forfeiting income, to pick it up. Others demanded birth certificates and other records that Davis-Jones, who adopted her daughter from foster care, did not have and could not get.

#### Integration improves school success and quality – studies prove.

IMO 17 – Institute on Metropolitan Opportunity, established in 1993 as the Institute on Race and Poverty, 2017 (“Charter schools increasing segregation, underperforming public schools,” February 10th, published by the University of Minnesota, Available Online At <https://twin-cities.umn.edu/news-events/charter-schools-increasing-segregation-underperforming-public-schools>, Accessed 7-26-2017)

But this new analysis also singles out a large group of charter schools for additional scrutiny. In this subset of schools, low-income children of color are almost completely isolated in homogeneous environments. The report dubs these schools “poverty academies,” noting that they have been intentionally created by charter school components as an alternative to racial and economic integration. In poverty academies, economic and racial concentration have been adopted as educational strategies, theoretically because they provide an avenue to target “compensatory” education toward historically disadvantaged groups.

However, analysis in the report suggests that the old-fashioned approach of integration would better serve disadvantaged groups than poverty academies. Data shows that students from historically disadvantaged groups perform better in schools that achieve even low or moderate levels of integration. For example, for some ages and groups, even schools that remain above 80 percent low-income or nonwhite appear to offer better academic opportunity than poverty academies.

The new report shows that integration remains indispensable to anyone wishing to close achievement gaps or reduce inequality in education.

#### Integrated schools improve student outcomes and decrease incarceration

Barnum 16 — Matt Barnum, 4-11-16 ("Are Charter Schools a Cause of — or a Solution to — Segregation?", The74, Accessed Online at https://www.the74million.org/article/are-charter-schools-a-cause-of-or-a-solution-to-segregation, Accessed on 7-10-2017, SV)

Integrated schools tied to stronger learning

But does it work? Do students, like those at Brooklyn Prospect, really benefit from an integrated environment?

“We know from more than 40 years of research … that the socioeconomic composition of a school has a huge effect on children’s learning outcomes,” Potter said.

Indeed, there is strong evidence that integration makes a difference.

One study of Montgomery County, Maryland looked at low-income students who were randomly assigned to integrated public housing — and thus an integrated neighborhood school — and found that those students made large achievement gains in comparison to students who attended a more segregated school.

Evidence from the Charlotte–Mecklenburg district in North Carolina found that the end of its busing program in 2002 widened the achievement gap between black and white students. The researchers also linked the increased school segregation to rises in arrest and incarceration rates among men of color; this occurred despite efforts by the district to bring additional resources to segregated schools.1

National research has also found that the desegregation efforts of the 60s, 70s, and 80s — many brought about by court order — led to long-term benefits for African Americans in the form of greater income, better health outcomes, and lower incarceration rates.

Some studies suggest that the benefits of integration come as affluent, politically influential parents increase school spending, improving school quality. Other studies find that money isn’t the whole explanation, and some speculate that concentrating disadvantaged students in the same school simply makes the job of educators more challenging.

#### Closing the opportunity gap in education is vital to reduce inequality.

Johnson 16 — Rucker C. Johnson, Associate Professor at the Goldman School of Public Policy at the University of California-Berkeley, Faculty Research Fellow at the National Bureau of Economic Research, Faculty Research Fellow at the W.E.B. Du Bois Institute at Harvard University, Research Affiliate at the National Poverty Center at the University of Michigan, Research Affiliate at the Institute for Poverty Research at the University of Wisconsin, holds a Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Michigan, 2016 (“Can Schools Level the Intergenerational Playing Field? Lessons from Equal Educational Opportunity Policies,” *Economic Mobility: Research & Ideas on Strengthening Families, Communities & the Economy*, Edited and Published by the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Available Online at https://www.stlouisfed.org/~/media/Files/PDFs/Community-Development/EconMobilityPapers/EconMobility\_Book\_508.pdf?la=en , Accessed 06-19-2017, p. 321)

Summary Discussion and Conclusions The key contributions of this study are three-fold. First, the paper provides a more detailed descriptive portrait of intergenerational economic mobility in the United States. Second, the paper attempts to explain why black-white mobility differences narrowed significantly for successive cohorts born between 1955 and 1979, with a focus on the role of three major equal educational opportunity policies pursued over this period: school desegregation, school finance reforms, and roll-out and expansions of Head Start, improving the understanding of the intergenerational mobility process in the United States and illuminating the central role schools play in the transmission of economic success from one generation to the next. Third, the paper emphasizes differences in early education and school quality—in particular, Head Start and school spending—as important components of the persistence in income across generations. Indeed, schools—and policies that influence their optimal functioning—are transformative agents that either provide or deprive children of the opportunity to reach their full potential. These equal educational opportunity policies were instrumental in the making of a growing black middle class. The evidence shows that the footprints of paths toward upward mobility are preceded by access to high quality schools beginning in early childhood through 12th grade. These school reforms expanded on-ramps to poor and minority children to get on that path. Evidence on the long-term productivity of education spending demonstrates that equal education policy initiatives can play a pivotal role in reducing the intergenerational transmission of poverty.

#### Racial and economic inequality is a form of structural violence that condemns entire populations to preventable suffering and death

Bezruchka 14 — Stephen Bezruchka, Senior Lecturer in Health Services and Global Health at the School of Public Health at the University of Washington, holds a Master of Public Health from Johns Hopkins University and an M.D. from Stanford University, 2014 (“Inequality Kills,” *Divided: The Perils of Our Growing Inequality*, Edited by David Cay Johnston, Published by The New Press, ISBN 9781595589446, p. 194-195)

Differences in mortality rates are not just a statistical concern—they reflect suffering and pain for very real individuals and families. The higher mortality in the United States is an example of what Paul Farmer, the noted physician and anthropologist, calls structural violence. The forty-seven infant deaths occur every day because of the way society in the United States is structured, resulting in our health status being that of a middle-income country, not a rich country. There is growing evidence that the factor most responsible for the relatively poor health in the United States is the vast and rising inequality in wealth and income that we not only tolerate, but resist changing. Inequality is the central element, the upstream cause of the social disadvantage described in the IOM report. A political system that fosters inequality limits the attainment of health. The claim that economic inequality is a major reason for our poor health requires that several standard criteria for claiming causality are satisfied: the results are confirmed by many different studies by different investigators over different time periods; there is a dose-response relationship, meaning more inequality leads to worse health; no other contending explanation is posited; and the relationship is biologically plausible, with likely mechanisms through which inequality works. The field of study called stress biology of social comparisons is one such way inequality acts. Those studies confirm that all the criteria for linking inequality to poorer health are met, concluding that the extent of inequality in society reflects the range of caring and sharing, with more unequal populations sharing less. Those who are poorer struggle to be accepted in society and the rich also suffer its effects. A recent Harvard study estimated that about one death in three in this country results from our very high income inequality. Inequality kills through structural violence. There is no smoking gun with this form of violence, which simply produces a lethally large social and economic gap between rich and poor.

#### The structural violence of inequality outweighs other impacts—there is an ethical obligation to address it

Ansell 17 — David A. Ansell, Senior Vice President, Associate Provost for Community Health Equity, and Michael E. Kelly Professor of Medicine at Rush University Medical Center (Chicago), holds an M.D. from the State University of New York Upstate Medical University College of Medicine, 2017 (“American Roulette,” *The Death Gap: How Inequality Kills*, Published by the University of Chicago Press, ISBN 9780226428291, p. kindle 307-363)

There are many different kinds of violence. Some are obvious: punches, attacks, gunshots, explosions. These are the kinds of interpersonal violence that we tend to hear about in the news. Other kinds of violence are intimate and emotional. But the deadliest and most thoroughgoing kind of violence is woven into the fabric of American society. It exists when some groups have more access to goods, resources, and opportunities than other groups, including health and life itself. This violence delivers specific blows against particular bodies in particular neighborhoods. This unequal advantage and violence is built into the very rules that govern our society. In the absence of this violence, large numbers of Americans would be able to live fuller and longer lives. This kind of violence is called structural violence, because it is embedded in the very laws, policies, and rules that govern day-to-day life.8 It is the cumulative impact of laws and social and economic policies and practices that render some Americans less able to access resources and opportunities than others. This inequity of advantage is not a result of the individual’s personal abilities but is built into the systems that govern society. Often it is a product of racism, gender, and income inequality. The diseases and premature mortality that Windora and many of my patients experienced were, in the words of Dr. Paul Farmer, “biological reflections of social fault lines.”9 As a result of these fault lines, a disproportional burden of illness, suffering, and premature mortality falls on certain neighborhoods, like Windora’s. Structural violence can overwhelm an individual’s ability to live a free, unfettered, healthy life. As I ran to evaluate Windora, I knew that her stroke was caused in part by lifelong exposure to suffering, racism, and economic deprivation. Worse, the poverty of West Humboldt Park that contributed to her illness is directly and inextricably related to the massive concentration of wealth and power in other neighborhoods just miles away in Chicago’s Gold Coast and suburbs. That concentration of wealth could not have occurred without laws, policies, and practices that favored some at the expense of others. Those laws, policies, and practices could not have been passed or enforced if access to political and economic power had not been concentrated in the hands of a few. Yet these political and economic structures have become so firmly entrenched (in habits, social relations, economic arrangements, institutional practices, law, and policy) that they have become part of the matrix of American society. The rules that govern day-to-day life were written to benefit a small elite at the expense of people like Windora and her family. These rules and structures are powerful destructive forces. The same structures that render life predictable, secure, comfortable, and pleasant for many destroy the lives of others like Windora through suffering, poverty, ill health, and violence. These structures are neither natural nor neutral. The results of structural violence can be very specific. In Windora’s case, stroke precursors like chronic stress, poverty, and uncontrolled hypertension run rampant in neighborhoods like hers. Windora’s illness was caused by neither her cultural traits nor the failure of her will. Her stroke was caused in part by inequity. She is one of the lucky ones, though, because even while structural violence ravages her neighborhood, it also abets the concentration of expensive stroke- intervention services in certain wealthy teaching hospitals like mine. If I can get to her in time, we can still help her. Income Inequality and Life Inequality Of course, Windora is not the only person struggling on account of structural violence. Countless neighborhoods nationwide are suffering from it, and people are dying needlessly young as a result. The magnitude of this excess mortality is mind-boggling. In 2009 my friend Dr. Steve Whitman asked a simple question, “How many extra black people died in Chicago each year, just because they do not have the same health outcomes as white Chicagoans?” When the Chicago Sun-Times got wind of his results, it ran them on the front page in bold white letters on a black background: “HEALTH CARE GAP KILLS 3200 Black Chicagoans and the Gap is Growing.” The paper styled the headline to look like the declaration of war that it should have been. In fact, we did find ourselves at war not long ago, when almost 3,000 Americans were killed. That was September 11, 2001. That tragedy propelled the country to war. Yet when it comes to the premature deaths of urban Americans, no disaster area has been declared. No federal troops have been called up. No acts of Congress have been passed. Yet this disaster is even worse: those 3,200 black people were in Chicago alone, in just one year. Nationwide each year, more than 60,000 black people die prematurely because of inequality.10 While blacks suffer the most from this, it is not just an issue of racism, though racism has been a unique and powerful transmitter of violence in America for over four hundred years.11 Beyond racism, poverty and income inequality perpetuated by exploitative market capitalism are singular agents of transmission of disease and early death. As a result, there is a new and alarming pattern of declining life expectancy among white Americans as well. Deaths from drug overdoses in young white Americans ages 25 to 34 have exploded to levels not seen since the AIDS epidemic. This generation is the first since the Vietnam War era to experience higher death rates than the prior generation.12 White Americans ages 45 to 54 have experienced skyrocketing premature death rates as well, something not seen in any other developed nation.13 White men in some Appalachian towns live on average twenty years less than white men a half-day’s drive away in the suburbs of Washington, DC. Men in McDowell County, West Virginia, can look forward to a life expectancy only slightly better than that of Haitians.14 But those statistics reflect averages, and every death from structural violence is a person. When these illnesses and deaths are occurring one at a time in neighborhoods that society has decided not to care about—neighborhoods populated by poor, black, or brown people—they seem easy to overlook, especially if you are among the fortunate few who are doing incredibly well. The tide of prosperity in America has lifted some boats while others have swamped. Paul Farmer, the physician-anthropologist who founded Partners in Health, an international human rights agency, reflects on the juxtaposition of “unprecedented bounty and untold penury”: “It stands to reason that as beneficiaries of growing inequality, we do not like to be reminded of misery of squalor and failure. Our popular culture provides us with no shortage of anesthesia.”15 That people suffer and die prematurely because of inequality is wrong. It is wrong from an ethical perspective. It is wrong from a fairness perspective. And it is wrong because we have the means to fix it.

### 1AC—Plan

#### The United States federal government should condition the awarding of funds to charter schools on the charter school’s inclusion of deliberate integration dimensions.

### 1AC—Solvency

#### Conditioning on federal funds solves integration

Rubinstein 17 - Rachel E. Rubinstein is a J.D. at the University of Richmond School of Law, January 2017 ("Civil Rights and the Charter School Choice: How Stricter Standards for Charter Schools Can Aid Educational Equity", Washington Education Law and Policy Review, Accessed online at <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1155&context=law-student-publications>, pg 109-112 Accessed on 7-13-2017, SV)

Recent federal administrations endorsed the expansion of charter schools by funding grants to schools and operators as well as incentives for states to implement charter-friendly legislation. States are likely also happy to receive the additional funding that follows students to charter schools through the CSP, Race to the Top, and even Title I funds. As states continue to define charters as “public” or “common” schools and dedicate taxpayer money to both non-profit and for-profit school operators, more protections are necessary to ensure transparency, accountability, and fairness to the residents who are impacted when a locally-controlled public school becomes a privately operated autonomous charter school.

A. Federal Incentives and Action

The federal government has some regulatory oversight of charter schools through the CSP, which issues grants to state education agencies based on applications describing the charter school’s objective, operations, expected community impact, facilities, and more. The state education agency may then distribute funding to charter schools, or to efforts for charter development. While the recent CSP guidelines are an improvement—previous guidelines required no mention of community impact or outreach plans—they could do more to encourage proactive steps toward achieving diversity.148

i. Authorization, Outreach, and Oversight Much of the variation in charter school operations comes from the requirements of each local authorizing agency, which differ by state. The CSP and subsequent federal guidelines should include more provisions targeting the authorizing board, whether that be a local board of education, non-profit, or higher education institution. State laws currently outline the responsibility of authorizers but are often vague, allowing broad discretion by the authorizing agency in what it requires from new applicants and how they assess renewals. The federal CSP should condition grant money on the implementation of state standards for authorizing agencies. High-quality standards would require charter applicants to provide detailed plans to achieve racial and socioeconomic diversity, as well as strategies for disseminating information and engaging in outreach toward disadvantaged students and families.149

High standards for authorizers should also require more data collection and transparency in reporting results to the local community, state, and federal agencies. Authorizers are currently the only source of oversight and accountability for charter schools other than the charter operator itself. The federal government should mandate that the authorizer collect and accurately report data on its schools’ enrollment demographics. The Education Department’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR) should monitor charter student enrollment and attrition by subgroup and provide annual reports to ensure charter schools are enrolling their proportional share of students in each subgroup (English-language status, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, etc.).150 Any school that continues to receive public money, as charter schools do, should be subject to the same accountability as all public schools, by providing transparent, accurate information accessible to the taxpayers. Widespread evidence suggesting subtle civil rights violations by charter schools prompted OCR to put forth a “Dear Colleague” letter addressing concerns in the charter school community.151 The letter reminded charter schools that federal legislation like IDEA and Title IV of the Civil Rights Act still apply to all charter schools, and specifically mentioned the discriminatory practices charter schools may mistakenly pursue in violation of federal law.152 In addition, OCR and the Office for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) recently published Frequently Asked Questions pertaining to charter schools and students with disabilities.153 The substance of these federal documents suggests the Department is aware of stakeholder concerns that charter schools may be engaging in inequitable or discriminatory practices and that oversight has failed at ensuring equal access to the charter school opportunity.

ii. Admissions, Enrollment and Lottery Weights Due to the dominant role authorizers play in a charter school’s administration and oversight, current standards for quality authorizers set out by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers should mention more actions that would encourage schools to achieve greater racial or socioeconomic diversity.154 Moving past concerns over access to admissions information and procedures, oversubscribed charters should use neutral lotteries to ensure a level of fairness to applicants. Aspects of the CSP permit charter schools to use weighted lotteries to further diversity,155 but, as discussed above in section III.B of this paper, charter schools do not always design lotteries fairly, setting aside seats for children of charter employees as well as neighborhood preferences that only serve to increase homogeneity. Federal funds should be contingent on 1) the design of lotteries that further diversity goals and 2) data collection of lottery results to ensure oversight by the authorizer and accountability to parents and students. A fair lottery minimizes neighborhood and personnel preferences, instead weighting lotteries for students based on socioeconomic status and/or zip code, thus increasing the socioeconomic and geographic diversity that often leads to racial diversity.156 Some of the charter school movement’s greatest strengths, autonomy and accountability, are also its greatest weaknesses, as variations in policy expose the discriminatory impact of profit-based, results-driven education.

#### Funding key—charters rely on federal funds

Rubinstein 17 - Rachel E. Rubinstein is a J.D. at the University of Richmond School of Law, January 2017 ("Civil Rights and the Charter School Choice: How Stricter Standards for Charter Schools Can Aid Educational Equity", Washington Education Law and Policy Review, Accessed online at <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1155&context=law-student-publications>, pg 91-94 Accessed on 7-13-2017, SV)

A. Federal Legislation and Influence Under President Obama's administration, charter schools were eligible for additional grants through the federal government’s Charter Schools Program (CSP). CSP awards over $157 million in grant money to states wishing to expand or open new charter schools.67 Charter applicants apply for money through their State Education Agency (SEA) after the school receives approval from the state’s charter authorizer.68 SEAs applying for a grant must follow a series of CSP guidance principles that are recommended, but not mandatory, in order to have their grant application approved.69 The guiding points ask the applicant to provide descriptions for how the school will be managed, its relationship with the charter authorizing board, and how funds will be allocated.70 Absent is any requirement that applicants include plans for racial balancing or other outreach and inclusivity initiatives.

In June 2015, the United States Department of Education (USDE) released new guidance for selection of CSP grants with the priority of strengthening high-quality charter schools.71 While some provisions aimed to strengthen oversight of charter schools by their authorizing boards or SEAs, few changes were made that would incentivize charters to diversify the student body.72 The guidance rewards charter schools for employing “evidence-based” best practices, with measures that increase diversity serving as an example, but by no means a required practice.73 The National Coalition on School Diversity noted in its comments to USDE that the regulatory guidance could more explicitly state how factors pertaining to diversity would be reviewed by the SEA as part of the charter school’s oversight.74

The lack of affirmative requirements is particularly problematic in terms of admissions, as charters either become part of an open enrollment plan or are exempted from geographically-based school assignments. Without more explicit requirements, charter schools may employ tactics designed to discourage certain types of students from attending their particular charters.75 Such strategies include: pointing out increased diversity at neighboring schools, expressing a lack of resources regarding disability services, or failing to provide translation services or transportation without an explicit parental request.76 These activities work to undermine the very principle of free-choice, as the school consequently appears to parents as an unviable option.

#### The plan integrates charter schools by requiring charter schools deliberately integrate themselves—schools that don’t comply will no longer receive funds

Parker 12 — James A. Webster Professor of Public Law, Wake Forest University School of Law (Wendy Parker, 2012, "From the Failure of Desegregation to the Failure of Choice" Washington University Journal of Law & Policy, http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1578&amp;context=law\_journal\_law\_policy, Accessed 7-3-2017, JWS)

As revealed earlier, charter schools segregate; they often even segregate more than our already segregated traditional public schools. Yet, when our federal government awards charter schools public money, it never asks whether the charter school is segregated, however one might define that status. Instead, our limited public education dollars subsidize charter schools that segregate. The federal government even promises funding to special-identity charter schools. Charter schools can choose to attempt integration, and get an additional five points on their application for CPS funding. But no one is asking or requiring charter schools to integrate because integration is right for our educational system. Nor is anyone asking that charter schools simply not increase our current levels of \*150 segregation. Our federal government spends, with no concern that it finances segregation. In fact, the federal government is actually promoting segregation when it advocates charter schools as a way to help failing school districts and at-risk students. In our country, this focus too often means poor and/or minority school children. These children certainly need and deserve better educational offerings supported by the federal government. But by offering charter schools as a solution to the plight of at-risk children in failing school districts, we will too often concentrate them again in segregated educational environments. If charter schools had a consistent record of improved educational outcomes, I could see how this focus on charter schools could make sense. But charter schools have a mixed academic record. And although the academic literature exhibits many disagreements, everyone agrees that high-poverty schools, whether traditional or charter, are the hardest to operate successfully. Federal funding to increase their number--by advocating charter schools as a better alternative for education--is ludicrous. In addition, to operate charter schools for the advantage of at-risk children requires that those typically with the fewest resources--poor parents--make the “right” choices to improve their children's education. While parents rightly desire options other than failing traditional schools, I fail to see how placing so much responsibility on poor parents will ensure success. This is particularly so given the lack of choices currently available in charter schools. At the very least, the federal government should condition the awarding of money on a charter school's inclusion of “deliberate integration dimensions.” Without that component, charter schools become a twenty-first century version of freedom-of-choice plans that locked in de jure segregation-- but worse: charter schools too often offer exclusively segregative educational experiences while the freedom-of-choice plans at least offered some degree of demographic \*151 choice. Requiring charter schools to at a minimum pay attention to integration would necessarily entail an end to federal funding of special-identity charter schools. The federal government should not be in the business of financing schools explicitly designed to segregate. The academic literature is very clear: integrated schools, particularly ones integrated by class, are much more likely to be successful than economically or racially segregated schools. For that reason alone, the federal government should once again embrace integration. . . . By its terms, choice has great appeal. As a society we need, however, leadership to determine what kinds of choices we should offer, at public expense, to parents. Charter schools too often separate out children who have the highest need for quality education into their separate schools, when the evidence is strikingly strong that these schools are too often doomed to failure. We cannot continue to design, operate, and fund charter schools that are returning us to the days of legal segregation.

#### Carefully designed school choice can enforce civil rights.

Siegel-Hawley and Frankenberg 16 – Genevieve Siegel-Hawley, research affiliate for UCLA Civil Rights Project, Ph.D. in urban schooling, University of California, Los Angeles, M.Ed. in education policy and management, Harvard University, M.A.T. in secondary social studies, Johns Hopkins University, B.A. in history/sociology, University of Virginia, received the VCU School of Education Distinguished Junior Faculty Award in 2015, received the VCU Presidential Research Quest Fund Grant Award for 2014-15, and Erica Frankenberg, assistant professor at Pennsylvania State University, Ed. D. from Harvard University, former Research and Policy Director for the Initiative on School Integration at the Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles at UCLA, 2016 (“Re v i e w o f The Integration Anomoly: Comparing the Effect of K-12 Education Delivery Models on Segregation in Schools,” January, *National Education Policy Center,* Available Online At <http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/ttr_siegel-hawley-frankenberg_integration_0.pdf>, Accessed 7-30-2017)

Alongside accumulated evidence indicating that choice and stratification often go handin-hand, studies show that carefully designed school choice can be used to promote integration.24 Attention to civil rights protections like extensive outreach, free transportation, diversity goals and interest-based admissions is fundamentally critical.25 Without such protections, less well-off families either will not know about the school, or will not be able to get their children to it, or—assuming they overcome those barriers—run into a selective admissions process based on test scores that measure wealth more than anything else.26 Yet the report ignores these well-documented and essential strategies in favor of a set of recommendations for expanding unrestricted school choice.

#### The federal government is key – states can’t implement civil rights law as uniformly or successfully as the fed.

Duncan Former Secretary of Education 17 — (Arne Duncan, 3-12-2017, "Arne Duncan: Trump, DeVos should preserve Office of Civil Rights to safeguard students," No Publication, http://getschooled.blog.myajc.com/2017/03/12/arne-duncan-trump-devos-should-preserve-office-of-civil-rights-to-safeguard-students/, Accessed 4-25-2017, JWS)

I strongly agree. To learn, every child has the right to be who they are at school and to feel protected from discrimination, abuse and injustice. This is not the case for far too many children across our country. The federal government has a long history of deferring to states and school districts on educational matters like standards, curriculum, funding and day-to-day operations. But when it comes to protecting students, federal law is clear: Civil rights are paramount. Sadly, states and local school districts have a long history of valuing some students more than others. A history of providing more—more spending, more high quality teachers, more advanced courses – to the children of the powerful than to those of everybody else. A history of excluding those who are different, especially if they are more challenging—or more expensive—to educate. That’s why Congress has repeatedly passed education and civil rights laws that require the U.S. Department of Education to protect vulnerable students and monitor the progress of states and districts in providing quality education to every child, in every classroom, in every state. We wish such oversight were no longer necessary. In Georgia alone, there are some heart-wrenching examples. In 2016, the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights investigated a Georgia school district (not named to protect the identity of the student involved) where a student who wore a hijab said she was the target of verbal and physical harassment by her classmates, including being called a “terrorist.” The student eventually left the school because the district did not address the hostile climate of the school and made no effort to extend counseling to the student even though she was distraught over the harassment. With federal intervention, the district created new policies on harassment, provided training to teachers and administrators and created a climate survey for students to determine what else needed to be addressed. In 2015, OCR investigated allegations that Wilcox County Schools discriminated in the recruitment and hiring of black teachers. During investigation, OCR learned that the district employed only 9 black teachers, out of 102 teachers total, even though there was a much larger number of black teachers living in the county or in surrounding counties and the student population in the district is was 36 percent black. Through federal intervention, the district agreed to revamp its recruitment and hiring policies. In 2014, a student in Rockdale County Schools was removed from the district’s AVID college readiness program because he had a disability and was told that students with disabilities couldn’t participate in the program. After OCR opened an investigation, the district agreed to not only allow the student to re-enroll in the program, but it also sent information on AVID to other students with disabilities in the district who were discouraged from applying because of their disabilities. These are not isolated problems, and they are not unique to Georgia. According to data from the Department of Education’s Civil Rights Data Collection, Americans learned that high schools enrolling concentrations of black and Latino students are less likely to offer courses in calculus, physics and chemistry than those that are predominantly white. We also learned that black students are almost four times as likely as white students to receive one or more out-of-school suspensions. Students with disabilities are more than twice as likely as those without. Publishing these data has inspired action on both these fronts, and helped lead the way to a 20 percent reduction in school suspensions nationwide. The Trump administration has repeatedly implied that OCR has overstepped its boundaries in enforcing the law. At various times, President Trump, Attorney General Jeff Sessions and Education Secretary Betsy DeVos have signaled that enforcing federal civil rights laws is “best left to states.” I strongly disagree. Leaving enforcement of civil rights laws to states will breed chaos, undermine the education of millions of children, and subject students of every age to abuse, neglect, indifference and outright racism, sexism, and anti-immigrant hostility. The Trump administration has no authority to simply abdicate responsibility to enforce civil rights laws.

## Neoliberalism Add-On

### 2AC – Neoliberalism Bad

#### Charters create class stratification based on race and class, but forcing desegregation destroys the hierarchy.

Brown 17 — (Nino Brown, 5-28-17, " DeVos’s “school choice” is corporate death trap for working families, educators " Liberation News, https://www.liberationnews.org/betsy-devos-school-choice-is-really-corporate-death-trap-for-working-families-and-educators/, Accessed 7-7-2017, JWS)

On May 22, Education Secretary Betsy DeVos gave a speech in Indianapolis at a summit hosted by the right wing pro “school choice” lobbying group, the American Federation for Children. DeVos’s speech championed the Trump administration’s Federal Education Budget and its concomitant expansion of so-called “school choice” as the “most ambitious” in history. AFC spokesman Tommy Schultz said of the Trump-DeVos education plan: “We see that this a really significant opportunity for her to lay out a vision for what she sees as educational choice going into the future for all 50 states.” DeVos claimed that the Trump administration would be somehow “making history” in trying to transform the nation’s allegedly “closed and antiquated educational system.” While there are transformations that need to be made within the education system, DeVos is not qualified to be making them. The policies she supports deepen the structural inequities that exist within public education as it stands. The kind of transformation DeVos and Trump speak of is a neoliberal transformation that would strengthen the hegemony of corporate control in education, deepen segregation, and destroy the teachers’ unions all across the nation. Today’s mainstream “reformers” are reformers of the ruling class elite and the corporate interests they represent. While these ruling class mouthpieces speak of “reform” on the one hand, what they do in deed is deform the already existing structures in public education, causing them to collapse so private capital can “intervene” to “save education.” Obama paved the path for Trump-DeVos Billionaire and ultraright-wing creationist Betsy DeVos, with a track record of demonstrating sheer ignorance in matters of education, clearly does not know the recent history of the Obama administration’s neoliberal education policies. In order to truly understand what DeVos and Trump’s plan for dismantling public education root and branch, we have to come to grips with the reality that their policies do not exist in a vacuum. The Trump administration’s education policy is in direct continuity with that of Obama’s. Let’s recall that it was the Obama administration that allocated $4.3 billion from the 2009 “stimulus package” under the auspices of former Secretary of Education Arne Duncan to implement the “Race to the Top” program. Under the RTTT at least 30 states were coerced to compete for grants by making several pro-corporate “reforms.” Already resource-strapped states and districts were pushed into implementing draconian policies such as tying teacher evaluations to standardized testing, raising or eliminating any caps on the expansion of charter school construction, shutting down “low-achieving” schools, claiming these schools are “turn around” schools when they become charter schools, and dismantling union power by inducing the mass turn over of veteran public school teachers and principals. Under Obama public schools were faced with a full frontal assault. Unions were systematically undermined and forced to capitulate to these neoliberal reforms. Often times the pro-corporate charter school advocates and institutions claimed to be acting in the interest of Black and Latino students as part of their racist and capitalist plan to restructure education in this country to fit the needs of multinational corporations and bolster corporate hegemony in public education. So DeVos is wrong. Trump’s plan is Obama’s plan. New boss meet the old boss. The main difference is the level of sheer ignorance of this regime in carrying out its wanton attack on public education and teacher’s unions. “School Choice” = privatization, deregulation, and smashed unions DeVos has spent the bulk of her political career as a proponent of so-called “school choice.” In her home state of Michigan where she led the Republican party offensive against enhanced public regulation of the collapsing Detroit Public Schools, she used her mass wealth to intervene and shut down the “Detroit Education Commission” which was a paltry attempt at greater oversight of Detroit’s underregulated and poorly performing charter schools. Despite the devastation she imparted on Michigan, DeVos is dead set on expanding her privatization campaign. “School choice,” vouchers, and tax credits are the tip of her spear. The veil of “school choice” may seem progressive to the untrained eye, but it is really a mask for the privatization of public education. The pushing of vouchers deceives the public into believing that more choice equals better outcomes. While the question of choice appears central to these education deformers’ plans, the “choice” we have under this capitalist system is no real choice at all for working and oppressed people. “School choice” will lead to a deepening of capitalist inequities. The already existing class divisions across races, gender, nationalities and abilities will come to the fore. “Middle class parents will add as much money as they can to their vouchers in order to get their kids into the best possible schools. The wealthy will spend whatever it takes to create an elite stratum of schools that insure their kids’ advantages. Lower-middle-class families will scour the system for decent schools they can afford; they’ll find that the more decent the school, the higher the demand for it, and the higher the price. And the poor? They will go to “government schools” – a term that market education reformers have long used to describe what everyone else calls public schools (Common Dreams).” “According to studies of voucher programs in Wisconson, Indiana, Arizona, and Nevada most of the money from the programs goes to parents wealthy enough to already have their children enrolled in private schools. Voucher programs rarely provide enough money to enable poor minority children to get access to the best private schools. A new comprehensive study of vouchers finds evidence that vouchers don’t significantly improve student achievement. What they do pose is a greater likelihood that students who are the most costly and difficult to educate–low income kids and children with special needs–will be turned away or pushed out by private schools that are not obligated to serve all students. (Common Dreams).” The Trump administration’s budget would cut upwards of $10.6 billion from the education budget. According to the Washington Post report on the cuts, they would be “eliminating at least 22 programs” which would include “$1.2 billion for after-school programs that serve 1.6 million children, most of whom are poor, and $2.1 billion for teacher training and class-size reduction.” The report continues, stating “The Trump administration would dedicate no money to a fund for student support and academic enrichment that is meant to help schools pay for, among other things, mental health services, anti-bullying initiatives, physical education, Advanced Placement courses and science and engineering instruction.” Schools are sites of social reproduction and struggle. Educators in this new terrain are already under much duress to do their job to the best of their ability and are hobbled by cuts in vital resources needed to provide for the whole child. As a young educator of color myself, I know that working conditions are teaching conditions. It is hard enough to retain teachers of color let alone teachers in general and these cuts will only weaken the resolve of all educators. They also have the potential to spark mass resistance, depending on the level of organization of progressive forces inside teacher’s unions and in working class communities. We are faced with “no choice” but to resist and rebel under this corporate assault on public education. That is the one “choice” our ruling class–the .01%–does not want us to make. Resistance to DeVos is resistance to Trumpism, racism and corporate control When DeVos was nominated to be the Education secretary many in the education justice movement criticized her for not having any experience in public education beyond promoting her “school choice” voucher privatization agenda. The ignorance of DeVos to not just public education but to basic U.S. history was revealing when she likened Historically Black Colleges to models of “school choice” she championed. DeVos faced huge backlash from students, staff, and proponents of Historically Black Colleges and Universities for using them as a prop to advance her “school choice” agenda, falsely claiming that “they are living proof that when more options are provided to students, they are afforded greater access and great quality. Their success has shown that more options help students flourish.” DeVos must not know that HBCUs were not created out of a passion for so-called “school choice” but because they were the only institutions that would provide educational services for Black people in this nation. They were the byproducts and necessary institutions of Black self-determination in a white supremacist apartheid state known as Jim Crow. In Indiana, a site of rapid expansion of private and charter schools, public school teachers are aware that the vague “school choice” language of DeVos and others is really just a assault on their profession and struggling urban school districts. As the president of the Indiana State Teacher’s Association stated, “What we have is a voucher system that funds kids who are already going, by and large, to private schools anyway, and there is no data that is showing they are doing any better than public school counterparts.” This is a pivotal point. No comprehensive studies have shown charter schools produce better results than public schools. In fact, most public schools outperform charters despite their unequal relationship to resources and opportunities. Moreover, charter schools in general are more selective and exclusionary than public schools and often reproduce the elitism of capitalist society. Ideologically this serves to train young people in neoliberal ideologies while robbing the state treasury of millions of dollars “in the name of the children” and even “progress” or “reform.” But DeVos is not a lone warrior in this crusade against public education. She has allies in corporate America that seek to drink the blood of students, teachers, and parents in the working and middle classes. Aided by the likes of Exxon Mobil, The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Dell, Facebook’s Mark Zuckerberg, and other ruling class formations and personalities, education is being turned into a market to reap super profits in a time when the rate of capital accumulation on a national and international scale is slowing down. The global free-marketization of education puts “schools, education management organizations, tutoring services, teacher training tests, curricula online classes, and franchises of branded universities” up for grabs. We know who is salivating to expand the already $2.5 trillion dollar global education market. Education, which is largely seen as a public good, or a part of our “commons” is being turned into a instrument of capitalist “added value” seeking to transform this common good into a private good. Once it is a private good, competition between students and families will increase and sharpen as the global economy continues to restructure in the age of the technological revolution, leaving some students to join the growing ranks of low wage service work, languish in prison subjected to slave labor, or join the growing army of the unemployed.

Scenario 1 is neoliberalism

#### Neoliberalism is the root cause of structural inequalities

- Answer to cede the political

Monbiot 16 — (George Monbiot, 4-1-2016, "Neoliberalism – the ideology at the root of all our problems," Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/apr/15/neoliberalism-ideology-problem-george-monbiot, Accessed 7-7-2017, JWS)

Imagine if the people of the Soviet Union had never heard of communism. The ideology that dominates our lives has, for most of us, no name. Mention it in conversation and you’ll be rewarded with a shrug. Even if your listeners have heard the term before, they will struggle to define it. Neoliberalism: do you know what it is? Its anonymity is both a symptom and cause of its power. It has played a major role in a remarkable variety of crises: the financial meltdown of 2007‑8, the offshoring of wealth and power, of which the Panama Papers offer us merely a glimpse, the slow collapse of public health and education, resurgent child poverty, the epidemic of loneliness, the collapse of ecosystems, the rise of Donald Trump. But we respond to these crises as if they emerge in isolation, apparently unaware that they have all been either catalysed or exacerbated by the same coherent philosophy; a philosophy that has – or had – a name. What greater power can there be than to operate namelessly? So pervasive has neoliberalism become that we seldom even recognise it as an ideology. We appear to accept the proposition that this utopian, millenarian faith describes a neutral force; a kind of biological law, like Darwin’s theory of evolution. But the philosophy arose as a conscious attempt to reshape human life and shift the locus of power. Neoliberalism sees competition as the defining characteristic of human relations. It redefines citizens as consumers, whose democratic choices are best exercised by buying and selling, a process that rewards merit and punishes inefficiency. It maintains that “the market” delivers benefits that could never be achieved by planning. Attempts to limit competition are treated as inimical to liberty. Tax and regulation should be minimised, public services should be privatised. The organisation of labour and collective bargaining by trade unions are portrayed as market distortions that impede the formation of a natural hierarchy of winners and losers. Inequality is recast as virtuous: a reward for utility and a generator of wealth, which trickles down to enrich everyone. Efforts to create a more equal society are both counterproductive and morally corrosive. The market ensures that everyone gets what they deserve. We internalise and reproduce its creeds. The rich persuade themselves that they acquired their wealth through merit, ignoring the advantages – such as education, inheritance and class – that may have helped to secure it. The poor begin to blame themselves for their failures, even when they can do little to change their circumstances. Never mind structural unemployment: if you don’t have a job it’s because you are unenterprising. Never mind the impossible costs of housing: if your credit card is maxed out, you’re feckless and improvident. Never mind that your children no longer have a school playing field: if they get fat, it’s your fault. In a world governed by competition, those who fall behind become defined and self-defined as losers. Among the results, as Paul Verhaeghe documents in his book What About Me? are epidemics of self-harm, eating disorders, depression, loneliness, performance anxiety and social phobia. Perhaps it’s unsurprising that Britain, in which neoliberal ideology has been most rigorously applied, is the loneliness capital of Europe. We are all neoliberals now. \*\*\* The term neoliberalism was coined at a meeting in Paris in 1938. Among the delegates were two men who came to define the ideology, Ludwig von Mises and Friedrich Hayek. Both exiles from Austria, they saw social democracy, exemplified by Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal and the gradual development of Britain’s welfare state, as manifestations of a collectivism that occupied the same spectrum as nazism and communism. In The Road to Serfdom, published in 1944, Hayek argued that government planning, by crushing individualism, would lead inexorably to totalitarian control. Like Mises’s book Bureaucracy, The Road to Serfdom was widely read. It came to the attention of some very wealthy people, who saw in the philosophy an opportunity to free themselves from regulation and tax. When, in 1947, Hayek founded the first organisation that would spread the doctrine of neoliberalism – the Mont Pelerin Society – it was supported financially by millionaires and their foundations. With their help, he began to create what Daniel Stedman Jones describes in Masters of the Universe as “a kind of neoliberal international”: a transatlantic network of academics, businessmen, journalists and activists. The movement’s rich backers funded a series of thinktanks which would refine and promote the ideology. Among them were the American Enterprise Institute, the Heritage Foundation, the Cato Institute, the Institute of Economic Affairs, the Centre for Policy Studies and the Adam Smith Institute. They also financed academic positions and departments, particularly at the universities of Chicago and Virginia. As it evolved, neoliberalism became more strident. Hayek’s view that governments should regulate competition to prevent monopolies from forming gave way – among American apostles such as Milton Friedman – to the belief that monopoly power could be seen as a reward for efficiency. Something else happened during this transition: the movement lost its name. In 1951, Friedman was happy to describe himself as a neoliberal. But soon after that, the term began to disappear. Stranger still, even as the ideology became crisper and the movement more coherent, the lost name was not replaced by any common alternative. At first, despite its lavish funding, neoliberalism remained at the margins. The postwar consensus was almost universal: John Maynard Keynes’s economic prescriptions were widely applied, full employment and the relief of poverty were common goals in the US and much of western Europe, top rates of tax were high and governments sought social outcomes without embarrassment, developing new public services and safety nets. But in the 1970s, when Keynesian policies began to fall apart and economic crises struck on both sides of the Atlantic, neoliberal ideas began to enter the mainstream. As Friedman remarked, “when the time came that you had to change ... there was an alternative ready there to be picked up”. With the help of sympathetic journalists and political advisers, elements of neoliberalism, especially its prescriptions for monetary policy, were adopted by Jimmy Carter’s administration in the US and Jim Callaghan’s government in Britain. After Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan took power, the rest of the package soon followed: massive tax cuts for the rich, the crushing of trade unions, deregulation, privatisation, outsourcing and competition in public services. Through the IMF, the World Bank, the Maastricht treaty and the World Trade Organisation, neoliberal policies were imposed – often without democratic consent – on much of the world. Most remarkable was its adoption among parties that once belonged to the left: Labour and the Democrats, for example. As Stedman Jones notes, “it is hard to think of another utopia to have been as fully realised.” \*\*\* It may seem strange that a doctrine promising choice and freedom should have been promoted with the slogan “there is no alternative”. But, as Hayek remarked on a visit to Pinochet’s Chile – one of the first nations in which the programme was comprehensively applied – “my personal preference leans toward a liberal dictatorship rather than toward a democratic government devoid of liberalism”. The freedom that neoliberalism offers, which sounds so beguiling when expressed in general terms, turns out to mean freedom for the pike, not for the minnows. Freedom from trade unions and collective bargaining means the freedom to suppress wages. Freedom from regulation means the freedom to poison rivers, endanger workers, charge iniquitous rates of interest and design exotic financial instruments. Freedom from tax means freedom from the distribution of wealth that lifts people out of poverty. As Naomi Klein documents in The Shock Doctrine, neoliberal theorists advocated the use of crises to impose unpopular policies while people were distracted: for example, in the aftermath of Pinochet’s coup, the Iraq war and Hurricane Katrina, which Friedman described as “an opportunity to radically reform the educational system” in New Orleans. Where neoliberal policies cannot be imposed domestically, they are imposed internationally, through trade treaties incorporating “investor-state dispute settlement”: offshore tribunals in which corporations can press for the removal of social and environmental protections. When parliaments have voted to restrict sales of cigarettes, protect water supplies from mining companies, freeze energy bills or prevent pharmaceutical firms from ripping off the state, corporations have sued, often successfully. Democracy is reduced to theatre. Another paradox of neoliberalism is that universal competition relies upon universal quantification and comparison. The result is that workers, job-seekers and public services of every kind are subject to a pettifogging, stifling regime of assessment and monitoring, designed to identify the winners and punish the losers. The doctrine that Von Mises proposed would free us from the bureaucratic nightmare of central planning has instead created one. Neoliberalism was not conceived as a self-serving racket, but it rapidly became one. Economic growth has been markedly slower in the neoliberal era (since 1980 in Britain and the US) than it was in the preceding decades; but not for the very rich. Inequality in the distribution of both income and wealth, after 60 years of decline, rose rapidly in this era, due to the smashing of trade unions, tax reductions, rising rents, privatisation and deregulation. The privatisation or marketisation of public services such as energy, water, trains, health, education, roads and prisons has enabled corporations to set up tollbooths in front of essential assets and charge rent, either to citizens or to government, for their use. Rent is another term for unearned income. When you pay an inflated price for a train ticket, only part of the fare compensates the operators for the money they spend on fuel, wages, rolling stock and other outlays. The rest reflects the fact that they have you over a barrel. Those who own and run the UK’s privatised or semi-privatised services make stupendous fortunes by investing little and charging much. In Russia and India, oligarchs acquired state assets through firesales. In Mexico, Carlos Slim was granted control of almost all landline and mobile phone services and soon became the world’s richest man. Financialisation, as Andrew Sayer notes in Why We Can’t Afford the Rich, has had a similar impact. “Like rent,” he argues, “interest is ... unearned income that accrues without any effort”. As the poor become poorer and the rich become richer, the rich acquire increasing control over another crucial asset: money. Interest payments, overwhelmingly, are a transfer of money from the poor to the rich. As property prices and the withdrawal of state funding load people with debt (think of the switch from student grants to student loans), the banks and their executives clean up. Sayer argues that the past four decades have been characterised by a transfer of wealth not only from the poor to the rich, but within the ranks of the wealthy: from those who make their money by producing new goods or services to those who make their money by controlling existing assets and harvesting rent, interest or capital gains. Earned income has been supplanted by unearned income. Neoliberal policies are everywhere beset by market failures. Not only are the banks too big to fail, but so are the corporations now charged with delivering public services. As Tony Judt pointed out in Ill Fares the Land, Hayek forgot that vital national services cannot be allowed to collapse, which means that competition cannot run its course. Business takes the profits, the state keeps the risk. The greater the failure, the more extreme the ideology becomes. Governments use neoliberal crises as both excuse and opportunity to cut taxes, privatise remaining public services, rip holes in the social safety net, deregulate corporations and re-regulate citizens. The self-hating state now sinks its teeth into every organ of the public sector. Perhaps the most dangerous impact of neoliberalism is not the economic crises it has caused, but the political crisis. As the domain of the state is reduced, our ability to change the course of our lives through voting also contracts. Instead, neoliberal theory asserts, people can exercise choice through spending. But some have more to spend than others: in the great consumer or shareholder democracy, votes are not equally distributed. The result is a disempowerment of the poor and middle. As parties of the right and former left adopt similar neoliberal policies, disempowerment turns to disenfranchisement. Large numbers of people have been shed from politics. Chris Hedges remarks that “fascist movements build their base not from the politically active but the politically inactive, the ‘losers’ who feel, often correctly, they have no voice or role to play in the political establishment”. When political debate no longer speaks to us, people become responsive instead to slogans, symbols and sensation. To the admirers of Trump, for example, facts and arguments appear irrelevant.

### They Say: “Charters Not Key”

#### Charter schools are a key issue – DeVos will replicate the failed privatization of Michigan nationally

Henderson 16 — Stephen Henderson has been editorial page editor for the Free Press since 2009. Henderson's work has been honored with more than a dozen national awards, including the 2014 Pulitzer Prize for Commentary. Degree from University of Michigan, 12-3-2016 ("Betsy DeVos and the twilight of public education", Detroit Free Press, Accessed Online at http://www.freep.com/story/opinion/columnists/stephen-henderson/2016/12/03/betsy-devos-education-donald-trump/94728574/, Accessed on 7-14-2017, SV)

In Detroit, parents of school-age children have plenty of choices, thanks to the nation’s largest urban network of charter schools.

What remains in short supply is quality.

In Brightmoor, the only high school left is Detroit Community Schools, a charter boasting more than a decade of abysmal test scores and, until recently, a superintendent who earned $130,000 a year despite a dearth of educational experience or credentials.

On the west side, another charter school, Hope Academy, has been serving the community around Grand River and Livernois for 20 years. Its test scores have been among the lowest in the state throughout those two decades; in 2013 the school ranked in the first percentile, the absolute bottom for academic performance. Two years later, its charter was renewed.

Or if you live downtown, you could try Woodward Academy, a charter that has limped along near the bottom of school achievement since 1998, while its operator has been allowed to expand into other communities.

For students enrolled in schools of choice — that is, schools in nearby districts who have opened their doors to children who live outside district boundaries — it’s not much better. Kids who depend on Detroit’s problematic public transit are too far away from the state’s top-performing school districts — and most of those districts don’t participate in the schools of choice program, anyway.

This deeply dysfunctional educational landscape — where failure is rewarded with opportunities for expansion and “choice” means the opposite for tens of thousands of children — is no accident. It was created by an ideological lobby that has zealously championed free-market education reform for decades, with little regard for the outcome.

And at the center of that lobby is Betsy DeVos, the west Michigan advocate whose family has contributed millions of dollars to the cause of school choice and unregulated charter expansion throughout Michigan.

Unqualified

President-elect Donald Trump has made a number of controversial cabinet nominations already. But none seems more inappropriate, or more contrary to reason, than his choice of DeVos to lead the Department of Education.

DeVos isn’t an educator, or an education leader. She’s not an expert in pedagogy or curriculum or school governance. In fact, she has no relevant credentials or experience for a job setting standards and guiding dollars for the nation’s public schools.

She is, in essence, a lobbyist — someone who has used her extraordinary wealth to influence the conversation about education reform, and to bend that conversation to her ideological convictions despite the dearth of evidence supporting them.

For 20 years, the lobby her family bankrolls has propped up the billion-dollar charter school industry and insulated it from commonsense oversight, even as charter schools repeatedly failed to deliver on their promises to parents and children.

DeVos is a believer, and a powerful influence wielder for the special interest she has championed. But that doesn’t make her the right pick to helm an entire arm of the federal government. Wealth should not buy a seat at the head of any policy-making table.

That is true especially in public education — a trust between government and the people that seeks to provide opportunity for those who wouldn’t otherwise have it.

The conflicts

Supporters call Betsy DeVos an “advocate” who cares for children. And she may be that.

But the policy expression of that concern has been one-sided, and as much about establishing an industry as it is about kids.

The DeVoses have helped private interests commandeer public money that was intended to fulfill the state’s mandate to provide compulsory education. The family started the Great Lakes Education Project, whose political action committee does the most prolific and aggressive lobbying for charter schools.

Betsy DeVos and other family members have given more than $2 million to the PAC since 2001. GLEP has spent that money essentially buying policy outcomes that have helped Michigan’s charter industry grow while shielding it from accountability.

This summer, the DeVos family contributed $1.45 million over two months — an astounding average of $25,000 a day — to Michigan GOP lawmakers and the state party after the Republican-led Legislature derailed a bipartisan provision that would have provided more charter school oversight in Detroit.

GLEP also pushed hard — and successfully — to lift the cap on charter schools a few years ago, even though Michigan already had among the highest number of charters in the nation despite statistics suggesting charters weren’t substantively outperforming traditional public schools.

And in 2000, the DeVos extended family spent $5.6 million on an unsuccessful campaign to amend Michigan’s constitution to allow school vouchers — the only choice tool not currently in play in Michigan.

Even if Betsy DeVos ceased her substantial contributions to pro-school choice lawmakers, or to GLEP’s PAC, what credibility would she have in a policy job that requires her to be an advocate for all schools? Would her family divest from the PAC if she were Secretary of Education? Rein in campaign spending? And even if it did, how could she credibly distance herself from her history as a lobbyist?

About those outcomes

Beyond the conflicts, there are also deep questions about Betsy DeVos’ substantive understanding of education policy.

As a private citizen, she’s free to hold any belief she wants, and to promote her beliefs however she likes, regardless of how it comports with fact or outcome. But as Secretary of Education, DeVos would be expected to help set standards, guide accountability and oversee research in a way that benefits children, through outcomes, not one particular interest or industry. And more important, the U.S. Secretary of Education must understand the value of both high-performing charters and traditional public schools.

She has no track record of working along those lines, and no experience that suggests she’s even interested in it.

Largely as a result of the DeVos’ lobbying, Michigan tolerates more low-performing charter schools than just about any other state. And it lacks any effective mechanism for shutting down, or even improving, failing charters.

We’re a laughingstock in national education circles, and a pariah among reputable charter school operators, who have not opened schools in Detroit because of the wild West nature of the educational landscape here.

In Michigan, just about anyone can open a charter school if they can raise the money. That’s not so in most other states, where proven track records are required.

In other states, poor performers are subject to improvement efforts, or sometimes closed. By contrast, once a school opens in Michigan, it’s free to operate for as long as it wants, and is seldom held accountable by state officials for its performance. Authorizers, often universities, oversee operation according to whatever loose standards they choose.

And in Michigan, you can operate a charter for profit, so even schools that fail academically are worth keeping open because they can make money. Michigan leads the nation in the number of schools operated for profit, while other states have moved to curb the expansion of for-profit charters, or banned them outright.

The illusion of choice

The results of this free-for-all have been tragic for Michigan children, and especially for those in Detroit, where 79% of the state’s charters are located.

A yearlong Free Press investigation found that 20 years after Michigan’s charter school experiment began, Detroit’s charter schools have shown themselves to be only incrementally stronger, on average, than traditional public schools. They have admirable graduation rates, but test scores that look nearly identical to those of public schools.

The most accurate assessment is that charter schools have simply created a second, privately managed failing system. Yes, there are high-performing outliers — a little more than 10% of the charter schools perform in the top tier. But in Detroit, the best schools are as likely to be traditional public schools.

DeVos and her family have not been daunted by these outcomes. It’s as if the reams of data showing just incremental progress or abysmal failure don’t matter. Their belief in charter schools is unshakable, their resistance to systematic reforms that would improve both public and charter schools unyielding.

They have also pushed hard on schools of choice, where districts open their borders to kids from other jurisdictions.

In concept, it could be a great equalizer: Children from poor districts could attend schools that have many more resources. But in practice, it has played out quite differently. In districts that participate in choice, white and more affluent parents have fled as poorer, minority kids have come into their schools, exacerbating de facto segregation, according to a report by Bridge Magazine.

Outcomes first

This newspaper has been, and will continue to be, an advocate for successful charter schools, and for educational choice as one way — but certainly not the only way — to improve this state’s school landscape.

But it’s impossible to imagine such improvement will be aided by an education secretary who is so willfully impervious to the relevant data. Instead, Betsy DeVos’ lodestar has been her conviction that any nontraditional public school is better than a traditional one, simply because it’s not operated by government.

Charter school advocates like DeVos reject any criticism of charters as a defense of the status quo. But that’s a gross and partisan distortion, especially for people like me.

I’ve made the most personal endorsement possible by sending my two children to charter schools in Baltimore and here in Detroit. In both cases, we’ve chosen high-quality charters; in Detroit, the best choices were far scarcer than in Baltimore. And to get into the high-performing school we chose in Detroit required an extraordinary effort. I have the income, the transportation and access to be sure my kids get the best opportunity available.

Most Detroit parents don’t enjoy those same advantages, and they are stuck choosing from among a sea of mediocrity or worse.

What Detroit needs are better, high-quality choices — public, charter, whatever.

But DeVos and her family have stood in the way of improving what we have. They’ve stood for the charter industry and its middling results, over our kids.

I’m certain she’ll try to make the nation’s charter landscape look more like the chaos we face here in Detroit, and less like it does in states like Tennessee or Massachusetts or Maryland — all much better performers who have tighter reins on charter creation and proliferation.

Her lobbying hasn’t been good for Detroit, or Michigan.

It won’t be good for the nation.

### Segregation is Neoliberal

#### Segregation is a core tenant of the neoliberal expansion of education – only federal checks solve – disengagement is net worse

Hutchinson 17 — Sikivu Hutchinson is the founder of the Women's Leadership Project. Hutchinson graduated from New York University with a Ph.D. in Performance Studies, Jan/Fed 2017 ("Segregation Now and Forever: Betsy DeVos and the Looting of Public Education", ProQuest, Accessed Online at https://search.proquest.com/docview/1858094578?pq-origsite=gscholar, Accessed on 7-20-2017, SV)

"Segregation now, segregation tomorrow, and segregation forever." This was white supremacist Alabama Governor George Wallaces epic battle cry in his infamous 1963 inaugural speech demonizing the civil rights movement. Billionaire Christian conservative Betsy DeVos and her family foundations school voucher crusade are inheritors of Wallaces legacy.

DeVos, who is President-elect Donald Trumps pick for secretary of education, has for over a decade been at the helm of a nationwide push to gut public education through voucher programs (whereby the state pays for students to switch from poorly performing public schools to private ones).

As many progressive and secular critics have pointed out, a linchpin of the DeVos agenda is an assault on secular education. The DeVos foundation, which has bankrolled the ultraconservative and homophobic Family Research Council and sponsored scores of insidious "school choice" bills from Michigan to Wisconsin, is part of an extensive network of right-wing foundations, institutes, and think tanks that subscribe to the dominionist belief that Christians must take control over societal and government institutions.

DeVos's influence as an architect of checkbook theocracy in education is unparalleled but has been largely unsuccessful so far. As the Los Angeles Times recently noted,

California and thirty-six other states have constitutional provisions-called Blaine amendments-that ban the expenditure of public money on religiously affiliated schools. Close to 80 percent of private school students attend religious schools, which would be ineligible for vouchers in Blaine amendment states.

But it's important for progressive humanists to understand that DeVos's activism isn't limited to the usual church-state separation issues vis-à-vis science literacy and white Christian fundamentalist efforts to shove creationism down students' throats. Certainly, her blatant disregard for church-state separation would further undermine science literacy in a nation that routinely ranks at the bottom in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) achievement. Yet a cornerstone of the Christian right's privatization agenda is the destruction of racial justice in education and a Dixiecrat-style return to separate and unequal schools.

Put straight: the voucher agenda is a byproduct of Southern states' efforts to circumvent the desegregation mandate of Brown vs. Board of Education. It was and is a key strategy in the white nationalist/supremacist political arsenal that powered Trump to victory. As secretary of education, DeVos is likely to steamroll vouchers, not to mention push the neoliberal focus on charter schools, union busting, drill-and-kill high-stakes tests, and the militarization of school campuses.

Under former Education Secretary Arne Duncan, the Obama administration cozied up to charters and implemented wrongheaded policies like Race to the Top, which dubiously tied teacher salaries to student performance on standardized tests. It made noises about shoring up STEM education and academic opportunities for young men of color (while marginalizing girls of color) but allocated a pittance to the enrichment and wraparound programming that could have changed educational outcomes. And when it comes to higher education, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) have floundered, scrambling for funding, support, and visibility from an administration that gave lip service to improving college access for students of color. Despite Obama's "yes we can" multicultural rhetoric, the so-called achievement gap between black and white students has remained static.

Yet, for all of the Obama administration's education policy failures, the DeVos appointment has the potential to be catastrophic. It represents a clear and present danger to the wellbeing of scores of students of color who have been most heavily impacted by privatization and the gutting of multicultural education. Nationwide, African-American, Latino, and Native-American students continue to have the lowest graduation and col- lege-going rates. They are less likely to be taught by well-qualified teachers and more likely to be in schools where college counselors are either absent or saddled with too many students. Indeed, some urban schools of color have more school police than college counselors. And because many students of color don't have equitable access to college prep curricula in the humanities and STEM disciplines, they have higher attrition rates when they go to college.

### Choice Commodifies Education

#### Choice makes education into a commodity – that justifies authoritarianism

Blakely 17 — Jason Blakely is an assistant professor of political philosophy at Pepperdine University. He is the author of Alasdair MacIntyre, Charles Taylor, and the Demise of Naturalism: Reunifying Political Theory and Social Science.Jason Blakely is an assistant professor of political philosophy at Pepperdine University. He is the author of Alasdair MacIntyre, Charles Taylor, and the Demise of Naturalism: Reunifying Political Theory and Social Science, 4-17-2017 ("How School Choice Turns Education Into a Commodity", Atlantic, Accessed Online at https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2017/04/is-school-choice-really-a-form-of-freedom/523089/, Accessed on 7-20-2017, SV)

Buoyed by Donald Trump’s championing of a voucher system—and cheered on by his education secretary Betsy DeVos—Arizona just passed one of the country's most thoroughgoing policies in favor of so-called “school of choice.” The legislation signed by Governor Doug Ducey allows students who withdraw from the public system to use their share of state funding for private school, homeschooling, or online education.

Making educational funding “portable” is part of a much wider political movement that began in the 1970s—known to scholars as neoliberalism—which views the creation of markets as necessary for the existence of individual liberty. In the neoliberal view, if your public institutions and spaces don’t resemble markets, with a range of consumer options, then you aren’t really free. The goal of neoliberalism is thereby to rollback the state, privatize public services, or (as in the case of vouchers) engineer forms of consumer choice and market discipline in the public sector.

DeVos is a fervent believer in neoliberalizing education—spending millions of dollars on and devoting herself to political activism for the spread of voucher-system schooling. In a speech on educational reform from 2015, DeVos expressed her long-held view that the public-school system needs to be reengineered by the government to mimic a market. The failure to do so, she warned, would be the stagnation of an education system run monopolistically by the government:

We are the beneficiaries of start-ups, ventures, and innovation in every other area of life, but we don’t have that in education because it’s a closed system, a closed industry, a closed market. It’s a monopoly, a dead end. And the best and brightest innovators and risk-takers steer way clear of it. As long as education remains a closed system, we will never see the education equivalents of Google, Facebook, Amazon, PayPal, Wikipedia, or Uber. We won’t see any real innovation that benefits more than a handful of students.

Many Americans now find DeVos’s neoliberal way of thinking commonsensical. After all, people have the daily experience of being able to choose competing consumer products on a market. Likewise, many Americans rightly admire entrepreneurial pluck. Shouldn’t the intelligence and creativity of Silicon Valley’s markets be allowed to cascade down over public education, washing the system clean of its encrusted bureaucracy?

What much fewer people realize is that the argument over “school of choice” is only the latest chapter in a decades-long political struggle between two models of freedom—one based on market choice and the other based on democratic participation. Neoliberals like DeVos often assume that organizing public spaces like a market must lead to beneficial outcomes. But in doing so, advocates of school of choice ignore the political ramifications of the marketization of shared goods like the educational system.

The first point to consider when weighing whether or not to marketize the public school system is that markets always have winners and losers. In the private sector, the role of competition is often positive. For example, Friendster, the early reigning king of social networks, failed to create a format that people found as useful and attractive as Facebook. The result was that it eventually vanished.

When businesses like Friendster fail, no significant public damage is done. Indeed, it is arguably a salutary form of what the economist Joseph Schumpeter called “creative destruction,” which is a feature of market innovation. But should all goods in a society be subjected to the forces of creative destruction? What happens to a community when its public schools are defunded or closed because they could not “compete” in a marketized environment?

In Detroit (where DeVos played a big role in introducing school choice) two decades of this marketization has led to extreme defunding and closing of public schools; the funneling of taxpayer money toward for-profit charter ventures; economically disadvantaged parents with worse options than when the neoliberal social experiment began; and finally, no significant increase in student performance. Indeed, some zones of Detroit are now educational deserts where parents and children have to travel exorbitant miles and hours for their children to attend school.

On the whole, neoliberalization is hardest on the poor. Market choice does, however, favor those who already have the education, wealth, and wherewithal to plan, coordinate, and execute moving their children to the optimal educational setting. This means the big beneficiaries of school of choice are often the rich. For instance, when Nevada recently passed an aggressive school-of-choice system the result was that the vast majority of those able to take advantage of it came from the richest areas of Reno and Las Vegas. As money is pulled from failing schools and funneled into succeeding ones, wealth can actually be redistributed by the state up the socioeconomic ladder.

Market competition in the context of schools thus opens the possibility for a vicious cycle in which weak and low-performing communities are punished for their failings and wealthy communities receive greater and greater funding advantages. Americans should ask themselves a basic question of justice when it comes to the education system: Should it be organized around a model in which the more you win the more you get, and the more you lose the less you are given? Markets are by their nature non-egalitarian. For this reason, neoliberalization has been one of the biggest factors contributing to the growing inequalities and diminishment of the middle and lower classes.

A common neoliberal response to this is simply to say that economic inequality is the cost paid for individual liberty and personal responsibility. But the problem is that this discourse of individualism followed to its logical conclusion eliminates any public goods whatsoever. For example, if student funds are portable based on consumption choices, why shouldn’t the growing number of childless taxpayers be able to move their funding outside the education system entirely toward goods they actually consume, like dog parks or public golf courses?

This is the logical conclusion of Margaret Thatcher’s famous neoliberal pronouncement that “there is no such thing as society” but only “individual men and women.” The problem with this way of thinking is that education is not simply another commodity to buy and sell on a market. It is a shared good. Free societies need educated members to intelligently and critically deliberate over public life, select representatives, and help guide policy decisions. Market freedom is thus in tension with the freedom of democratic participation.

Many people recognize this fact and for that reason favor coordinating action and sharing costs through the government when it comes to goods like education, defense, public parks, transportation, public health, and the environment. Yet forming a shared collective action through government or a labor organization is the one kind of individual freedom that neoliberal philosophy does not tolerate. As the preeminent historian of neoliberalism, David Harvey, puts it, “neoliberals have to put strong limits on democratic governance … while individuals are supposedly free to choose, they are not supposed to choose to construct strong collective institutions.”

Neoliberalism is thereby fundamentally opposed to any democratic, individual choices that seek to constrain markets—be it teachers unions or simply majority decisions about how to fund and shape public schools. Indeed, historically speaking, neoliberal attempts to marketize public goods are often unpopular and so have required non-majoritarian institutions like the courts, the World Bank, or even strong men and authoritarians (like Chile’s Augusto Pinochet) to enact policies against the will of the majority. Authoritarianism and market freedoms can and often do go together. There is a basic tension between neoliberal market choice and democratic freedom to shape one’s community in ways that do not conform to market logic.

## Solvency

### Federal Funding key

#### Financial incentives empirically work in charters—backfilling

Pondiscio 16 — (Robert Pondiscio, 5-18-2016, "Backfilling charter schools," Thomas Fordham Institute, https://edexcellence.net/articles/backfilling-charter-schools, Accessed 7-13-2017, JWS)

Other options involve creating financial incentives for schools to backfill. It is intuitive to think that public school funding formulas would naturally incentivize backfilling since funding should be tied to the number of students in a building and charter operators should want to enroll as many students as they can so they will have more funds to implement their model. However, public school funding formulas typically only incentivize backfilling when there is “real time” funding for students. When there isn’t “real time” funding, schools aren’t financially motivated to backfill. Typically, if a student is counted at a school on the state’s official enrollment count day (such as October 1st), the state’s public school funding formula gives the school the per pupil funding for that student for the entire year, even if that student leaves the school the next day. Also, if a new student enrolls in the school after the official enrollment county day, the school doesn’t receive the funding associated with that new student. To create systems focused more on “real time” funding, states should establish multiple enrollment count days to allocate funding based on who is in the building at multiple points throughout the school year. This approach may encourage schools to consider backfilling as a strategy to keep sustainable funding streams.

## Segregation

### They Say: “No Access Problems/Achievement Gaps”

#### Choice locks in achievement gaps – only the white and rich have the bargaining power to ensure access to quality schools.

Brathwaite 16 — PhD in sociology from Temple University (Jessica Brathwaite, 6-1-2016, "Neoliberal Education Reform and the Perpetuation of InequalityCritical Sociology," No Publication, http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0896920516649418, Accessed 7-7-2017, JWS)

This research adapts a critical perspective on the impact of neoliberal policy. I argue that neoliberal policy is not likely to reduce inequality because individuals have varying levels of power and capital. In addition, I argue that neoliberal policy does not include a direct mechanism for reducing inequality, and that the indirect methods are not likely to be effective. Eduardo Bonilla Silva (2009) argues that ‘choice is based on the fallacy that racial groups have the same power in the American polity’ (p. 36). Neoliberalism assumes that everyone is a rational actor who makes the best decision for their self. This assumes that all people have equal knowledge Brathwaite 437 to make the best decision and equal power to execute their choice. Bonilla Silva further argues that ‘because Whites have more power, their unfettered, so-called individual choices help reproduce a form of White supremacy in neighborhoods, schools, and in society in general’ (p. 36). White and wealthy parents have more political and economic power, and can achieve better results for their children. Neoliberalism ignores structural inequalities in access and opportunity, and shifts responsibility for high-quality education from the state to the individual. Neoliberal policy creates an illusion of meritocracy, where all students are perceived to have equal access to a high-quality education. Given this perceived equality of opportunity, poor outcomes are attributed to individual decisionmaking and not the state or any existing racial or socioeconomic inequalities. Good outcomes are attributed to individual merit and hard work. The lifelong learning movement is another educational example of such policy. This movement advocates constant occupational training as a personal responsibility to remain employable. This movement shifts the responsibility of training employees from employers to the individual (Olssen, 2006). This type of policy also creates an illusion of meritocracy, where the most prepared individual is most employable. Individuals have unequal access to professional and workforce development, but the spread of lifelong learning policies will create a system where those with the most access to personal development excel, thus reproducing existing inequalities. In New York City, advantaged parents are more successful at advocating for their child, and at gaining admission to the best schools (Ravitch, 2013). Upperclass students also tend to live in neighborhoods with good schools and many K-8 schools privilege local residents in their admissions. A system of school choice can result in advantaged groups receiving the same advantages that they have had historically, rather than an equal playing field where all families have equal access to good schools. Increased choice may work best for middle-class students. Middle-class parents tend to be more aggressive and knowledgeable when dealing with the school system. These parents tend to have more flexible hours and more time to visit schools, and they can also afford to travel long distances to take their children to school (Apple, 2001). This leads to a concentration of more advantaged students in the best-performing schools and the reproduction of inequality. Despite universal access to the best public high schools, middle-class students are still more likely to attend high-performing schools (Mead and Green, 2012). Choice policy that does not directly address racial and socioeconomic inequality can result in a perpetuation of inequality, where all students have access to better schools but advantaged groups are more able to secure spots in the best schools. Scholars have argued that reforms using accountability and choice systems are an attempt by the middle class to alter the rules of competition in education, in order to provide an advantage for their children in the face of rising economic uncertainty (Henig, 1994; Darling-Hammond, 2000). Giroux and Schmidt (2004) argue that education is now a private good used to gain an advantage rather than a public benefit to be consumed by all. Constantly raising the bar and increasing exclusion from educational opportunity is a mechanism by which low income and minority students are continually denied access to the potential for social mobility that is afforded by increasing one’s educational attainment (Bourdieu, 1973). While the rules surrounding school choice reflect an increase in required knowledge that benefits advantaged students, neoliberal reforms result in a decreased level of skills for disadvantaged students. Bowles and Gintis (2002) argue that schools do more than educate students, that they teach students how to think and how to see the world (also see Hill Collins, 2009: 33). Schools implicitly impart educational skills and ideas that reproduce social inequalities. Under neoliberal reforms, the prevalence of testing reshapes the curriculum in low-performing schools to focus primarily on basic skills, while students in better-performing schools are exposed to a wider variety of knowledge and critical thinking skills (Giroux, 2012). 438 Critical Sociology 43(3) In addition to creating citizens with unequal levels of knowledge, neoliberal policies have the harshest impact on the most disadvantaged schools. Blum (2015) argues that poorly resourced districts will experience more accountability pressure and have fewer resources to actually implement the data and measurement requirements that exist under neoliberal reforms. He argues that the marketization of schools creates winners and losers, and the losing schools are more likely to be in low-resourced areas with concentrated poverty and segregation, which is exacerbated by the choice system. Market logic privileges those with higher levels of knowledge, material resources, and power (Apple, 2006). Lisa Delpit (1995) argues that in order to eliminate achievement gaps and social inequalities as they relate to education, we must address the ‘larger power differentials that exist in our society between schools and communities, between teachers and parents, between poor and well-to-do, between whites and people of color’ (p. 133). Neoliberal policies indirectly address the greater social inequalities that exist, and I argue that they are more likely to perpetuate these inequalities as they rely on decisions and knowledge that are most abundant among those in power.

### They Say: “Public Schools AC”

#### Trump and DeVos will expand choice and charter schools.

Strauss 17 – Valerie Strauss, reporter for the Washington Post, 2017 (“What ‘school choice’ means in the era of Trump and DeVos,” May 22nd, *The Washington Post,* Available Online At <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2017/05/22/what-school-choice-means-in-the-era-of-trump-and-devos/?utm_term=.13c3e8c5c9f4>, Accessed 7-30-2017)

DeVos’s Education Department is planning to spend an unprecedented amount of public money — well over $1 billion — to expand school choice in the 2018 proposed budget, and it is said to be considering other ways to promote choice. The secretary has not been shy about expressing disdain for the traditional public school system by calling it a “dead end” and a “monopoly.”

Trump, too, has disparaged traditional public schools, calling them, in his inaugural speech, part of the “American carnage.” His pro-school-choice bent was clear when he welcomed a group of 10 teachers and parents to the White House in February: two invitees were from traditional public schools, one was from a public school that specializes in special education, three came from private schools, two were home-schoolers, one was from a charter school, and one was from a dropout-prevention program.

### They Say: “Societal Racism Outweighs”

#### Education reform can spill over into governmental and societal shifts.

Glaude 16—Professor of African American Studies and Religion at Princeton and a PhD in Religion from Princeton [Eddie S., Jr., *Democracy in Black: How Race Still Enslaves*, p. 185-197, Print]

We have to change our view of government, especially when it comes to racial matters. Government policy ensured the vote for African Americans and dismantled legal segregation. Policy established a social safety net for the poor and elderly; it put in place the conditions for the growth of our cities. All of this didn't happen simply because of individual will or thanks to some abstract idea of America. It was tied up with our demands and expectations. Goldwater was wrong. So was Reagan. And, in many ways, so is Obama. Our racial habits are shaped by the kind of society in which we live, and our government plays a big role in shaping that society. As young children, our community offers us a way of seeing the world; it lets us know what is valuable and sacred, and what stands as virtuous behavior and what does not. When Michael Brown's body was left in the street for more than four hours, it sent a dear message about the value of black lives. When everything in our society says that we should be less concerned about black folk, that they are dangerous, that no specific policies can address their misery, we say to our children and to everyone else that these people are "less than"-that they fall outside of our moral concern. We say, without using the word, that they are niggers. One way to change that view is to enact policies that suggest otherwise. Or, to put it another way, to change our view of government, we must change our demands of government. For example, for the past fifty years African American unemployment has been twice that of white unemployment. The 2013 unemployment rate for African Americans stood at 13.1 percent, the highest annual black unemployment rate in more than seventy years. Social scientists do not generally agree on the causes of this trend. Some attribute it to the fact that African Americans are typically the "last hired and first fired." Others point to changes in the nature of the economy; still others point to overt racial discrimination in the labor market. No matter how we account for the numbers, the fact remains that most Americans see double-digit black unemployment as "normal." However, a large-scale, comprehensive jobs agenda with a living wage designed to put Americans, and explicitly African Americans, to work would go a long way toward uprooting the racial habits that inform such a view. It would counter the nonsense that currently stands as a reason for long-term black unemployment in public debate: black folk are lazy and don't want to work. If we hold the view that government plays a crucial role in ensuring the public good-if we believe that all Americans, no matter their race or class, can be vital contributors to our beloved community-then we reject the idea that some populations are disposable, that some people can languish in the shadows while the rest of us dance in the light. The question ''Am I my brother's or my sister's keeper?" is not just a question for the individual or a mantra to motivate the private sector. It is a question answered in the social arrangements that aim to secure the goods and values we most cherish as a community. In other words, we need an idea of government that reflects the value of all Americans, not just white Americans or a few people with a lot of money. We need government seriously committed to racial justice. As a nation, we can never pat ourselves on the back about racial matters. We have too much blood on our hands. Remembering that fact-our inheritance, as Wendell Berry said-does not amount to beating ourselves over the head, or wallowing in guilt, or trading in race cards. Remembering our national sins serves as a check and balance against national hubris. We're reminded of what we are capable of, and our eyes are trained to see that ugliness when it rears its head. But when we disremember-when we forget about the horrors of lynching, lose sight of how African Americans were locked into a dual labor market because of explicit racism, or ignore how we exported our racism around the world-we free ourselves from any sense of accountability. Concern for others and a sense of responsibility for the whole no longer matter. Cruelty and indifference become our calling cards. We have to isolate those areas in which long-standing trends of racial inequality short-circuit the life chances of African Americans. In addition to a jobs agenda, we need a comprehensive government response to the problems of public education and mass incarceration. And I do mean a government response. Private interests have overrun both areas, as privatization drives school reform (and the education of our children is lost in the boisterous battles between teachers' unions and private interests) and as big business makes enormous profits from the warehousing of black and brown people in prisons. Let's be clear: private interests or market-based strategies will not solve the problems we face as a country or bring about the kind of society we need. We have to push for massive government investment in early childhood education and in shifting the center of gravity of our society from punishment to restorative justice. We can begin to enact the latter reform by putting an end to the practice of jailing children. Full stop. We didn't jail children in the past. We don't need to now. In sum, government can help us go a long way toward uprooting racial habits with policies that support jobs with a living wage, which would help wipe out the historic double-digit gap between white and black unemployment; take an expansive approach to early childhood education, which social science research consistently says profoundly affects the life chances of black children; and dismantle the prison-industrial complex. We can no longer believe that disproportionately locking up black men and women constitutes an answer to social ills. This view of government cannot be dismissed as a naive pipe dream, because political considerations relentlessly attack our political imaginations and limit us to the status quo. We are told before we even open our mouths that this particular view won't work or that it will never see the light of day. We've heard enough of that around single payer health care reform and other progressive policies over the Obama years. Such defeatist attitudes conspire to limit our imaginations and make sure that the world stays as it is. But those of us who don't give a damn about the rules of the current political game must courageously organize, advocate, and insist on the moral and political significance of a more robust role for government. We have to change the terms of political debate. Something dramatic has to happen. American democracy has to be remade. John Dewey, the American philosopher, understood this: The very idea of democracy, the meaning of democracy, must be continually explored afresh; it has to be constantly discovered and rediscovered, remade and reorganized; while the political and economic and social institutions in which it is embodied have to be remade and reorganized to meet the changes that are going on in the development of new needs on the part of human beings and new resources for satisfying these needs. Dewey saw American democracy as an unfinished project. He knew that the aims and purposes of this country were not fixed forever in the founding documents, but the particular challenges of our moment required imaginative leaps on behalf of democracy itself. Otherwise, undemocratic forces might prevail; tyranny in the form of the almighty dollar and the relentless pursuit of it might overtake any commitment to the idea of the public good; and bad habits might diminish our moral imaginations. The remaking of America will not happen inside the Beltway. Too many there have too much invested in the status quo. A more robust idea of government will not emerge from the current political parties. Both are beholden to big money. Substantive change will have to come from us. Or, as the great civil rights leader Ella Baker said, "we are the leaders we've been looking for"-a model of leadership that scares the hell out of the Reverena Sharpton. We will have to challenge the status quo in the streets and at the ballot box. In short, it will take a full-blown democratic awakening to enact this revolution. On February 7, 2014, I flew to Raleigh, North Carolina, to join with tens of thousands of other like-minded people to protest the draconian laws passed by the North Carolina state legislature. Since 2010, while many people-especially black people-were still reeling from the 2008 recession/depression, Republicans eliminated Medicaid coverage for half a million North Carolinians, passed a voter-ID law designed to disenfranchise primarily African American voters, transferred $90 million from public schools to voucher schools and cut pre-K for 30,000 children, passed a law requiring women about to have an abortion to listen to the heartbeat of the fetus, repealed the earned income tax credit for 900,000 people, and constitutionally banned gay marriage. North Carolina Republicans had declared war. They represented clear examples of those who hold a view of government that hardens hearts and reinforces racial habits. I watched from afar as the Forward Together moral movement took shape in response. People from all across North Carolina organized and mobilized to take back the state from extremists. The state NAACP, with its charismatic leader, Reverend William Barber II, built a movement from the ground up to challenge what they took to be an allout assault on the moral and social fabric of the state. The movement was not simply a reaction to Tea Party Republicans. "We started this when the Democrats were in power," Barber said. "We put out the word. The state had not complied with the Leandro decision [a 1994 publiceducation-equity lawsuit]. We still had not given public employees collective bargaining rights. We didn't have a racial justice act." But the actions of the North Carolina GOP intensified the group's efforts. More than 900 people who engaged in nonviolent civil disobedience to protest the Republican agenda were arrested during the 2013 legislative session. Reverend Barber put out a call across the country for a massive march in February to launch the 2014 Forward Together campaign. Eighty thousand to 100,000 people answered. It was the largest mass demonstration in the South since the Selma march in 1965. I arrived early. It was cold, and clouds blocked the sun as organizers began to set up. A few people worked on their signs. One sign read PROTECT ALL N.C. CITIZENS with different examples of vulnerable groups written underneath (the mentally ill, the unemployed, teachers, the elderly, students, prisoners, the uninsured, minorities). I was struck from the beginning by the cross-section of people there. Old and young, straight and gay, black, white, and Latino all began to gather. I asked a few of them why they were marching. Leslie Boyd, a white woman from Asheville, North Carolina, told me about her son, Michael Danforth. He had suffered from a birth defect that made it next to impossible for him to get health insurance. He died in the hospital, and ever since, she has dedicated her life to health care activism. She started a small nonprofit called Western North Carolina Health Advocates, through which she met Reverend Barber. He asked her to join the movement. The cold weather drove me into the nearby McDonald's, where several people sipped coffee while they waited for the march to begin. I struck up a conversation with Martin Marshall from Atlanta, Georgia, and Ron Gray from Rock Hill, South Carolina. Martin told me a story about his childhood experiences with racism, about the wall that divided his white community from the black community, and how racism was still alive today. "Voter restrictions and access to health care " were · the reasons he was marching. Ron was less talkative. He said, "I will give you the short form: injustice. I am here because it is the right place to be." Sitting next to Martin and Ron was an older white couple, Bill and Betsy Crittendon from Chapel Hill, North Carolina. They were members of an interracial choir called the United Voices of Praise. They had been involved in interracial social issues for a number of years and found the "regressive policies that have come about in this state [to be] just awful, absolutely awful. They have completely reversed the course of this state." Mrs. Crittendon wasn't too optimistic that the march would change the minds of state legislators, but she and her husband understood the long-term significance of the march and the Forward Together movement. "People need to see and hear what this is all about .... Every step along the way is a building step [to clear] the way for justice issues." These were people from different walks of life who understood the common ground of suffering in this country. For them, that understanding did not require anyone to leave the particulars of their suffering at the door. Anti-racism remained a part of their advocacy whether they struggled for universal health care or a living wage. They joined with others to urge a fundamental change in North Carolina and the country that could help break down racial habits. Reverend Barber thinks of their efforts in this way: [It's] about showing people the intersectionality of their lives; the intersectionality of their moving together . ... We have a phrase: we is the most important word in the justice vocabulary. The issue is not what I can do, but what we can do when we stand together, fight together, pray together, and work together, and we feel movement together. As I finished the conversations in McDonald's, I looked outside. Busload after busload of people had begun to arrive. Before the march began, speakers rallied the crowd. The topics were wide-ranging, from LGBT concerns, the state of public education, issues of immigration and the status of undocumented workers, to racist voter-ID laws. It was an in-the-flesh performance of a multiracial, multi-issue coalition. And whenever someone shouted, "Forward together," the crowd replied, "Not one step back." Initially, to an outsider looking in, the moment resembled the traditional theater of contemporary American protest. A march serves as a moment of catharsis. People gather, tensions are released, folks go back to business as usual, and the men (and it is typically always men) who lead the march leverage the spotlight for personal gain. But a brief glance beneath the surface of this particular gathering revealed something much more expansive. The march was just the tip of an organizing iceberg. Reverend Barber declared, "The Moral March inaugurates a fresh year of grassroots empowerment, voter education, litigation, and nonviolent direct action." In other words, this march wasn't a culmination but a catalyst: it dramatized an organizing effort (which preceded the gathering) that encompassed the courtroom, the ballot box, and the streets. For Barber, the work of democracy doesn't happen through marches or backroom deals but through concerted efforts "to change the context in which power operates." Of course, voting matters. But democracy is about the commitment to get one's hands dirty, and that work is often selfless and thankless. At the heart of those efforts is a more robust conception of government-a belief that government has the capacity to transform lives through focused legislation-and an insistence that we shift the center of moral gravity in North Carolina and in the nation. Five demands guide this insistence: (1) secure pro-labor, anti-poverty policies that ensure economic sustainability; (2) provide well-funded, quality public education to all; (3) stand up for the health of every North Carolinian by promoting health care access and environmental justice across all the state's communities; (4) address the continuing inequalities in the criminal justice system and ensure equality under the law for every person, regardless of race, class, creed, documentation, or sexual preference; and (5) protect and expand voting rights for people of color, immigrants, the elderly, and students to safeguard fair democratic representation. Each demand carries with it an expectation of the role of government in safeguarding the public good and an affirmation of the dignity and standing of all Americans. If we were to embrace these demands as policy, we would be well on our way to a revolution of value. As we marched from historic Shaw University, the place where the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee was founded in April 1960, to the state capitol, Americans from all walks of life expressed a radically egalitarian vision of this country. This vision did not require African Americans to leave their experiences at the door. Alongside demands for marriage equality, cries for support of public education, and calls for a more robust commitment to labor, marchers embraced the call for an anti-racist politics. As Reverend Barber said, "Some people wanted us to emphasize poverty instead of race. But you have to speak the truth. [Race] can be the Achilles' heel of the movement or lend itself to your moral positioning." We have to confront white supremacy, or what Barber calls "the corruption of the spirit and the conscience," as a fundamental contradiction of American democracy, or face the consequences of our silence. As the march concluded, I stood amazed at the power of ordinary people. Thousands of people had come together, for a moment, to declare their commitment to a radical vision of democracy. This is what has been missing in contemporary American politics. Reverend Barber's inspiring remarks struck a chord that reached back to the nineteenthcentury abolitionists, black and white, who decided to become traitors in the name of American democracy. They turned their backs on the slave regime. Barber called us to do the same with the political extremists of our times. We need the kind of language that's not left or right or conservative or liberal, but moral, fusion language that says look: it's extreme and immoral to suppress the right to vote. It's extreme and immoral to deny Medicaid for millions of poor people. . .. It's extreme and immoral to raise taxes on the working poor by cutting earned income taxes and to raise taxes on the poor and middle class in order to cut taxes for the wealthy. It's extreme and immoral to use power to cut off poor people's water in Detroit. That's immoral! What we need to cut off is that kind of abusive power! It's extreme and immoral to re-segregate our schools and underfund our public schools. It's extreme and immoral for people who came from immigrants to now have a mean amnesia and cry out against immigrants and the rights of children . ... That's not just bad policy, it's against the common good and a disregard for human rights. It's a refusal to lean toward the angels of our better selves . ... In policy and politics in America, we face two choices. One is the low road to political destruction, and the other is the pathway to higher ground. Barber finished speaking-preaching, really. The crowd joined hands to sing "We Shall Overcome." The voices were full of emotion and faith, not the sound of trepidation heard in the voices of those who sang the song after Reagan's speech in the Rose Garden. For much of the march, the day had been cloudy and cold. But as he spoke, the sun finally broke through. "The sun has come out," Reverend Barber started to shout. "The sun has come out. We are on our way to higher ground. Even the universe blesses this day. Even the universe says yes to justice, yes to equality, yes to higher ground." Marchers shouted. In front of me stood a white Episcopalian preacher in tears. I wiped my own eyes. This is the kind of social movement that will transform our idea of government. It insists on the dignity and standing of black people and other marginalized groups, and it argues for a dramatic change in what we as Americans care" most about. To be sure, the Forward Together moral movement isn't the only form of struggle we need. (In some ways, Reverend Barber represents the long-standing tradition of the charismatic preacher as leader, although he happens to be aware of the pitfalls of the model of leadership even as he exemplifies it.) It represents just one example of what a democratic awakening must do if we are to change the terms of political debate in this country: it must enact a different way of thinking about government and its relation to the most vulnerable among us.

### Happening now

#### Despite only being 1/3 of all charter school students, 70% of Black charter students attend intensely segregated minority charter schools.

Civil Rights 9 — (The Civil Rights Project, 2009, "Choice Without Equity: Charter School Segregation and the Need for Civil Rights Standard, The Civil Rights Project, https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/choice-without-equity-2009-report, Accessed 6-24-2017, JWS)

Seven years after the Civil Rights Project first documented extensive patterns of charter school segregation, the charter sector continues to stratify students by race, class and possibly language. This study is released at a time of mounting federal pressure to expand charter schools, despite on-going and accumulating evidence of charter school segregation. Our analysis of the 40 states, the District of Columbia, and several dozen metropolitan areas with large enrollments of charter school students reveals that charter schools are more racially isolated than traditional public schools in virtually every state and large metropolitan area in the nation. While examples of truly diverse charter schools exist, our data show that these schools are not reflective of broader charter trends. Four major themes emerge from this analysis of federal data. First, while charter schools are increasing in number and size, charter school enrollment presently accounts for only 2.5% of all public school students. Despite federal pressure to increase charter schools--based on the notion that charter schools are superior to traditional public schools, in spite of no conclusive evidence in support of that claim--charter school enrollment remains concentrated in just five states. Second, we show that charter schools, in many ways, have more extensive segregation than other public schools. Charter schools attract a higher percentage of black students than traditional public schools, in part because they tend to be located in urban areas. As a result, charter school enrollment patterns display high levels of minority segregation, trends that are particularly severe for black students. While segregation for blacks among all public schools has been increasing for nearly two decades, black students in charter schools are far more likely than their traditional public school counterparts to be educated in intensely segregated settings. At the national level, seventy percent of black charter school students attend intensely segregated minority charter schools (which enroll 90-100% of students from under-represented minority backgrounds), or twice as many as the share of intensely segregated black students in traditional public schools. Some charter schools enrolled populations where 99% of the students were from under-represented minority backgrounds. Forty-three percent of black charter school students attended these extremely segregated minority schools, a percentage which was, by far, the highest of any other racial group, and nearly three times as high as black students in traditional public schools. Overall, nearly three out of four students in the typical black student’s charter school are also black. This figure indicates extremely high levels of isolation, particularly given the fact that black students comprise less than one-third of charter students. Black students are not the only racial group experiencing higher segregation in charter schools. Higher percentages of charter school students of every race attend predominantly minority schools (50-100% minority students) or racially isolated minority schools (90-100% minority students) than do their same-race peers in traditional public schools. Half of Latino charter school students, for example, attended racially isolated minority schools. Third, charter school trends vary substantially across different regions of the country. Latinos are under-enrolled in charter schools in some Western states where they comprise the largest share of students. At the same time, a dozen states (including those with high concentrations of Latino students like Arizona and Texas) report that a majority of Latino charter students attend intensely segregated minority schools. Patterns in the West and in a few areas in the South, the two most racially diverse regions of the country, also suggest that charters serve as havens for white flight from public schools. Finally, in the industrial Midwest, more students enroll in charter schools compared to other regions, and midwestern charter programs display high concentrations of black students. Fourth, major gaps in multiple federal data sources make it difficult to answer basic, fundamental questions about the extent to which charter schools enroll and concentrate low- income students and English Language Learners (ELLs). Charter schools receive public funding and therefore should be equally available to all students regardless of background. Approximately one in four charter schools does not report data on low-income students. Since eligibility for receiving free lunch is proof that families cannot afford to provide it, the lack of a free lunch program at school would impose a severe economic barrier to attending a charter school. There is a similar lack of information on ELLs. Federal data on charter schools in California, arguably the country's most significant gateway for immigrants, describe just seven ELL students attending its state charter programs. In general, state charter school legislation is less likely to contain requirements for enrolling ELL students than for racial balance or diversity standards. The glaring lack of data on each of these traditionally underserved groups makes it difficult to assess charter schools as an educational reform, or monitor their compliance with basic civil rights regulations and state charter school legislation. We concentrate on state and metropolitan charter trends and not district level patterns since many charter schools can—and do—draw students from multiple school districts. In Arizona, for example, students attending charter schools within a single district boundary line were actually drawn from 21 different school districts (Gifford, Ogle, & Solomon, 1998). Thus, a comparison of similarly functioning charter schools to only one nearby district would be misleading. Even so, our findings of higher segregation in charter schools do not substantively differ from other analyses comparing charters to their surrounding district or nearest public school. Decades of social science studies find important benefits associated with attending diverse schools, and, conversely, related educational harms in schools where poor and minority students are concentrated. In the recent State of the Union address, the President recognized the persistent link between segregated neighborhoods and schools, saying “In this country, the success of our children cannot depend more on where they live than their potential.”4 Ironically, charter schools held an early promise of becoming more integrated than regular public schools because they were not constrained by racially isolating school district boundary lines. This report shows instead that charter schools make up a separate, segregated sector of our already deeply stratified public school system. So, at the same time it continues to promote the growth of charter schools, the Obama administration should take immediate action to reduce the segregation in charter schools, working instead to achieve the integrative promise of charter schools. The Education Department should update its now archived guidance on civil rights regulations for charter schools, and strengthen it by including provisions known to have been successful in other programs like magnet schools, which combine school choice with high-quality diverse student bodies. New legislation is needed to ensure that we are collecting enough information about charter school students so that we can monitor student access and outcomes by race, class, and language ability. As ESEA is reauthorized, it should be amended to include students’ socio-economic status as part of the annual evaluation of charter school enrollment. At the same time, more should be done to strengthen and promote magnet schools as another successful type of school choice, and to emphasize the ability of magnet and charter schools to draw students across boundary lines. States should also work to ensure that diversity considerations are part of the charter approval process, and exercise stronger oversight of existing charter schools. Indeed, we all must work to build a more inclusive sector of schools, one that magnifies and strengthens the role of choice in fostering integration and equality in American education.

#### Yes segregation – studies

Whitehurst et al. 16 - Grover J. “Russ” Whitehurst, Director of the Brown Center on Education Policy at the Brookings Institution, Member of The Koret Task Force on K–12 Education—a group of senior education scholars brought together by the Hoover Institution, former Director of the Institute of Education Sciences at the U.S. Department of Education, former U.S. Assistant Secretary for Educational Research and Improvement, former Chair of the Department of Psychology at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, holds a Ph.D. in Experimental Child Psychology from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Richard V. Reeves, Edward Rodrigue, October 2012 ("Segregation, Race, and Charter Schools: What do we Know", Brookings, Accessed Online at https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/ccf\_20161021segregation\_version-10\_211.pdf, pg 29-39, Accessed on 7-6-2017, SV)

We have examined segregation, especially in terms of race, across all public schools. But an important question for policy is whether particular school systems, admissions procedures, or school types influence patterns of segregation. In particular, the relationship between charter schools and segregation has attracted considerable attention.

Charter schools form a small but growing part of the school systems of many states. Enrollment in charters increased from 0.8 million (1.6 percent of total public school enrollment) to 2.5 million (5.1 percent) between the 2003-04 and 2013-14 school years, according to National Center for Education Statistics data.89 There is wide variation between states: from zero in states without charter laws,90 to 4.6 percent in Texas, 8.3 percent in California, 8.5 percent in Florida, and 17.8 percent in Arizona.91 Together these four states account for almost half of national charter enrollment.92

Who attends charters? In terms of race, charters serve almost equal numbers of white, black, and Hispanic students, and are becoming more balanced in terms of racial share over time:93

Despite this racial balance in overall numbers, there are signs that charters may be more segregated than comparable traditional public schools (TPS). The challenge here is that since charter schools make up only a small number of schools, measuring their levels of segregation requires care in selecting comparable TPS. Again, measures matter. The two main approaches taken by scholars are:

i) longitudinal studies, which track children moving into charters from TPS and compare the demographics of the two.

ii) area-based studies, which compare charters to TPS in the surrounding area. The extent of this area is defined differently by researchers; it could be the neighborhood, the district, the metro, or even the state. This choice makes a big difference to the results.

LONGITUDINAL STUDIES OF CHARTERS AND SEGREGATION

Longitudinal studies examine the flows of students from TPS into charters, and, by comparing the racial composition of the old school and the new school, estimate the aggregate impact on segregation.

The schools in PresidentTown can be used help to illustrate the basic methodology. Say Hamilton High (the mostly white school) becomes a charter. If a white student then leaves Jefferson High for Hamilton, segregation will increase, because Hamilton would be more white (and Jefferson more black).94

Longitudinal studies are valuable, since they track real moves by real students. But they are data-intensive and can only be conducted at a local level. This means findings cannot be necessarily extrapolated to other places or to the national level. Because of the time lag required to collect the data, these studies are also often backward-looking in terms of the policy landscape.

The headline result of most longitudinal studies is that students typically move into a charter school that is more segregated than the TPS they leave. But importantly, this pattern varies by place and race. Black students, in particular, often move to charters that have more black students than their previous TPS. The key findings from the principal longitudinal studies are:

• In Texas, “whites, African Americans, and Latinos transfer into charter schools where their groups comprise between 11 and 14 percentage points more of the student body than the traditional public schools they are leaving.”95

• In California, charter students enter schools slightly more diverse than the TPS they left, with one exception: black students. “The typical black transfer moves from a traditional public school that is 39 percent black to a charter that is 51 percent black.”96

• In San Diego, open-enrollment charter schools increased segregation, in contrast to the district’s magnet schools and integration busing program, which decreased racial segregation. “The [charters] increase the exposure of whites to Asians but decrease the exposure of whites to blacks and Hispanics…The Choice open-enrollment program does the least to boost integration, and across some measures of diversity, it actually segregates the district’s schools.”97

• In North Carolina, both black and white charter students ended up in more segregated schools. Black switchers “transferred from traditional public schools that are 53 percent black, on average, to charter schools that are 72 percent black, on average.”98

• In Arizona, where by the late 1990s around 5 percent of students attended charters, black students, especially at the elementary level, move into more racially segregated schools.99 The average black mover enters an elementary charter that has 29 percentage points more black students.100

• Across eight states from the mid-1990s to the mid-2000s, “students are moving to charter schools with racial compositions that do not differ dramatically from those of the TPSs they left behind.” But black students may be the exception to this pattern, at least in some places: in Texas, Ohio, Philadelphia, Denver, and San Diego, black movers all entered charters with a greater percentage of same-race peers.101

Overall, then, longitudinal studies suggest charter schools maybe be slightly more segregated than TPS. Importantly, this often seems to be the result of black students moving to predominantly black charter schools, especially in particular cities.

AREA-BASED STUDIES OF CHARTERS AND SEGREGATION

The second way to gauge the levels of racial segregation is to compare how far charter schools reflect the populations they serve. If the local TPS reflect the composition of the overall area more closely than charters, it is reasonable to worry that charters are leading to more segregation.

But here, too, it is important to be careful about what is defined as the “overall area.” Take PresidentTown as an example. Remember that Hamilton High is mostly white and Jefferson High is mostly black. This is because Hamilton is in the residentially-segregated “white half of town,” and Jefferson is in the residentially-segregated “black half of town.”

Now say a charter, Madison High, opens near Jefferson, and enrolls a first class that is 80 percent black. Does this 80 percent figure mean that Madison is more segregated than the traditional schools? It depends on the comparison area. The 80 percent black enrollment is way above the 38 percent representation of black students in the whole district, but actually below the TPS right next door: Jefferson, which is 95 percent black.

The main message of area-based studies, especially those of the highest quality, is that charters are more segregated along racial lines than TPS, especially for black students. There are also a few cases where the segregation of whites into charter schools is very pronounced. But the chosen area of comparison matters a great deal: more granular studies find smaller differences between charters and TPS. The main findings of area-based studies are as follows:

• Charter schools are more segregated than TPS at national, state, and metro levels. “Black students in charter schools are far more likely than their traditional public school counterparts to be educated in intensely segregated settings. At the national level, 70 percent of black charter school students attend intensely segregated minority charter schools (which enroll 90-100 percent of students from under-represented minority backgrounds), or twice as many as the share of intensely segregated black students in traditional public schools.”102

• At a smaller geographical level, the picture is much more nuanced. It is true that charter enrollments differ significantly from national enrollment demographics. But charters aren’t located in nationally-representative areas. So national comparisons don’t tell us much. If we zoom in to the county level, for example, there looks to be little difference between charters and TPS.103

• In the Twin Cities, “A geographical analysis shows that the racial makeups of charter schools mimic the racial composition of the neighborhoods where they are located...charter schools are segregating students of color in non-white segregated schools that are even more segregated than the already highly-segregated traditional public schools”: heavily white sharters sit beside heavily black, Asian, or American Indian charters.104 Charters in Michigan reflect the composition of the most residentially-segregated districts, but are more segregated than TPS in more residentially integrated districts: “Predominantly white rural or suburban districts or predominantly African American Detroit, reflect that racial segregation, and in some cases show evidence of greater racial integration. However, where charter schools draw their students from racially diverse districts—mostly central cities— they are less diverse than these districts.”105

• Charters do not reflect the diversity of their surrounding areas as closely as nearby TPS, according to a new study by Nat Malkus, who draws on three datasets from the 2011-2012 school year, including the Department of Education’s Common Core of Data (CCD).106 Malkus matches 4,800 charter schools to their five nearest TPS counterparts, which provides a fine-grained look at how charters compare to TPS.107 He also creates a random sample of 25,000 TPS that mimics the urban-suburban-rural composition of the charter schools. Then, as with the charter schools, he compares these “control” TPS schools to their five nearest TPS. This allows him to report the difference not only between charters and nearby TPS schools, but between TPS schools in similar areas to charters and their neighboring schools. The first striking result is the heterogeneity of TPS schools. Ten percent of TPS have black enrollment shares that differ from their neighboring five TPS by more than 20 percentage points; 13 percent of TPS have similarly divergent white student shares. But charters show even more variation: 17 percent of charters enroll 20 percentage points or more black students than surrounding TPS. There are also more charters that enroll substantially more white students, and substantially fewer Hispanic students:108

Malkus also finds that charters tend either to enroll lots of low-income (FRPL) students, or very few, relative to the TPS comparison group.109

On the basis of this study at least, it seems as if charters tend to have more homogeneous student bodies. Malkus’s study, thoughtfully and carefully conducted, seems to confirm earlier analyses suggesting that, on average, charters are slightly more segregated, especially for black students. But it also reinforces the general finding that there is wide variation this front. Different metros, districts, and schools have very different patterns of segregation.

#### Yes segregation

Gross 17 — Natalie Gross is a program specialist and the Latino Ed Beat blogger for EWA, She holds a bachelor’s degree from Maranatha Baptist University and is pursuing a master’s in journalism from Georgetown Universit, 2-8-2017 ("Why Some Parents Choose Racially Isolated Schools", Atlantic, Accessed Online at https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2017/02/the-benefit-of-racial-isolation/516018/, Accessed on 7-7-2017, SV)

Kriste Dragon grew up in Atlanta, a mixed-race child in a segregated school system.

When it came time to find a school for her children in her new Hollywood, California, home, Dragon was hopeful that the neighborhood’s highly diverse demographics would be reflected in its schools. But instead, she found a low-performing school system that was as segregated as—or worse than—what she’d experienced growing up.

So Dragon, equipped with experience as a classroom teacher and as the executive director of Teach For America Los Angeles, set out to create her own school.

Now the CEO and co-founder of the “intentionally racially and socioeconomically diverse” Citizens of the World Charter Schools network, Dragon shared her story with reporters at a recent Education Writers Association seminar in Los Angeles. She joined a discussion on segregation and whether charter schools perpetuate the problem, as some critics have claimed.

One of those critics is Gary Orfield, the co-director of the Civil Rights Project/ Proyectos Derechos Civiles at UCLA, who joined Dragon on a panel along with Chris Stewart of the Chicago-based nonprofit Education Post.

In a 2016 Civil Rights Project research brief, “Brown at 62: School Segregation by Race, Poverty and State,” Orfield and his co-authors wrote that it has been a long time since the challenge of school segregation has been met with viable approaches to integrate schools by race, ethnicity, and income levels.

Instead, we have spent decades trying another approach: policies that have focused on attempting to equalize schools and opportunity through accountability and high-stakes testing policies, not to mention the federal subsidization of entirely new systems of school choice, like charter schools, without any civil-rights provisions. These policies have not succeeded in reducing racial segregation or inequality.

The project’s last national look at charter schools, in 2010, found that racial and ethnic isolation of minorities is far more common in charter schools than traditional public schools. Seventy percent of black students enrolled in charters attended schools deemed “intensely segregated.” (The report defines such segregation as occurring when at least 90 percent of students were minorities.) This level of segregation was twice as high as in traditional public schools, the report said. The same analysis also found that half of Latino charter school students attended “intensely segregated” schools. Critics say the national data in the report are misleading, since so many charters serve inner-city neighborhoods.

“I don’t think the effect of segregation is very much different between these two systems,” Orfield said of charters and traditional public school districts. “The problem is, these are new schools. We’re creating new segregated schools….In most of them, nobody’s doing anything to make them diverse.”

#### Charter schools increasingly segregated in the squo

Rubinstein 17 - Rachel E. Rubinstein is a J.D. at the University of Richmond School of Law, January 2017 ("Civil Rights and the Charter School Choice: How Stricter Standards for Charter Schools Can Aid Educational Equity", Washington Education Law and Policy Review, Accessed online at <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1155&context=law-student-publications>, pg 87-88 Accessed on 7-13-2017, SV)

B. The State of Segregation: Charter Schools Are No Exception

Researchers at the UCLA Civil Rights Project have reported on the benefits of integrated education, the state of segregated schools today, and the racial composition of charter schools over the last decade.43Researchers found that in most states, rates of enrollment in charter schools was higher for Black students than any for other race/ethnicity; in four states, White enrollment in charters outweighed that in public schools.44 The authors looked further, however, to examine whether the charter schools are more homogenous than the traditional public schools. They found that nationally 70% of Black charter school students attend a school that is intensely segregated (90–100% minority).45 The UCLA team concluded that, despite their potential to provide an integrated education, evidence demonstrates that many charter schools are more segregated and racially isolated than traditional public schools in the same state.46

The research team at UCLA began to question the ability of charter schools to provide their promised solution of innovative, integrative education. Emerging literature began to recognize that certain legislative policies applicable only to charter schools were helping facilitate general school segregation, as well as White flight from traditional public schools into racially isolated charters.47 The UCLA Civil Rights Project compiled data from a survey of forty states and the District of Columbia.48 The authors found alarming rates of racial isolation in charter schools, outpacing the patterns of segregation occurring in traditional public schools.49 While Black students are overenrolled in charter schools in all regions, they found that was often a result of the charter school’s location in an “urban” district.50 When separated and examined by region, some patterns of enrollment evidenced that segregation was largely a result of White flight.51 Because charter school operations can vary based on their state’s guiding legislation, the UCLA-CRP report demonstrated the need for comprehensive civil rights protections to prevent the choice of a charter education from creating a segregated, two-tiered public education system.

### AT Child Push Out

#### No child push out – stats
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Conclusion

Recently, concerns have been raised that charter schools may try to improve their academic profile by pushing out low-performing students. These concerns suggest that a comprehensive examination of charter schools in comparison with TPSs with respect to the exit of low-performing students is warranted to inform whether the “push-out” argument serves as a strong argument against charter schools in general and whether greater scrutiny should be imposed on individual charter schools on reauthorization. Although our study is not able to know definitively why a student exits a school, we are able to examine whether there are patterns in the data consistent with the push-out claim in the aggregate level and micro level.

Our descriptive results suggest that students transferring out of charter schools do have slightly lower achievement levels than their former peers. However, the same holds true for TPSs. When we examine these aggregate patterns with a formal regression model, including a number of sensitivity analyses, we find little evidence that low-performing students are more likely to transfer out of charter schools than above-average students or that they are more likely to transfer out of charters than TPSs. In looking at different groups of charter schools (i.e., charter schools near AYP proficiency thresholds, low- and high-performing schools, primary and secondary schools), we generally find no evidence consistent with the claim of pushing out low-performing students. The only groups that could raise some concern are low-achieving charter schools and charter high schools, but the patterns of students transferring out of these schools are similar to those in TPSs, which suggest that there may be a more general problem with low achieving schools and high schools than a problem with charter schools exclusively.

Finally, in examining individual schools, we found only 15 out of more than 300 schools districtwide in which below-average students were more likely to transfer out than above-average students at the rates of 10% or more. Of these, only one is a charter school, and that school focuses on students at the risk of dropping out. The other 14 schools were TPSs and many of these schools are alternative discipline schools. Together, our analysis suggests that there is no evidence consistent with the claim that charter schools are in general or at the individual level pushing out low performing students. Although there needs to be more research in other districts or states, our results weaken the “push-out” argument against the establishment of charter schools in general.

### AT No Excuses

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2016/01/26/former-dean-questions-costs-of-no-excuses-charter-schools-on-students-of-color/?utm\_term=.123fe327b6aa

#### No Excuse research is flawed
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Limitations and Future Research

Yet there are some research limitations to mention. Most importantly, the understanding and assessment of No Excuses charter schools is largely shaped and limited by research methods studying these schools. Though informative, such research cannot provide a conclusive appraisal of No Excuses charter schools, not to mention all charter schools. In social science, there is almost always a tradeoff when choosing a research design. Studies that maximize internal validity often sacrifice external validity, and vice versa. The primary value of meta-analysis is that it allows researchers to combine several studies with high internal validity into a single analysis that has high external validity. Still, more research would be helpful.

Specifically, our meta-analysis draws upon studies that use a random-assignment research design, which were made possible only by the fact that charter schools with waiting lists must determine enrollment by lottery. Though this gold standard research provides the strongest available causal evidence, using this high research standard also narrows the scope of schools examined to those with waiting lists and well-kept lottery records. Such schools may be not representative of all No Excuses charter schools. For example, when comparing nonexperimental estimates of over- and under-subscribed charters schools in Boston, Abdulkadiroglu et al. (2009) find positive effects in both instances, but they find that oversubscribed charter schools tend to outperform charter schools with lower demand. Using a similar approach and looking at a national sample of KIPP middle schools, Tuttle et al. (2013) compare KIPP schools that employed lotteries with non-lottery KIPP schools. They find that the non-lottery schools perform slightly lower in math, but produce similar effects in reading.

Charter schools are either oversubscribed or not oversubscribed for a nonrandom reason. For instance, better schools might have longer waitlists because of higher parental demand, a proposition that would explain the findings in Abdulkadiroglu et al.’s and Tuttle et al.’s studies. Parental demand for oversubscribed charter schools, especially oversubscribed No Excuses charter schools, may be higher due to their reputation of high academic quality. Indeed, parents rely on social networks and the name branding of schools when selecting schools for their children (Author Cite, 2014; Schneider & Buckley, 2007; Schneider et al., 1997; Trivitt & Wolf, 2010). Many of these who parents seek high academic quality and are able to recognize that higher-performing oversubscribed charter schools offer that feature (Bast & Walberg, 2004; Schneider & Buckley, 2007; Schneider et al., 1997; Solmon, 2003). Thus, while we can be very confident about the effects generated in our meta-analysis of experimental studies of charter schools, we cannot confidently assume that these effects are generalizable to all charter schools or all No Excuses schools, even as we leverage the ability of meta-analysis to increase external validity.

Likewise, the recent increase in the volume of random-assignment studies of charter schools has had wide geographic coverage. But the studies of No Excuses charter schools are primarily concentrated on schools in the eastern United States. We anticipate that forthcoming studies will provide greater geographic diversity.

Finally, the research we analyze focuses primarily on achievement effects of charter schools, even though there are many other important educational outcomes. Unfortunately, few studies have looked at other learning outcomes, such as student motivation, engagement, and other personality dispositions and character traits that have been shown to be important determinants of future wellbeing (Amlund et al., 2011; Heckman, Stixrud, & Urzua, 2006; Levin, 2012; Borghans et al., 2006). There is little research into how charter schools impact these noncognitive skills, though some studies have looked beyond test scores. For example, Zimmer et al. (2009) find that charter school students are more likely to graduate high school and attend college, and Booker et al. (2014) find that students who attend charter schools have higher educational attainment and higher incomes in adulthood. For example, Dobbie and Fryer (2013) find that students in a No Excuses charter school have lower incidences of teen pregnancy and incarceration. Still, much remains to be seen and would be informative for the policy debates over charter schools. For now, there is strong evidence that No Excuses charter schools increase achievement among disadvantaged students in the United States, particularly in the core subjects of math and literacy.

### 1AR No Shifting from No Excuses

#### Shift will never occur
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Comments and concerns

It’s unclear whether rethinking these policies will lead to a total reboot of school culture or a series of small tweaks. The answer will likely vary at each network and within each school and classroom.

But some worry the high-pressure environment created both externally and internally at charter schools schools leaves little wiggle room for a seismic shift. Charter school renewal is based on academic results. Few charters leaders are interested in sweeping changes, either.

“I think that networks will continue that practice as long as they see it producing the outcomes that they are supposed to produce,” said Steve Zimmerman, the founder of two charter schools in Queens and the co-director of the Coalition for Community Charter Schools, which represents many smaller, independent schools.

Success Academy, for its part, has not changed its discipline philosophy and does not plan to, according to a spokesman. Far from reforming the discipline code, Eva Moskowitz, the founder and CEO of Success Academy said it should serve as a model.

“The city could learn from Success’s code of conduct and provide the same safe, engaging learning environments that children need — and parents want,” she said.

Anthony Bush, who teaches special education, algebra, and dance at KIPP NYC College Prep High School, said he understands the practical problems with changing discipline policies. He said he would like to solve behavioral issues as the school suggests, hours after the fact in a calm and collaborative discussion with his students, but that can be challenging in the middle of a lesson.

It is especially difficult during state testing season, when the pressure to help students master the rigorous Common Core learning standards allows even less time to have conversations about discipline, he said.

“In the moment it’s very difficult to put into action because we’re human,” Bush said.

## Integration

### DeVos Rollback Coming

#### DeVos will roll back regulations
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Secretary of Education nominee Betsy DeVos had her Senate confirmation hearing last Tuesday for yet another hot Trump administration nominee that had Democrats and Republicans sharply divided.

Apart from the hundreds of ethical concerns that have yet to be thoroughly investigated. Examples include DeVos’s donations of hundreds of millions of dollars to GOP lawmakers, openness to allowing guns on all school campuses, refusing to commit to stricter policing of campus sexual assault and complete lack of experience with public education itself, the main point of contention surrounding DeVos’s nomination is her promotion of privatizing schools with a lack of governmental oversight in advocating for more school choices for parents.

DeVos’s only experience with the education field is through spending her own money in donations to different legislatures and organizations to persuade them to create legislation on charter schools and vouchers.

Her million-dollar funding in her home state Michigan has created a deregulated charter program that critics say is the root of Detroit’s issues and charter advocates acknowledge it as a disaster.

Offering charter programs as part of school choice has worked well in some instances, but often has many shortcomings. Charters, which are publicly funded yet independently controlled schools, create a lack of general oversight by privatizing and fracturing the education industry within their municipalities.

However, charter schools in New Orleans have done pretty well because of good oversight. Unfortunately, DeVos prefers a hands-off approach to charters in Detroit. This makes New Orleans charter schools exceptions and not positive indicators of education’s future under DeVos. Under DeVos, any hope advocates may hold for charters will fail under DeVos.

#### Absent the plan, the privatization and deregulation of charters schools is inevitable

Eastman 17 - Nicholas J. Eastman has a Ph.D. in Educational Policy Studies from Georgia State Univerisity, this is his dissertation, 5-12-2017 ("Lost Ground: Neoliberalism, Charter Schools, and the End of Desegregation in St. Louis, Missouri", Georgia State University, Accessed online at scholarworks.gsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1192&context=eps\_diss, Accessed on 7-14-2017, pg 52-54, SV)

The Rust Belt is the primary laboratory of neoliberal education experimentation. Much like neoliberal theory coming out of the Chicago school was first tested in the Global South by reactionaries like Chile’s Pinochet before Reagan and Thatcher imported it back to its birthplaces, the full marketization of public education is being tested first in the majority-black space of New Orleans and more systemically in the hypersegregated and deindustrialized spaces of the Rust Belt. Whether it will remain in those spaces is difficult to tell. However, just as Arne Duncan took Chicago’s program of closing traditional public schools in majority-black and low-income neighborhoods and replacing them with charters to the national scale as Secretary of Education, the Midwestern model of targeting majority-minority districts for privatization appears poised to intensify under the Betsy DeVos’s leadership. As a national leader in school choice, Michigan is also a national leader in charter school corruption.100 With her husband’s family’s fortune coming from Amway, a multi-level marketing scheme with a sort of prosperity gospel message, and her brother’s success founding and running the mercenary military contractor Blackwater USA, DeVos is an ideological thoroughbred of hard-right neoliberalism. It is reasonable to assume that, as U.S. Secretary of Education, DeVos will advance a public policy portfolio that will not only further the expansion of urban charter schools but also the deregulation of public education through various forms of privatization that have been mostly off the federal policy table for the last few decades. In 2000, her family spent $5.6 million dollars in their failed effort to expand school choice in Michigan by legalizing public school vouchers. 101 In promoting a national school voucher program, DeVos has a powerful ally in Vice President Pence, who as governor of Indiana, expanded his state’s voucher program to the largest in the country at over 32,000 students.102 Ohio has multiple smaller voucher programs that cumulatively outnumber Indiana’s voucher recipients, yet Indiana remains the largest unified program, followed closely by Wisconsin.103 Taken together, there is every reason to believe that Midwestern right-neoliberalism will fashion national education policy according to the privatization model it has spent decades forging and testing in the Rust Belt. Although charter schools make up only 6 percent of public schools nationwide, federal education policymakers are now the very same people who have helped to push them above 30 or even 50 percent in the postindustrial heartland. Should this remain the case during the next decade, pro-charter consulting group Bellwether Education Partner’s prediction of 20-40 percent of public school students in charters by 2035 is certainly possible.104

## Charter School Good DA

### 2AC – Charter Schools Not Key to ELL/ESL

#### Charter schools reject English-language learners for boosts in test scores.

Vaznis 16 – James Vaznis, reporter for the Boston Globe, graduated from Northeastern University, 2016 (“Many charter schools lag in enrolling students lacking English fluency,” October 31st, *The Boston Globe,* Available Online At <https://www.bostonglobe.com/metro/2016/10/30/many-charter-schools-lag-enrolling-students-lacking-english-fluency/f1aEsAI7o9KchqgZfqKkwO/story.html>, Accessed 7-21-2017)

Massachusetts charter schools bill themselves in television ads as golden opportunities for disadvantaged students trapped in failing district schools, but charters often leave behind one of the most challenging student populations to teach: those who lack fluency in English.

As voters decide whether to allow more charter schools, a Globe review has found that the schools enroll English-language learners at much lower rates than those in traditional systems, even as many charter schools have been stepping up efforts to recruit more of the students.

One of the widest enrollment disparities exists in Boston, even though the city boasts one of the largest immigrant populations in the state.

The failure of most charter schools to fully embrace English-language learners draws into question the stellar results many of these schools achieve on state standardized tests. Similar concerns have been raised about whether charter schools serve their fair share of students with disabilities, although the enrollment disparities are not as stark.

During the last school year in Boston, English-language learners made up 13 percent of the combined enrollments at 19 independently run charter schools, the analysis of state enrollment data found. By contrast, students who cannot speak English fluently made up nearly a third of the Boston school system’s enrollment.

“We know why charter schools are not enrolling English-language learners: They are harder to teach, and they will inevitably bring down MCAS scores,” said Roger Rice of Multicultural Education, Training & Advocacy, a nonprofit based in Somerville that works on behalf of linguistic minorities.

### 1AR – Charter Schools Not Key

#### Most charter schools are worse at educating English-language learners – only a few are successful.

Garland 10 – Sarah Garland, staff writer for Herchinger Ed, 2009 recipient of the Spencer Fellowship in Education Reporting at Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, received her master’s degree from New York University as a Henry M. MacCracken fellow, 2010 (“Charter schools and English language learners” *Hechinger Ed,* September 1st, Available Online At <http://hechingered.org/content/2570_2570/>, Accessed 7-21-2017)

Charter schools get a lot of accolades, but rarely are they touted for their work with English language learners (ELLs). That’s because in charter-school hot spots like New York City, charters have tended not to serve ELLs as much as they do other students, causing some groups to complain that they’re avoiding some of the most vulnerable and difficult-to-teach children.

In fact, 16.5 percent of charter students are English language learners, according to a new report by the Center for American Progress (CAP) and the National Council of La Raza (NCLR). Nationally, nine percent of schoolchildren in the U.S. don’t speak English at home.

Yet ELLs in charters tend to do much worse than their peers in regular public schools, the report’s authors note, citing one national study by Stanford researchers.

So what to do? The report, which is pegged to the Race to the Top competition and the flood of new charter schools it could unleash, says that “educators and policymakers certainly know more about what doesn’t work for Latino and ELL students and less about what does work.”

Perhaps — although one study by Pew that I often cite shows that English language learners do significantly better when they’re not isolated. As the study puts it: “When ELL students attended public schools with at least a minimum threshold number of white students, the gap between the math proficiency scores of white students and ELL students was considerably narrower.”

Diversity is also something that charters don’t always do well. But diversity may not be an option in places like the Rio Grande Valley in Texas, one of the poorest places in the country, where the student population is overwhelmingly Hispanic. (Forty percent of Latinos in the U.S. speak English as a second language.)

The report showcases four charters that appear to be doing quite well with ELLs. Two have student populations that are majority-ELLs. All four schools are majority-minority, meaning minorities make up the majority of the student body. CAP and NCLR hope these schools can point the way to success for other charters – let’s hope so!

### 2AC—Nonuq

#### Charters fail—low academic achievement, accountability, and lost funds

Buchheit 15 — (Paul Buchheit, 7-6-2015, "Growing Evidence that Charter Schools Are Failing," Common Dreams, https://www.commondreams.org/views/2015/07/06/growing-evidence-charter-schools-are-failing, Accessed 7-14-2017, JWS)

Charters Are Underperforming The inadequacies of charter schools have been confirmed by other recent studies, one of them by CREDO itself, which found that in comparison to traditional public schools "students in Ohio charter schools perform worse in both reading and mathematics." Another recent CREDO study of California schools reached mixed results, with charters showing higher scores in reading but lower scores in math. In a study of Chicago's public schools, the University of Minnesota Law School determined that "Sadly the charter schools, which on average score lower that the Chicago public schools, have not improved the Chicago school system, but perhaps made it even weaker." In general, as concluded by the nonpartisan Spencer Foundation and Public Agenda, "There is very little evidence that charter and traditional public schools differ meaningfully in their average impact on students' standardized test performance." Another report from Data First, part of the Center for Public Education, stated that "the majority of charter schools do no better or worse than traditional public schools." But there's a lot of data that leans toward "worse" rather than "better." A Brookings report showed underperformance in Arizona's charter schools. An In the Public Interest group found that an analyst for the District of Columbia "could not provide a single instance in which its strategy of transferring a low-performing school to a charter management organization had resulted in academic gains for the students." The Minnesota Star Tribune reported that "Students in most Minnesota charter schools are failing to hit learning targets and are not achieving adequate academic growth." Over 85 percent of Ohio's charter students were in schools graded D or F in 2012–2013. In the much-heralded New Orleans charter experiment, the Investigative Fund found that "eight years after Hurricane Katrina...seventy-nine percent of RSD charters are still rated D or F by the Louisiana Department of Education." Charters Won't Tell Us What They're Doing Performance aside, charters have other serious issues. The Nation called them "stunningly opaque...black boxes." Indeed, the federal government has spent billions on charter development without basic forms of accountability, even for the causes and details of school closings. The charter system is so unregulated that oversight often comes from whistleblowers who feel disturbed enough, and courageous enough, to report abuses. The report Cashing in on Kids notes that the Walton Foundation, one of the biggest charter school supporters, has "supported the unregulated growth of a privatized education industry." The Walton-funded New York Charter School Association, which takes considerable public money and advertises itself as "independently-run public schools," refused state audits, arguing that they were run by boards outside the public domain. Charter operators want the best of both worlds. As Diane Ravitch explains, "When it is time for funds to be distributed, they want to be considered public schools. But when they are involved in litigation, charter operators insist they are private organizations." According to Integrity in Education, $100 million (ballooning in the past year to $200 million) in taxpayer money was lost, misused, or wasted in just 15 of the 42 states that have charter schools. The abuses are well documented. The report states: "Charter operators have used school funds illegally to buy personal luxuries for themselves, support their other businesses, and more."

#### Charter schools are bad

West and Chingos 14 — Martin West is a former nonresident Senior Fellow with the Center on Children and Families. He is an associate professor of education at Harvard. Martin West is also a contributor to the Evidence Speaks project. He has a Ph.D. from Harvard in Government and Social Policy. Matthew M. Chingos is director of the Urban Institute’s Education Policy Program. Chingos was a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution. He received a BA in government and economics and a PhD in government from Harvard University, 11-6-2014 ("Mixed Results for Arizona’s Charter Schools", Brookings, Accessed Online at https://www.brookings.edu/research/mixed-results-for-arizonas-charter-schools/, Accessed on 7-9-2017, SV)

On average, charter schools in Arizona do no better, and sometimes worse, than the traditional public schools. Figure 1 shows our estimates of the average impact of attending a charter school on test scores, expressed in standard deviation units. To put these units in context, the average middle school student gains about a quarter of a standard deviation per year; for elementary students, the average gain is between a third and a half of a standard deviation. For example, the negative impact of charter middle schools on math scores of 0.02 standard deviations translates into about 10 percent of a year of learning.

We find negative average impacts of attending a charter school on math scores for all three grade levels, and on science scores for middle and high schools but not for elementary schools. We don’t find any evidence that charters have much of an impact on reading scores at any grade level.

### 2AC—No link

#### No link – the plan is oversight not overregulation

Cowen 17 — Joshua Cowen is an associate professor of education policy in the College of Education at Michigan State University. He received my Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1-12-2017 ("Oversight or overregulation? Debating school choice accountability", Brookings, Accessed Online at https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2017/01/12/oversight-or-overregulation-debating-school-choice-accountability/, Accessed on 7-11-2017, SV)

It’s oversight:

Accountability systems can benefit the traditional public sector. Studies of NCLB and of school report card-style programs such as New York City’s have found positive impacts. These studies, alongside evidence from Milwaukee on the effect of an NCLB-style program on the city’s private schools, suggest accountability programs may spur student achievement.

In places like Boston and New York, where charter school authorizers face substantial hurdles to establishing and maintaining their programs, lottery-based estimates of positive charter effects are among the largest nationwide. This suggests that such hurdles encourage (or at minimum, do not discourage) school innovation and ultimately school quality.

Early indications are that centrally administered systems of choice such as the portfolio model—in particular the common enrollment application—may reduce disparities in access to individual schools of choice by minimizing application burdens for students with particular academic needs. This suggests that local coordination between providers promotes rather than inhibits individual family choice.

Active charter school closure plans can have positive impacts on the students. In Ohio, students whose low-performing schools were closed realized substantial academic gains after transferring elsewhere. This suggests that robust monitoring of school performance under choice may translate into meaningful benefits for individual students.

In research available from areas with choice across multiple sectors, and where information on many school attributes is available, parents still consistently rank schools with high academic performance as measured by state testing as their top choices. This suggests that parents can and do make use of government-provided information—especially academic outcomes—when making their choices.

### Charter not key to STEM

#### Charter not key to STEM – better studies

Yettick 14 — Holly Yettick directs the Education Week Research Center. Holly began working at Education Week in 2014 after earning a Ph.D. in 2013 from the University of Colorado at Boulder's School of Education and completing a postdoctoral fellowship at the University of Colorado at Denver's School of Public Affairs, 6-1-2014 ("Studies of STEM-Focused Schools Yield Mixed Results", Education Week, Accessed Online at http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/inside-school-research/2014/06/stem\_schools.html, Accessed on 7-13-2017, SV)

For those who are concerned that the nation is starving for students who specialize in science, technology, engineering and math, STEM-focused schools are a popular solution.

In 2010, the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology called for 1,000 such such schools to open in the next decade. But the results of several new studies raise questions about the overall efficacy of this approach.

In an article published online in March by the peer-refereed Journal of Educational Research, Michael Hansen, a principal researcher at the American Institutes for Research, found that students in STEM schools in North Carolina were significantly more likely to take core, advanced, and vocational-technical STEM courses than were their peers in other types of schools. However, in Florida, STEM students participated in vocational-technical STEM courses at higher rates but were about as likely as students at other types of schools to take core and advanced STEM courses.

Hansen also found that students in STEM-focused schools were no more likely than students in other school types to perform well on state math exams in Florida and North Carolina between 2006 and 2008. Results from 8th grade science tests in North Carolina likewise showed no association between attending a STEM school and student achievement on the exam.

Hansen's analysis used so-called "value-added" methods that accounted for prior student achievement, demographics, and other factors. It included five different samples of elementary and middle grades in both states, the largest of which included more than 3,200 schools.

The goal of that study was to tease out characteristics of schools that were higher and lower-performing in science and in math. It did not focus on STEM schools per se.

But another article published online in February by that same journal focuses specifically on STEM schools. That study was unusual in that it examined STEM-focused elementary and middle schools. Studies tend to address STEM schools at the high school level, where they are generally more common. For instance, Hansen's study found that 28 percent of STEM-focused schools were high schools, as compared to 10 percent of non-STEM schools in that state. In North Carolina, nearly half of STEM-focused schools were high schools, as compared to 15 percent of non-STEM schools.

In his article on STEM elementary and middle grades, Eugene Judson, an associate professor of science education at Arizona State University in Mesa, compared the TerraNova math, language arts and reading results of 289 students who transferred into 11 STEM-focused magnet and charter elementaries in his state in 2005 and 2006 and then remained there for at least three years. (Magnets are regular public schools that seek to attract students with specialized offerings while charters are independently operated, publicly funded schools.) The results were mixed. Transferring to STEM magnets did not change the achievement trajectories of students, who performed at about the same levels as peers who transferred to non-STEM schools in the same district. Transferring to STEM-focused charters in 2005 (but not in 2006) did appear to help students make significantly more academic growth in math and language arts than they had made before, although not in reading. But those increases were similar to the increases experienced by children who transferred to non-STEM schools during that same period.

"These results do provide mild indication that the STEM-focused charter schools contributed to growth in the traditional content areas, but overall the evidence is insubstantial," Judson concluded. "Further, attention is drawn to the finding that the students to whom the charter school students were compared also made noteworthy gains during each of the four-year periods. This may possibly be due to students, who transfer to another school system, simply becoming more established after three years and thus posting such gains. If that is the case, then the same argument can be made for the students who transferred to the STEM-focused charter schools; this would wash away the conjecture that it is the STEM-focused charter school itself that led to the gains."

Judson noted that his analysis was limited in that he did not have data on science, technology or engineering achievement—just math.

A richer set of STEM-related student achievement data was available for another article published in the June issue of the peer-reviewed Economics of Education Review. The first author of that article was Matthew Wiswall an assistant professor of economics at Arizona State. Wiswall and his co-authors examined math, biology, chemistry, and physics course-taking and exam results for more than 70,000 students attending both selective and nonselective public STEM high schools in New York City. (Although STEM schools in many areas of the country were historically exam schools for high-achieving students , newer versions tend to eschew selective admissions in favor of open/lottery-based policies that aim to attract a wider array of students.)

The NYC STEM schools appeared at first glance to be doing a better job because they had higher scores and STEM-course-taking rates than other local public high schools. But once the researchers accounted for demographics and prior test scores, most of the STEM-focused schools' advantages disappeared, suggesting that the schools were disproportionately attracting higher-achieving students who were interested in STEM.

### STEM not key

#### STEM education doesn’t matter – no STEM crisis

Charette 13 — Robert N. Charette is editor for IEEE Spectrum’s Risk Factor blog, Charette is the author of multiple books and numerous articles on the subjects of risk management, project and program management, innovation, and entrepreneurship, 8-1-2013 ("The STEM Crisis Is a Myth", IEEE Spectrum: Technology, Engineering, and Science News, Accessed Online at http://spectrum.ieee.org/at-work/education/the-stem-crisis-is-a-myth, Accessed on 7-14-2017, SV)

In preparing this article, I went through hundreds of reports, articles, and white papers from the past six decades. There were plenty of data, but there was also an extraordinary amount of inconsistency. Who exactly is a STEM worker: somebody with a bachelor’s degree or higher in a STEM discipline? Somebody whose job requires use of a STEM subject? What about someone who manages STEM workers? And which disciplines and industries fall under the STEM umbrella?

Such definitions obviously affect the counts. For example, in the United States, both the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the Department of Commerce track the number of STEM jobs, but using different metrics. According to Commerce, 7.6 million individuals worked in STEM jobs in 2010, or about 5.5 percent of the U.S. workforce. That number includes professional and technical support occupations in the fields of computer science and mathematics, engineering, and life and physical sciences as well as management. The NSF, by contrast, counts 12.4 million science and engineering jobs in the United States, including a number of areas that the Commerce Department excludes, such as health-care workers (4.3 million) and psychologists and social scientists (518 000).

Such inconsistencies don’t just create confusion for numbers junkies like me; they also make rational policy discussions difficult. Depending on your point of view, you can easily cherry-pick data to bolster your argument.

Another surprise was the apparent mismatch between earning a STEM degree and having a STEM job. Of the 7.6 million STEM workers counted by the Commerce Department, only 3.3 million possess STEM degrees. Viewed another way, about 15 million U.S. residents hold at least a bachelor’s degree in a STEM discipline, but three-fourths of them—11.4 million—work outside of STEM.

The departure of STEM graduates to other fields starts early. In 2008, the NSF surveyed STEM graduates who’d earned bachelor’s and master’s degrees in 2006 and 2007. It found that 2 out of 10 were already working in non-STEM fields. And 10 years after receiving a STEM degree, 58 percent of STEM graduates had left the field, according to a 2011 study from Georgetown University.

The takeaway? At least in the United States, you don’t need a STEM degree to get a STEM job, and if you do get a degree, you won’t necessarily work in that field after you graduate. If there is in fact a STEM worker shortage, wouldn’t you expect more people with STEM degrees to be filling those jobs? And if many STEM jobs can be filled by people who don’t have STEM degrees, then why the big push to get more students to pursue STEM?

Now consider the projections that suggest a STEM worker shortfall. One of the most cited in recent U.S. debates comes from the 2011 Georgetown University report mentioned above, by Anthony P. Carnevale, Nicole Smith, and Michelle Melton of the Center on Education and the Workforce. It estimated there will be slightly more than 2.4 million STEM job openings in the United States between 2008 and 2018, with 1.1 million newly created jobs and the rest to replace workers who retire or move to non-STEM fields; they conclude that there will be roughly 277 000 STEM vacancies per year.

But the Georgetown study did not fully account for the Great Recession. It projected a downturn in 2009 but then a steady increase in jobs beginning in 2010 and a return to normal by the year 2018. In fact, though, more than 370 000 science and engineering jobs in the United States were lost in 2011, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

I don’t mean to single out this study for criticism; it just illustrates the difficulty of accurately predicting STEM demand and supply even a year or two out, let alone over a prolonged period. Highly competitive science- and technology-driven industries are volatile, where radical restructurings and boom-and-bust cycles have been the norm for decades. Many STEM jobs today are also targets for outsourcing or replacement by automation.

The nature of STEM work has also changed dramatically in the past several decades. In engineering, for instance, your job is no longer linked to a company but to a funded project. Long-term employment with a single company has been replaced by a series of de facto temporary positions that can quickly end when a project ends or the market shifts. To be sure, engineers in the 1950s were sometimes laid off during recessions, but they expected to be hired back when the economy picked up. That rarely happens today. And unlike in decades past, employers seldom offer generous education and training benefits to engineers to keep them current, so out-of-work engineers find they quickly become technologically obsolete.

Any of these factors can affect both short-term and longer-term demand for STEM workers, as well as for the particular skills those workers will need. The agencies that track science and engineering employment know this to be true. Buried in Chapter 3 of a 2012 NSF workforce study, for instance, you’ll find this caveat: “Projections of employment growth are plagued by uncertain assumptions and are notoriously difficult to make.”

So is there a shortfall of STEM workers or isn’t there?

The Georgetown study estimates that nearly two-thirds of the STEM job openings in the United States, or about 180 000 jobs per year, will require bachelor’s degrees. Now, if you apply the Commerce Department’s definition of STEM to the NSF’s annual count of science and engineering bachelor’s degrees, that means about 252 000 STEM graduates emerged in 2009. So even if all the STEM openings were entry-level positions and even if only new STEM bachelor’s holders could compete for them, that still leaves 70 000 graduates unable to get a job in their chosen field.

Of course, the pool of U.S. STEM workers is much bigger than that: It includes new STEM master’s and Ph.D. graduates (in 2009, around 80 000 and 25 000, respectively), STEM associate degree graduates (about 40 000), H-1B visa holders (more than 50 000), other immigrants and visa holders with STEM degrees, technical certificate holders, and non-STEM degree recipients looking to find STEM-related work. And then there’s the vast number of STEM degree holders who graduated in previous years or decades.

Even in the computer and IT industry, the sector that employs the most STEM workers and is expected to grow the most over the next 5 to 10 years, not everyone who wants a job can find one. A recent study by the Economic Policy Institute (EPI), a liberal-leaning think tank in Washington, D.C., found that more than a third of recent computer science graduates aren’t working in their chosen major; of that group, almost a third say the reason is that there are no jobs available.

Spot shortages for certain STEM specialists do crop up. For instance, the recent explosion in data analytics has sparked demand for data scientists in health care and retail. But the H-1B visa and similar immigrant hiring programs are meant to address such shortages. The problem is that students who are contemplating what field to specialize in can’t assume such shortages will still exist by the time they emerge from the educational pipeline.

What’s perhaps most perplexing about the claim of a STEM worker shortage is that many studies have directly contradicted it, including reports from Duke University, the Rochester Institute of Technology, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, and the Rand Corp. A 2004 Rand study, for example, stated that there was no evidence “that such shortages have existed at least since 1990, nor that they are on the horizon.”

That report argued that the best indicator of a shortfall would be a widespread rise in salaries throughout the STEM community. But the price of labor has not risen, as you would expect it to do if STEM workers were scarce. In computing and IT, wages have generally been stagnant for the past decade, according to the EPI and other analyses. And over the past 30 years, according to the Georgetown report, engineers’ and engineering technicians’ wages have grown the least of all STEM wages and also more slowly than those in non-STEM fields; while STEM workers as a group have seen wages rise 33 percent and non-STEM workers’ wages rose by 23 percent, engineering salaries grew by just 18 percent. The situation is even more grim for those who get a Ph.D. in science, math, or engineering. The Georgetown study states it succinctly: “At the highest levels of educational attainment, STEM wages are not competitive.”

Given all of the above, it is difficult to make a case that there has been, is, or will soon be a STEM labor shortage. “If there was really a STEM labor market crisis, you’d be seeing very different behaviors from companies,” notes Ron Hira, an associate professor of public policy at the Rochester Institute of Technology, in New York state. “You wouldn’t see companies cutting their retirement contributions, or hiring new workers and giving them worse benefits packages. Instead you would see signing bonuses, you’d see wage increases. You would see these companies really training their incumbent workers.”

“None of those things are observable,” Hira says. “In fact, they’re operating in the opposite way.”

So why the persistent anxiety that a STEM crisis exists? Michael S. Teitelbaum, a Wertheim Fellow at Harvard Law School and a senior advisor to the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, has studied the phenomenon, and he says that in the United States the anxiety dates back to World War II. Ever since then it has tended to run in cycles that he calls “alarm, boom, and bust.” He says the cycle usually starts when “someone or some group sounds the alarm that there is a critical crisis of insufficient numbers of scientists, engineers, and mathematicians” and as a result the country “is in jeopardy of either a national security risk or of falling behind economically.” In the 1950s, he notes, Americans worried that the Soviet Union was producing 95 000 scientists and engineers a year while the United States was producing only about 57 000. In the 1980s, it was the perceived Japanese economic juggernaut that was the threat, and now it is China and India.

You’ll hear similar arguments made elsewhere. In India, the director general of the Defence Research and Development Organisation, Vijay Kumar Saraswat, recently noted that in his country, “a meagre four persons out of every 1000 are choosing S&T or research, as compared to 110 in Japan, 76 in Germany and Israel, 55 in USA, 46 in Korea and 8 in China.” Leaders in South Africa and Brazil cite similar statistics to show how they are likewise falling behind in the STEM race.

“The government responds either with money [for research] or, more recently, with visas to increase the number of STEM workers,” Teitelbaum says. “This continues for a number of years until the claims of a shortage turn out not to be true and a bust ensues.” Students who graduate during the bust, he says, are shocked to discover that “they can’t find jobs, or they find jobs but not stable ones.”

At the moment, we’re in the alarm-heading-toward-boom part of the cycle. According to a recent report from the Government Accountability Office, the U.S. government spends more than US $3 billion each year on 209 STEM-related initiatives overseen by 13 federal agencies. That’s about $100 for every U.S. student beyond primary school. In addition, major corporations are collectively spending millions to support STEM educational programs. And every U.S. state, along with a host of public and private universities, high schools, middle schools, and even primary schools, has its own STEM initiatives. The result is that many people’s fortunes are now tied to the STEM crisis, real or manufactured.

Clearly, powerful forces must be at work to perpetuate the cycle. One is obvious: the bottom line. Companies would rather not pay STEM professionals high salaries with lavish benefits, offer them training on the job, or guarantee them decades of stable employment. So having an oversupply of workers, whether domestically educated or imported, is to their benefit. It gives employers a larger pool from which they can pick the “best and the brightest,” and it helps keep wages in check. No less an authority than Alan Greenspan, former chairman of the Federal Reserve, said as much when in 2007 he advocated boosting the number of skilled immigrants entering the United States so as to “suppress” the wages of their U.S. counterparts, which he considered too high.

Governments also push the STEM myth because an abundance of scientists and engineers is widely viewed as an important engine for innovation and also for national defense. And the perception of a STEM crisis benefits higher education, says Ron Hira, because as “taxpayers subsidize more STEM education, that works in the interest of the universities” by allowing them to expand their enrollments.

### AT Competitiveness

#### Immigration is an alt cause to competiveness

Ali 17 — (Mohamad Ali, 5-15-2017, "Immigration Is at the Heart of U.S. Competitiveness," Harvard Business Review, https://hbr.org/2017/05/immigration-is-at-the-heart-of-u-s-competitiveness, Accessed 7-14-2017, JWS)

This is possible because this is the United States of America. I believe the U.S. draws its global competitive advantage from its openness to new people and new ideas. It’s an ability the country devalues at its peril. We risk impeding growth in sectors such as high tech and life sciences if we make it harder for top talent to arrive and compete for jobs. From my personal experience, including in the corner office, I firmly believe that curtailing immigration will make it harder to sustain America’s vibrant, creative mix. Forty percent of Fortune 500 companies were founded by immigrants or the children of immigrants. Intel founder Andy Grove was a refugee from communist Hungary. Apple cofounder Steve Jobs is the son of Abdulfattah Jandali, an immigrant from Syria. Today, the trend continues. A recent study of billion-dollar startups found more than half were founded by immigrants. Our next generation of great companies, too, will depend on immigrants — as will the American economy as a whole. Consider the country where I grew up. In 1970, the year I was born, Guyana’s dictator declared the country a cooperative republic and deepened relations with Cuba, North Korea, and the Soviet Union. Imports were banned, including flour. The president started nationalizing businesses. By 1979, the private sector was reduced to only 10% of the economy. There was a widespread shortage of food, fuel, water, and electricity. My mother was a teacher. My father was a police officer. We were better off than most. We had a home made from wood, instead of mud. We had a small amount of money, but there was not much to buy. The government told us to grow vegetables. Without running water, we walked long distances to fetch water. In 1980, my parents decided this was no life for their three young children, then three, five, and 10 years old. My father found his way to America; my mother and I came a year later; and three years later, my younger brother and sister arrived. After four years, we were reunited, living in near-poverty in New York, but we were together and hopeful. In 1991, we became U.S. citizens. Millions of people like us have fought tooth and nail for a better life in America. Assembled under a set of consistent rules called the Constitution, we compete fiercely and win on a global scale. This is the kind of diverse team that CEOs covet and that builds great businesses. I’ve seen this dynamic in practice at two iconic companies, IBM and HP. When I joined, each had approximately $100 billion in revenues and more than 250,000 direct employees. Each had become proud, complacent, and insular. New ideas and new blood were unwelcome. In 1993, IBM was within months of bankruptcy. For the first time in the company’s history, the board hired a CEO from outside the company – an immigrant of sorts to the IBM nation. Louis Gerstner created an environment that gave new employees like me a chance to innovate and compete. We eventually shed the hard drive and the iconic IBM PC businesses – much to the chagrin of the old guard. Instead, we invested in software and analytics. Similarly, in 2011, HP was declining at a precipitous rate. A new CEO, Meg Whitman, came in to fix a company mired in complacency and isolationist thinking. She began infusing the company with new talent, including me. We eventually split the company into smaller ones that could move faster with new ideas and compete better. Both IBM and HP had suffered from stagnation: too many employees set in their ways, too few new ideas. One key to reviving them was bringing in new people. A healthy mix of old and new is critical to the vitality of a company – and the nation. Earlier this year, when the U.S. administration proposed and enacted changes to travel and immigration policies, my company set up a teleconference for U.S.-based employees. More than 10% dialed in, most of whom were born in unaffected countries such as China and Mexico. Employees asked whether we have a contingency plan if they were unable to reenter the U.S. after traveling abroad. Certainly, I would rather keep the talent who come to our universities and join our company within the United States. To retain those employees, however, if immigration and travel become more restrictive, we may be forced to expand Carbonite’s European and Canadian offices, much like Microsoft and other tech companies have done. Worries and logistical distractions hurting overall productivity is one thing. The imminent threat to innovation and progress is another. The technology sector already suffers from a significant talent shortage. Meaningful K-12 investment, internships, apprenticeships, and retraining of American workers are needed, along with immigration. The country also cannot afford to curtail the new companies and jobs that immigrants create. In recent months, I’ve thought back many times to my own path to U.S. citizenship. Three decades after I looked up from the bottom of that escalator, I am contributing to the economy and creating jobs in a meaningful way. The American Dream is still alive, and it is core to innovation and competitiveness. But we must protect it.

#### U.S. competitiveness is high and resilient

Rodriguez 16 (Michelle Drew, Michelle leads many of Deloitte’s Manufacturing Competitiveness research efforts as part of her role as the Manufacturing Leader for Deloitte’s Center for Industry Insights. She is an accomplished professional with 15 years of strategic and operational experience, having worked directly in the automotive industry as well as currently serving as an advisor to global manufacturing executives. She and her team have worked on a number of efforts that explored the future trends impacting the manufacturing industry, from the boardroom to the shop floor. She has most recently authored multiple research studies on the topic of manufacturing. The foundation of the research Michelle leads is based on dozens of interviews with CEOs, CTOs, governmental leaders, university presidents, national laboratory leaders, and labor union leaders as well as collaboration with organizations such as World Economic Forum, Council on Competitiveness, NAM, and The Manufacturing Institute. She has a MBA from the University of Michigan (Ross School of Business) and also holds a Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering from the University of Wisconsin. “Innovation drives competitiveness. But what drives innovation?” 7/25/16 https://innovation-in-manufacturing.deloitte.com/2016/07/25/innovation-drives-competitiveness-but-what-drives-innovation/)

Research shows advanced manufacturing is more essential than ever to economic competitiveness and prosperity. But what is involved in driving, sustaining, and applying the innovation that makes a company or country a leader in advanced manufacturing? In this post, I’ll explore the drivers that make the US a leader in innovation. Research and development (R&D) certainly plays a role, but the real key may be an intangible one: the innovation ecosystem.¶ The US innovation ecosystem has evolved significantly over the last century, transitioning from business monopolies dominating R&D early last century, assertive government sponsorship mid-century, to the current environment, within a globally connected world in which small and big businesses collaborate with universities, venture capitalists, and research institutions to drive the innovation ecosystem. Meanwhile, the technological focus of R&D has followed a similar arc, shifting from the creation of physical to digital products, to the more recent formation of new business models that combine the physical and digital worlds to create and capture new forms of value.¶ With capital, intellectual property, and talent flowing across borders with limited constraints, the United States faces fundamental questions of great importance to the future of its innovation ecosystem: How can it best cultivate the potential of advanced technologies to spur competitiveness? Can the United States continue to lead given the research spend and talent within other nations? No one entity houses all the brightest people or best ideas – the answer lies with looking outside your traditional walls.¶ Insights from our recent Advanced Technologies Initiative: Manufacturing and Innovation study indicated that, when it comes to tangible factors such as R&D spend, the United States is a clear leader.¶ We spend more on R&D in raw dollars than any other nation.2¶ We account for about one-third of the globe’s R&D spending. In comparison, the next-largest share is China’s, at less than one-quarter of the global total. The other eight in the top 10 barely surpass the US share when all combined.¶ This strong set of R&D capabilities reaches across many industries. In a recent global study3 that assessed R&D leadership in 10 top sectors, the United States was ranked number one for seven of those 10 sectors.¶ But we may not stay in the lead for long. Other countries are ramping up their spending. Some with far smaller R&D footprints—like Japan and South Korea—already outpace us in two measures of R&D intensity: spend as a percentage of GDP and researchers per million inhabitants.¶ As the graphic below shows, from 2000 through 2013, South Korea, China, and Taiwan dramatically expanded their R&D intensity in both respects, while the United States made little change over the same period.¶ And what about the US’s global lead in raw-dollar R&D spending? Experts predict China is on a pace to pass us by 2019.4 China already focuses more of its R&D on commercializing new technologies, while the US focuses a significant core on basic and applied research.5¶ The “secret sauce” of innovation¶ R&D spend alone isn’t a defensible advantage for the US. Other countries can—and do—increase their investments. And someday in the not too distant future they may very well surpass us. Does that mean we’ll lose our leadership? No. The enduring strength of US innovation, or of any nation’s capacity to invent, is more complicated than the number of dollars spent on R&D alone.¶ What matters is the innovation ecosystem–the complex collaboration between private business, government, academia, finance, independent research, and other functions to bring new products and services to market. An effective innovation ecosystem marshals top talent, allows ideas to flow, and lowers barriers to breakthroughs. The US’ entrepreneurial spirit and substantial funding from venture capital firms are huge competitive advantages and key differentiators for the country. It remains the center for “disruptive innovation” thanks to its research infrastructure and low barriers to entrepreneurs and start-ups.¶ It’s also more resilient with the sum being greater than the individual parts. That’s one of the hidden strengths of what the US brings to the challenge: Key stakeholders within our ecosystem have evolved over time to become less siloed and more collaborative. With the increasing pace of digitalization across the manufacturing industry, its innovation ecosystem has become a more closely connected system with stronger linkages between government, small business, big business, universities, venture capitalists, and research institutions that leverage and benefit from the deeper knowledge and connectivity between each other.¶ What’s next?¶ The US innovation ecosystem must continue to evolve to maintain our competitive position. To stay ahead, key players in the ecosystem should regularly analyze our relative position within the global innovation environment, identify challenges, and capitalize on our strengths.¶ For example, the US is a pioneer in basic and applied research. That’s long been a strength. But spending in these areas has stagnated over the last decade and the government contribution has shrunk as a percentage of the overall federal budget. This puts research performed at government-sponsored institutions at potential risk. Executives indicated that as basic and early applied research takes more time to deliver results in terms of tangible products and technologies, and how/when/where the learnings will be precisely applied aren’t known, it thereby makes it more difficult for shorter term sector specific businesses to nurture it properly. To keep our competitive edge, the government needs to maintain investment levels in the basic and early applied research to ensure a strong foundation for future success. While many other economies across the globe have increased their government R&D support, how should the innovation ecosystem respond? We need to focus on building efficient and effective collaboration and tech transfer mechanisms between basic and applied research as well as through to scale-up commercialization.¶ The health, adaptability, and success of a nation’s innovation ecosystem ultimately determines its competitiveness. When the ecosystem works, there is a continuous and self-reinforcing cycle in which breakthroughs bring new technologies and products to market, sales and profits increase, and companies invest more in R&D. Our nation’s success hinges on the ability of industry, government, and research labs to work together and engage in ongoing dialogue about creating an environment in the US that continues to promote competitive R&D work and innovations in advanced manufacturing.

#### Competitiveness isn’t key to heg

Wohlforth et al 8(William, Dartmouth government professor, 2008 World out of Balance, International Relations and the Challenge of American Primacy, pg 32-5,ldg)

American primacy is also rooted in the county's position as the world's leading technological power. The United States remains dominant globally in overall R&D investments, high-technology production, commercial innovation, and higher education (table 2.3). Despite the weight of this evidence, elite perceptions of U.S. power had shifted toward pessimism by the middle of the first decade of this century. As we noted in chapter 1, this was partly the result of an Iraq-induced doubt about the utility of material predominance, a doubt redolent of the post-Vietnam mood. In retrospect, many assessments of U.S. economic and technological prowess from the 1990s were overly optimistic; by the next decade important potential vulnerabilities were evident. In particular, chronically imbalanced domestic finances and accelerating public debt convinced some analysts that the United States once again confronted a competitiveness crisis.23 If concerns continue to mount, this will count as the fourth such crisis since 1945; the first three occurred during the 1950s (Sputnik), the 1970s (Vietnam and stagflation), and the 1980s (the Soviet threat and Japan's challenge). None of these crises, however, shifted the international system's structure: multipolarity did not return in the 1960s, 1970s, or early 1990s, and each scare over competitiveness ended with the American position of primacy retained or strengthened.24 Our review of the evidence of U.S. predominance is not meant to suggest that the United States lacks vulnerabilities or causes for concern. In fact, it confronts a number of significant vulnerabilities; of course, this is also true of the other major powers.25 The point is that adverse trends for the United States will not cause a polarity shift in the near future. If we take a long view of U.S. competitiveness and the prospects for relative declines in economic and technological dominance, one takeaway stands out: relative power shifts slowly. The United States has accounted for a quarter to a third of global output for over a century. No other economy will match its combination of wealth, size, technological capacity, and productivity in the foreseeable future (tables 2.2 and 2.3). The depth, scale, and projected longevity of the U.S. lead in each critical dimension of power are noteworthy. But what truly distinguishes the current distribution of capabilities is American dominance in all of them simultaneously. The chief lesson of Kennedy's 500-year survey of leading powers is that nothing remotely similar ever occurred in the historical experience that informs modern international relations theory. The implication is both simple and underappreciated: the counterbalancing constraint is inoperative and will remain so until the distribution of capabilities changes fundamentally. The next section explains why.

## Politics

### 2AC – Plan Popular

#### The plan is popular with both sides

Valant 17 — Jon Valant is a Fellow in the Brown Center on Education Policy at the Brookings Institution. Jon holds a Ph.D. in Education and M.A. in Political Science from Stanford University, an M.P.P. from the Harvard Kennedy School, and a B.A. from the University of Michigan, 2-7-2017 ("Donald Trump, Betsy DeVos, and the changing politics of charter schools", Brookings, Accessed Online at https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2017/02/07/donald-trump-betsy-devos-and-the-changing-politics-of-charter-schools/, Accessed on 7-9-2017, SV)

THE HISTORY OF SCHOOL CHOICE POLITICS

Politics makes strange bedfellows, and this certainly has been true for school choice politics. Early voucher and charter programs were rooted in political alliances between conservatives, motivated by market efficiency and individual liberty, and civil rights groups, motivated by equity and opportunity. Howard Fuller, a civil rights leader in Milwaukee, argued that African-Americans have made political progress only when they had some form of “interest convergence” with those in power. The interest convergence that Fuller found with Wisconsin’s Republican governor, Tommy Thompson (among others), helped create the political conditions to launch the Milwaukee Parental School Choice Program as the country’s first modern private school choice program.

Historically, Republican leaders have enthusiastically embraced school choice reforms, while Democratic leaders have been more selective (and varied) in which programs they support. Many Democrats—and, of course, teachers unions—have been reluctant to embrace either charters or private school choice programs. Many other Democrats, including former presidents Bill Clinton and Barack Obama, have distinguished their generally supportive positions on charter schools from their generally unsupportive positions on vouchers. This distinction might have contributed to charter schools eclipsing private school choice programs in enrollment and public attention.

A recent EdNext report documenting 10-year trends in public opinion suggests that public opinion might not split along party lines in quite the way it does with party leaders. That report found that majorities of both Republicans and Democrats, but substantially higher percentages of Republicans, have supported charter schools. Support for vouchers is more modest in both parties, with Democrats, intriguingly, being more supportive of vouchers than Republicans.

Notably, a large percentage of the public seems uninformed or misinformed about charters and choice. In a 2014 PDK/Gallup poll, for example, 48 percent of respondents incorrectly said that charter schools are free to teach religion and 40 percent said that charter schools can charge tuition. PDK/Gallup observed similar percentages of incorrect responses when it asked those questions in 2006 and 2009. With charter schools more salient in U.S. politics than ever before as political and media elites discuss the DeVos nomination, this could be a period of change in Americans’ awareness and opinion of charters.

THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF SCHOOL CHOICE POLITICS

Public opinion surveys from EdNext indicate that support for vouchers might be trending downwards while support for charter schools has held steady among both Democrats and Republicans (58 and 74 percent in 2016, respectively). However, even the surveys administered in May/June 2016 might not capture the potential effects of recent developments in the politics of charter schools, especially on the Democratic side.

### 2AC – No Link

#### Even if democrats hate the plan, it doesn’t matter—they’re not key to tax reform—Trump needs to unify the Republican majority

#### Charter schools are bipartisan, and democrats like integration

Vyse 17 (Graham Vyse, Staff Writer at The New Republic, February 1, 2017, “Are Charter Schools Good or Bad for Black Students?” The New Republic, <https://newrepublic.com/article/140319/charter-schools-good-bad-black-students>, accessed 7/20/17)//ac

Black History Month began Wednesday, and this year’s theme is “The Crisis in Black Education.” According to the Association for the Study of African American Life and History, the group that founded BHM—this crisis “has grown significantly in urban neighborhoods where public schools lack resources, endure overcrowding, exhibit a racial achievement gap, and confront policies that fail to deliver substantive opportunities.” Delivering those opportunities is one of America’s unfinished civil rights imperatives. But it will require resolving new divisions within the racial justice movement over one of the great hopes for extending educational opportunity: Charter schools. President Barack Obama championed these publicly funded but independently run schools, whose promise is that freedom from traditional bureaucratic regulation will allow educators to innovate, thus improving student outcomes. Unlike vouchers—essentially publicly funded passes for select students to attend private school, which Democrats typically oppose—charters are a public form of “school choice” that enjoys bipartisan support. In particular, supporters see them as a lifeline to poor and minority families; most are located in urban and other low-income areas across the country.

#### Funding for charter schools is bipartisan—republican control ensures popularity

Roberts 6/12 (Joshua Roberts, writer and reporter for Reuters, June 12, 2017, “Charter Schools See Opportunity With Republicans in Power: Lobbying Group” Reuters, <https://www.usnews.com/news/us/articles/2017-06-12/charter-schools-see-opportunity-with-republicans-in-power-lobbying-group>, accessed 7/20/17)//ac

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - Having Republicans control both the White House and Congress could deliver more federal funds to charter schools and also create competition for dollars from alternative approaches to education, the head of a charter school lobbying group told its members on Monday. President Donald Trump and Education Secretary Betsy DeVos, both Republicans, suggested in their proposed budget last month to increase federal funding for charter schools, which are public schools that are run independently from local districts, typically by a corporation. "We have a huge opportunity to score major funding increases for our movement," said National Alliance for Public Charter Schools President Nina Rees at an annual meeting. "But if you don't speak up now, we may never have as good a chance to make a difference for our students." More than three million children across the country attend charter schools, Rees said. The budget also proposed increasing money for other "school choice" programs, primarily giving families vouchers to pay private school tuition. The overall education budget would be cut by $9 billion under the Trump administration's plan, which Congress must still approve. The two major teacher unions, the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers, have said the budget would slash public school funding to free up money for private initiatives. Democrats have supported charter schools in the past, but now are nervous about associating themselves with Trump policies, Rees said. Republicans have long wanted to pursue ideas different from the traditional state schools.

## School Choice CP

### Inev/aff good

#### AT School Choice Bad/CP – it is inevitable – it is only a question of slowing it

Potter 13 — Halley Potter is a fellow at The Century Foundation, where she researches public policy solutions for addressing educational inequality. She graduated summa cum laude from Yale University with a bachelor’s degree in religious studies, 6-10-2013 ("Three Reasons to Support Integrated Charter Schools", Century Foundation, Accessed Online at https://tcf.org/content/commentary/three-reasons-to-support-integrated-charter-schools/, Accessed on 7-10-2017, SV)

School choice is already a reality; we need to focus on providing more equitable access to choice, not slowing the growth of choice.

There is a chance that kids in our country might be better off if everyone was thrown into a hat and assigned to a school randomly. The more that choice is an element in getting into a good school, the greater the risk that students whose parents have less access to information or less time to devote the school search will be disadvantaged.

But, according to a recent Brookings report, more than half of all parents in this country already exercise choice over their children’s school, and 27 percent of parents do so by selecting their home based on access to schools. If we stop the expansion of charter schools and other public choice schools, middle-class families will still have the option to select private schools or move into a different school district, but low-income families will be left with very few options.

The solution to the inequities introduced by choice is not to limit choice but to expand it. Charter schools should conduct aggressive outreach to low-income families, and more districts should adopt a “controlled choice” system like the one in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

### Choice is Bad

#### Choice reifies neoliberalism – it undermines educational equality.

- Choice CP fails

Blakely 17 — Assistant professor of political philosophy at Pepperdine University (Jason Blakely, 4-17-2017, "How School Choice Turns Education Into a Commodity," Atlantic, https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2017/04/is-school-choice-really-a-form-of-freedom/523089/, Accessed 7-6-2017, JWS)

Buoyed by Donald Trump’s championing of a voucher system—and cheered on by his education secretary Betsy DeVos—Arizona just passed one of the country's most thoroughgoing policies in favor of so-called “school of choice.” The legislation signed by Governor Doug Ducey allows students who withdraw from the public system to use their share of state funding for private school, homeschooling, or online education. Making educational funding “portable” is part of a much wider political movement that began in the 1970s—known to scholars as neoliberalism—which views the creation of markets as necessary for the existence of individual liberty. In the neoliberal view, if your public institutions and spaces don’t resemble markets, with a range of consumer options, then you aren’t really free. The goal of neoliberalism is thereby to rollback the state, privatize public services, or (as in the case of vouchers) engineer forms of consumer choice and market discipline in the public sector. DeVos is a fervent believer in neoliberalizing education—spending millions of dollars on and devoting herself to political activism for the spread of voucher-system schooling. In a speech on educational reform from 2015, DeVos expressed her long-held view that the public-school system needs to be reengineered by the government to mimic a market. The failure to do so, she warned, would be the stagnation of an education system run monopolistically by the government: Many Americans now find DeVos’s neoliberal way of thinking commonsensical. After all, people have the daily experience of being able to choose competing consumer products on a market. Likewise, many Americans rightly admire entrepreneurial pluck. Shouldn’t the intelligence and creativity of Silicon Valley’s markets be allowed to cascade down over public education, washing the system clean of its encrusted bureaucracy? What much fewer people realize is that the argument over “school of choice” is only the latest chapter in a decades-long political struggle between two models of freedom—one based on market choice and the other based on democratic participation. Neoliberals like DeVos often assume that organizing public spaces like a market must lead to beneficial outcomes. But in doing so, advocates of school of choice ignore the political ramifications of the marketization of shared goods like the educational system. The first point to consider when weighing whether or not to marketize the public school system is that markets always have winners and losers. In the private sector, the role of competition is often positive. For example, Friendster, the early reigning king of social networks, failed to create a format that people found as useful and attractive as Facebook. The result was that it eventually vanished. When businesses like Friendster fail, no significant public damage is done. Indeed, it is arguably a salutary form of what the economist Joseph Schumpeter called “creative destruction,” which is a feature of market innovation. But should all goods in a society be subjected to the forces of creative destruction? What happens to a community when its public schools are defunded or closed because they could not “compete” in a marketized environment? In Detroit (where DeVos played a big role in introducing school choice) two decades of this marketization has led to extreme defunding and closing of public schools; the funneling of taxpayer money toward for-profit charter ventures; economically disadvantaged parents with worse options than when the neoliberal social experiment began; and finally, no significant increase in student performance. Indeed, some zones of Detroit are now educational deserts where parents and children have to travel exorbitant miles and hours for their children to attend school. On the whole, neoliberalization is hardest on the poor. Market choice does, however, favor those who already have the education, wealth, and wherewithal to plan, coordinate, and execute moving their children to the optimal educational setting. This means the big beneficiaries of school of choice are often the rich. For instance, when Nevada recently passed an aggressive school-of-choice system the result was that the vast majority of those able to take advantage of it came from the richest areas of Reno and Las Vegas. As money is pulled from failing schools and funneled into succeeding ones, wealth can actually be redistributed by the state up the socioeconomic ladder. Market competition in the context of schools thus opens the possibility for a vicious cycle in which weak and low-performing communities are punished for their failings and wealthy communities receive greater and greater funding advantages. Americans should ask themselves a basic question of justice when it comes to the education system: Should it be organized around a model in which the more you win the more you get, and the more you lose the less you are given? Markets are by their nature non-egalitarian. For this reason, neoliberalization has been one of the biggest factors contributing to the growing inequalities and diminishment of the middle and lower classes. A common neoliberal response to this is simply to say that economic inequality is the cost paid for individual liberty and personal responsibility. But the problem is that this discourse of individualism followed to its logical conclusion eliminates any public goods whatsoever. For example, if student funds are portable based on consumption choices, why shouldn’t the growing number of childless taxpayers be able to move their funding outside the education system entirely toward goods they actually consume, like dog parks or public golf courses? This is the logical conclusion of Margaret Thatcher’s famous neoliberal pronouncement that “there is no such thing as society” but only “individual men and women.” The problem with this way of thinking is that education is not simply another commodity to buy and sell on a market. It is a shared good. Free societies need educated members to intelligently and critically deliberate over public life, select representatives, and help guide policy decisions. Market freedom is thus in tension with the freedom of democratic participation. Many people recognize this fact and for that reason favor coordinating action and sharing costs through the government when it comes to goods like education, defense, public parks, transportation, public health, and the environment. Yet forming a shared collective action through government or a labor organization is the one kind of individual freedom that neoliberal philosophy does not tolerate. As the preeminent historian of neoliberalism, David Harvey, puts it, “neoliberals have to put strong limits on democratic governance … while individuals are supposedly free to choose, they are not supposed to choose to construct strong collective institutions.” Neoliberalism is thereby fundamentally opposed to any democratic, individual choices that seek to constrain markets—be it teachers unions or simply majority decisions about how to fund and shape public schools. Indeed, historically speaking, neoliberal attempts to marketize public goods are often unpopular and so have required non-majoritarian institutions like the courts, the World Bank, or even strong men and authoritarians (like Chile’s Augusto Pinochet) to enact policies against the will of the majority. Authoritarianism and market freedoms can and often do go together. There is a basic tension between neoliberal market choice and democratic freedom to shape one’s community in ways that do not conform to market logic. Of course, thoughtful advocates of school choice might argue that while perhaps there are reasons to be skeptical of neoliberal theory, there are many schools of choice that in practice are phenomenal sites for educational innovation. Such advocates might point to cases of successful charter schools in poorer communities—for example, the Knowledge Is Power Program (or “KIPP”) charter schools across the country. Although KIPP is nonprofit, it is still engaged in the project of neoliberalizing public goods by introducing consumer choice as a form of subjecting the school system to a kind of market discipline. KIPP is not without its critics, but there is also undeniable merit in efforts to experiment with education on a more local level (some of these carried out by intelligent well-meaning teachers and administrators at charter schools). Rejecting neoliberal policies like school choice does not mean that people such as DeVos and charter-school employees who are attracted to experimentation and less centralization of curriculum don’t have a point. America’s public schools—like all institutions—are in constant need of reform, rejuvenation, and innovation. But debates about “freedom” and educational reform might be more constructive if participants center their questions around democratic freedoms—the freedom of every citizen to access education and the freedom of various communities to shape what that education looks like. Arguments over democratic freedom might contest how much of curriculum decision-making can be taken rightfully by the federal government versus devolution onto localities. Likewise, disagreements over democratic freedom could involve constructive debates over whether and how to fund private religious schools.

## States CP

### Segregation

#### Can’t solve segregation—states find ways to avoid enforcement and it ignores differences

Parker 12 — James A. Webster Professor of Public Law, Wake Forest University School of Law (Wendy Parker, 2012, "From the Failure of Desegregation to the Failure of Choice" Washington University Journal of Law & Policy, http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1578&amp;context=law\_journal\_law\_policy, Accessed 7-3-2017, JWS)

The overwhelming majority of states require no attention to diversity and integration by their charter schools for charter schools to receive and maintain a charter. Only twelve of the forty states and the District of Columbia authorizing charter schools have any integration or diversity requirements at all. Nevada and South Carolina have the strictest provisions because they have specific numerical goals. Nevada’s statute mandates that charter school enrollments be within ten percentage points of the student demographics of the school district in which the charter school is located. South Carolina mandates a more forgiving standard—twenty percentage points. California, Florida, Kansas, New Jersey, North Carolina, and Wisconsin do not specify any defined percentage, but generally require that their charter schools reflect the racial composition of the student enrollment in the surrounding school district. Connecticut, Hawaii, Ohio, and Rhode Island require a more general commitment to ensuring diverse student populations in their charter schools. In sum, of the forty-one jurisdictions allowing charter schools, only twelve pay some sort of statutory attention to integration. Twenty-eight states and the District of Columbia make no mention of either diversity or integration. Even the states requiring some attention to student demographics have limited enforcement measures. A South Carolina charter school running afoul of the racial standard need only prove that the school is not ―operating in a racially discriminatory manner. Likewise, Nevada requires the integration only ―if practicable. I found no specific, statutory guidance on how the schools were to attain racial balance. I found no state that included any provisions on producing integration. Instead, charter school legislation treats all students alike in terms of admission and outreach efforts. Given the differences by race and class embedded in choice, treating everyone alike almost guarantees segregative outcomes. Not surprisingly, even states with racial balancing provisions have segregated charter schools. An examination of charter schools in Nevada and South Carolina, the only states with specific numerical diversity requirements, reveals that their charter schools still suffer from segregation. Through a quick study of the states’ websites, I easily discovered schools in each state that were segregated when compared to the school’s surrounding school district. For example, in Nevada, Rainbow Dreams Academy is more than 90 percent black, while its surrounding school district (Las Vegas, Clark County) is 12 percent African American. That same school district, which is 32 percent white, also has a charter school, Beacon Academy of Nevada, with a 62 percent white student population. In South Carolina, approximately 13 percent of the charter schools are virtual, online schools. One such school operating in Columbia, South Carolina, is 68 percent white, while the two school districts in Columbia are overwhelmingly African American. The disconnect between charter school legislation promoting racial balance and the practice of segregation is not new. An earlier study by the U.S. Department of Education identified twelve states with high rates of segregation in their charter schools. Yet, five of the states listed also required racial balancing in their charter schools. In sum, the reality of charter school operations contradicts legislative racial balancing provisions, suggesting their ineffectiveness and meaninglessness.

#### States can’t solve—OCR handles issues of equality and discrimination

Mansukhani 17 — (Sunil Mansukhani, 2-8-2017, "Finding common ground for the Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights," Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2017/02/08/finding-common-ground-for-the-department-of-educations-office-for-civil-rights/, Accessed 4-25-2017, JWS)

Since Donald Trump’s election, there has been a great deal of media speculation about the future of the U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR), an agency tasked with fighting discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, and disability in federally assisted education programs. The overwhelming majority of OCR’s work involves investigating and resolving discrimination complaints against educational institutions. OCR also issues policy guidance, provides technical assistance, publishes civil rights data, and responds to requests for information. Much of the speculation about OCR’s future has centered on whether the new administration will walk back certain policy guidance documents issued during the Obama years. I will leave that issue for another day, and instead focus on areas of what I hope are common ground. As the new administration gets started, let me suggest two areas in which all sides should be able to agree that our educational institutions could use additional guidance because they are emerging areas of law. I also suggest a third area that must continue so that the pursuit of equity under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) can become a reality. PROVIDE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES WITH THE TOOLS TO COMBAT CYBERBULLYING With a phone increasingly becoming a part of every student’s backpack, it is incumbent upon the Trump administration to provide schools, colleges, and universities with guidelines about their responsibilities in this rapidly emerging area. According to Department of Education data, nearly 7 percent of students ages 12-18 reported being cyberbullied during the 2012-13 school year. That amounts to over 2 million students per year who have to endure this behavior. There is no question that cyberbullying can have a negative effect on academic performance, and the news has shown examples of far more tragic consequences. I was heartened to hear that cyberbullying is among the issues the first lady hopes to address. Developing this guidance will undoubtedly raise difficult questions about the scope of students’ First Amendment rights, as well as the legal obligations of educational institutions in addressing conduct that may have begun off school grounds. But there is no doubt this issue is here to stay, and OCR is well positioned to address it. OCR’s career staff have literally decades of experience addressing instances of bullying and how it has evolved over the years. Aside from describing an institution’s legal responsibilities, OCR can provide examples of best practices and disseminate relevant research to state and local education agencies. ENSURE EMERGING TECHNOLOGY IS ACCESSIBLE TO STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES The degree to which technology pervades our classrooms seemingly increases by the day. There is certainly a robust debate about whether our increasing reliance on technology actually improves academic performance or helps our students think more critically. There is no debate, however, that students with disabilities, such as print disabilities, have no chance of benefiting from these advances if the technology is not accessible to them. In 2015, for example, over 450,000 school-age children had a vision disability in the United States. The Obama administration, including OCR, took many steps to ensure that students with disabilities have equal access to educational programs and services. These steps included issuing guidance on how educational institutions can ensure their electronic information, such as websites, are accessible to students with disabilities, and reaching resolution agreements with a number of school districts and colleges that did not have accessible information. The Trump administration should continue these efforts, as technology will keep evolving at a breakneck pace. The most comprehensive OCR guidance on this topic was issued in 2011. At that time, electronic book readers were still considered a type of emerging technology; today, my kids use their electronic book readers as paperweights. Google Hangouts had not even burst onto the scene, and Pinterest was just in its infancy. The government should do its best to keep up with these changes so that “equal access” is not just a legal buzzword, but also a practical reality. PROMOTE TRANSPARENCY BY CONTINUING THE CIVIL RIGHTS DATA COLLECTION The Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) is a biennial survey of public schools that examines barriers to educational opportunity, and has been around since before the Department of Education became its own federal agency. The CRDC has been a sleeping giant for many of these years, until the Obama administration overhauled it and made the results much more publicly accessible. The results have been dramatic, as now everyone has the tools on their desktop (or phone) to see how their school, district, or state is doing in its pursuit of equity. Admittedly, the CRDC has not been free of controversy, as some school districts have complained that the collection is too burdensome. Those complaints, which were relatively few to begin with, have lessened over time as the collection has become institutionalized–so much so that important parts of the CRDC have become a part of ESSA. For instance, the state and school district report cards required by ESSA must include data that’s already collected by the CRDC, such as rates of in-school suspensions, referrals to law enforcement, instances of bullying and harassment, number of students enrolled in accelerated coursework, number of inexperienced teachers, and per-pupil expenditures. The CRDC data, such as those listed above, provide a critical window into how ESSA is playing out around the country and how the law’s implementation is affecting our most vulnerable students. Fortunately, new Secretary of Education Betsy Devos’s answers to questions from Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) during her confirmation hearing last month indicate that she will continue it. SERVING EVERY STUDENT Also during that hearing, DeVos affirmed her commitment for every student in America to be in a safe environment free from discrimination. The suggestions above provide her with immediate opportunities where the OCR’s work can continue to demonstrate that commitment.

#### Only the federal government can successfully address discrimination

Duncan Former Secretary of Education 17 — (Arne Duncan, 3-12-2017, "Arne Duncan: Trump, DeVos should preserve Office of Civil Rights to safeguard students," No Publication, http://getschooled.blog.myajc.com/2017/03/12/arne-duncan-trump-devos-should-preserve-office-of-civil-rights-to-safeguard-students/, Accessed 4-25-2017, JWS)

I strongly agree. To learn, every child has the right to be who they are at school and to feel protected from discrimination, abuse and injustice. This is not the case for far too many children across our country. The federal government has a long history of deferring to states and school districts on educational matters like standards, curriculum, funding and day-to-day operations. But when it comes to protecting students, federal law is clear: Civil rights are paramount. Sadly, states and local school districts have a long history of valuing some students more than others. A history of providing more—more spending, more high quality teachers, more advanced courses – to the children of the powerful than to those of everybody else. A history of excluding those who are different, especially if they are more challenging—or more expensive—to educate. That’s why Congress has repeatedly passed education and civil rights laws that require the U.S. Department of Education to protect vulnerable students and monitor the progress of states and districts in providing quality education to every child, in every classroom, in every state. We wish such oversight were no longer necessary. In Georgia alone, there are some heart-wrenching examples. In 2016, the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights investigated a Georgia school district (not named to protect the identity of the student involved) where a student who wore a hijab said she was the target of verbal and physical harassment by her classmates, including being called a “terrorist.” The student eventually left the school because the district did not address the hostile climate of the school and made no effort to extend counseling to the student even though she was distraught over the harassment. With federal intervention, the district created new policies on harassment, provided training to teachers and administrators and created a climate survey for students to determine what else needed to be addressed. In 2015, OCR investigated allegations that Wilcox County Schools discriminated in the recruitment and hiring of black teachers. During investigation, OCR learned that the district employed only 9 black teachers, out of 102 teachers total, even though there was a much larger number of black teachers living in the county or in surrounding counties and the student population in the district is was 36 percent black. Through federal intervention, the district agreed to revamp its recruitment and hiring policies. In 2014, a student in Rockdale County Schools was removed from the district’s AVID college readiness program because he had a disability and was told that students with disabilities couldn’t participate in the program. After OCR opened an investigation, the district agreed to not only allow the student to re-enroll in the program, but it also sent information on AVID to other students with disabilities in the district who were discouraged from applying because of their disabilities. These are not isolated problems, and they are not unique to Georgia. According to data from the Department of Education’s Civil Rights Data Collection, Americans learned that high schools enrolling concentrations of black and Latino students are less likely to offer courses in calculus, physics and chemistry than those that are predominantly white. We also learned that black students are almost four times as likely as white students to receive one or more out-of-school suspensions. Students with disabilities are more than twice as likely as those without. Publishing these data has inspired action on both these fronts, and helped lead the way to a 20 percent reduction in school suspensions nationwide. The Trump administration has repeatedly implied that OCR has overstepped its boundaries in enforcing the law. At various times, President Trump, Attorney General Jeff Sessions and Education Secretary Betsy DeVos have signaled that enforcing federal civil rights laws is “best left to states.” I strongly disagree. Leaving enforcement of civil rights laws to states will breed chaos, undermine the education of millions of children, and subject students of every age to abuse, neglect, indifference and outright racism, sexism, and anti-immigrant hostility. The Trump administration has no authority to simply abdicate responsibility to enforce civil rights laws.

### Inequality

#### States will compete with each other and focus on creating productive employees—increases market education

Hursh and Martina 14 — Hursh is an Associate Professor at the Warner Graduate School of Education and Human Development, University of Rochester and Martina is a Doctoral Student at the Warner Graduate School of Education and Human Development, University of Rochester (David Hursh and Camille Anne Martina, 8-6-14, "," No Publication, http://www.jceps.com/wp-content/uploads/PDFs/01-2-02.pdf, Accessed 7-14-2017, JWS)

The United States, like many countries, is transforming its educational system within the context of the changing global economic system. Internationally, education increasingly focuses on those subjects and dispositions that increase citizens’ economic productivity. Susan Robertson describes the changing mandate as requiring “educational systems, through creating appropriately skilled and entrepreneurial citizens and workers able to generate new and added economic values, will enable nations to be responsive to changing conditions within the international marketplace” (Robertson, 2000, p. 187). In the U.S. policy makers have initiated accountability systems in which standardized tests are used to determine whether students are to graduate or be promoted from one grade to another and to evaluate schools and school districts. Further, the federal government and some states are transforming education into a market system though charter (publicly funded private governed) schools, vouchers (public funding that students can use for private school tuition) and school choice (permitted students to choose between schools within and across school districts1 ). Jill Blackmore (2000) describes these changes as shifting “from the liberal to the vocational, from education’s intrinsic value to its instrumental value, and from qualitative to quantitative measures of success” (p. 134). Schools are decreasingly concerned with developing thoughtful informed citizens and more concerned with raising test scores and preparing economically productive employees. In this paper we will undertake a critical policy analysis in which we place educational reform within the context of the social structure and examine its implications for social inequality. In particular, we situate our analysis within the rise of increased global economic competition and neo-liberal policies in which the government seeks to retain legitimacy by instituting reforms to improve education while, at the same time, reducing education funding as part of the overall plan to reduce governmental expenditures on social services and, if possible, to privatize them. As evidence we will draw primarily on the federal government’s implementation of No Child Left Behind Act and New York State’s new testing and graduation requirements. Over the last decade education in the U.S. has undergone the largest transformation within its history. While the federal government provides less than ten percent of public school funding, it has intervened to an unprecedented degree, through the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), in elementary and secondary education. Previous to the passage of NCLB, elementary and secondary school education policies were the responsibility of the state and local governments. However, with NCLB the federal government has determined which subject areas take precedence, limits the ways in which they may be taught, and designates what reform options are available to schools and districts that fail to improve sufficiently their aggregated test scores. The federal government now requires standardized testing in math and reading (and later science), which are to be used to determine whether schools or districts are making “adequate yearly progress” (AYP). Students in schools that a designated as failing for two consecutive years (and in some states this is ninety percent of the schools) are given the option of enrolling in a successful school in their district or, if there are no successful schools in their district, in another district. NCLB, along with charter schools and voucher systems, introduces markets into education, therefore introducing a market system in public education. While previous to NCLB, some states (Amrein & Berliner, December 2002) were using standardized tests to hold students, teachers, and schools accountable, NCLB extends testing and accountability to all states. One state that had already initiated a system of testing and accountability is New York. The State Education Department (SED) and the Board of Regents have created standards for all the subject areas and have instituted standardized tests in a variety of subject areas and grade levels. Elementary students are required to take standardized tests in grades four, five, six, and eight. High school students take standardized Regents exams at the culmination of most courses but must pass the exams in five subject areas in order to earn a high-school diploma. Because these exams are used to compare teachers, students, schools, and school districts; and passing the exams is required for high school graduation, these have become high-stakes exams. A variety of data indicates that the emphasis on testing and accountability has not resulted in improved education. Numerous reports reveal that the emphasis on raising test scores is leading to students being pushed out of schools so that their low or failing score will not harm the school’s passing rate or aggregate score (Haney, August 19, 2000; Winerip, August 13, 2003; Lewin & Medina, July 31, 2003; Medina & Lewin, August 1, 2003). In New York, the new requirements have resulted in an increased dropout rate, especially for students of color, students for whom English is a second language, students living in poverty, and students with disabilities (Monk, Sipple & Killeen 2001). Elementary teachers report that they are pressured to spend more time preparing students for the tests given at their own or subsequent grade levels and less time teaching those subject areas not tested. For example, fourth grade teachers are pressured to prepare students not only to do well on the English Language Arts exam, the first standardized exam given to elementary students, but also to prepare fourth graders for the social studies exam given in the fall of fifth grade. The pressure placed on fourth grade teachers is causing many of them to request transfers to other grades or to resign from teaching. (Goodnough, June 14, 2001; Monk, Sipple and Killeen 2002). Furthermore, secondary teachers report that they devote increased time to teaching toward the test. One group of students, in particular, has been harmed by the standardized testing requirements. Previous to this year, many English as a second language (ESL) students excelled in their courses and were accepted to university, but did not graduate because they could pass all but their English Regents exam. This year the ESL students face an additional problem. Because the ESL exam, an exam that they must pass to be waived from ESL courses, was made significantly more difficult, few have been able to pass the exam, even though they could pass the English Regents exam required for graduation! While no statewide figures are available, schools reported that fewer than 10 percent of students passed the ESL test, essentially relegating them to less academic courses (Winerip, Sept. 17, 2003). Students of color, living in poverty, and for whom English is a second language are facing more not fewer education barriers. The exams are exacerbating, not lessening, inequality High-stakes testing and accountability has had a negative effect on teachers and students by narrowing the curriculum and increasing the number of students dropping out and teachers leaving schools. How is it, then, that the tests have received such widespread support and are only recently receiving public resistance and critical commentary? In order to answer that question we need to place the rise of high-stakes tests and accountability systems within the context of the changing economic, political, and cultural policies (Dale, Fall 2000) of the last three decades. In particular, we will situate schooling within the demise of Keynesian and the rise of neo-liberal policies, the denigration of collective social responsibility and the rise of individualism, and the implementation of systems of auditing and accountability. Beginning in the 1970s, neo-liberal policies began replacing Keynesian policies in North American, Europe and much of the rest of the world. Post World War II Keynesian economic policies focused on providing a stable and growing economy through government intervention in the economic cycle and support of social services such as education, health and welfare. In contrast, neo-liberal policies focus on reducing tax revenues and, consequently, social spending. The federal government, particularly under the current Bush administration, has vastly increased military spending and reduced corporate and individual taxes, creating a budget deficit that forces social service cuts (The Nation, Sept. 18, 2003). As the federal government has shifted social spending to states, states, which also compete with one another to reduce taxes and thus create a “favorable business climate,” spend the least that is politically feasible on social services. In order to reduce resistance to cuts in social services, neo-liberal governments have attempted to retain legitimacy by shifting social responsibility from society to the individual and using auditing and accounting procedures to improve education efficiency. Conservative leaders in both the U.S. and Britain have embarked on an ideological crusade to shift social responsibility from the community to the individual, thereby transforming the relationship between the individual and society. Margaret Thatcher portrayed this ideology most succinctly when she stated “there is no such thing as society…There are individual men and women, and there are families. And no government can do anything except through people, and people must look to themselves first” (Thatcher, 1993: 626-7 cited in Gillborn & Youdell, 2000). Thatcher’s statement shifts responsibility for success or failure entirely onto the individual and family. Thatcher, Gillborn and Youdell (2000) note, “perfectly encapsulated an ideological drive that reduced everything to individualized relationships between providers and consumers, and understood inequality variously as a sign of personal/community deficit or part of the necessary spur to achievement in a meritocracy” (Gilborn & Youdell, 39). By reducing success to individual merit, schooling becomes one more consumer choice where one benefits by choosing wisely. Consequently, both Britain’s and the U.S.’s educational policies increasingly focus on developing educational markets in which schools compete for students and families. In Britain each school’s students’ aggregated performance on a variety of exams is published yearly in what are commonly referred to as “league tables.” Gillborn and Youdell (2000) state that “according to the rhetoric of the market place, the tables are meant to provide ‘objective’ indicators of quality so that consumers can discriminate between the competing institutions” (p. 26). Similarly, in the US NCLB legislation requires that states post the test results for each school and identify schools as either achieving or failing to achieve “adequate yearly progress,” (AYP) with students given the option to leave failing for passing schools. (However, given the high percentage of schools designated as failing in a district and state, the number of openings for students is a small percentage of the students eligible to transfer.) While collective responsibility is denigrated and education is reduced to a system where everyone competes for the best schools, government must still be seen as supporting education. As neo-liberal governments reduce social welfare expenditures, they must be careful to retain the legitimacy of the economic system and policies. While inequality is exacerbated and funding for education is reduced, neo-liberal governments must develop strategies that legitimate its policy making (Bonal 2003, p. 160). Therefore, governments need to appear to be concerned with and supporting education even as they reduce funding. Further, because neo-liberals have condemned previous liberal governments for their intervention into the everyday lives of citizens either through welfare programs or regulations, neo-liberals must implement these reforms without direct intervention. Consequently, governments in many countries have resolved this dilemma by “steering at a distance” (Ball, 1994, p. 54). Rather than enacting coercive or prescriptive control, governments replace constraints with incentives. Auditing and accountability replace intervention, therefore lessening resistance. “Prescription is replaced by ex post accountability based on quality or outcome assessments. Coercion is replaced by self-steering- the appearance of autonomy. Opposition or resistance is side-stepped, displaced” (Ball, 1994, p. 54). Lastly, neo-liberal governments must adopt discourses that convince the public of the necessity of these reforms. They, therefore, embed their educational policies within a discourse of fairness and objectivity. As we will show, in the U.S. the state and federal governments claim that the reforms will result in improved education for all. Further, NCLB’s assessment of AYP is intended to “give them [parents and communities] objective data” through standardized testing (U.S. Department of Education, April 2002, p. 12). In the UK the “league tables” are meant to provide “objective indicators” of quality. In the remainder of this paper we will first briefly describe the shift from Keynesian to neo-liberal economic policies and demonstrate that the state, in order to retain legitimacy while reducing social services such as education, implements educational policies that indirectly controls education “from a distance” which they justify as improving education for all and providing objective assessments. We will then critique the policy claims of promoting fairness and objectivity and argue that, in fact, the outcomes are the opposite of the claims. The rise of neo-liberalism and education’s role in developing productive workers and legitimating the government Neo-liberalism arose as a corporate and political response to the Keynesian accommodation that existed to different degrees in Europe and North America after World War II. In contrast to the years preceding the war, an unusual level of agreement between corporations and workers marked the first two decades after the war. During this period workers consented to capital’s right not only to control the workplace but to allow capitalist control of investment and growth, primarily through the growth of multinational corporations. In exchange, workers, women, and people of color struggled for and were able to extend their personal and political rights for education, housing, health, workplace safety and to vote (Bowles & Gintis 1986, pp. 57-59). This same period was marked by unusually rapid and stable economic growth, fueled in large part because of the growing wages of workers. However, while workers were earning and spending more, businesses’ net rate of profit fell by more than fifty percent between 1965 and 1974 (Parenti, 1999, p. 118). Profits fell primarily because cost pressures from labor could not be passed on to consumers in the increasingly competitive and open world economy (Bowles & Gintis, 1986, p. 60). In order to restore higher rates of profit, the U.S. and other developed countries implemented monetarist and neo-liberal policies (Gill, 2003, p. 7) that would support corporations over workers. In the US monetarist policies restored the power of capital by inducing a recession to deflate wage demands, escalate the scarcity of jobs and reverse the growth of social spending. Such policies were instituted with the intent of reducing the living standards of all but wealthy Americans. In 1979 Paul Volcker, Federal Reserve Board Chairman, provided the following rationale for the recession: “The standard of living of the average American has to decline. I don’t think you can escape that” (Parenti, 1999, p. 119). Such monetarist policies were soon linked with neo-liberal policies that emphasize "the deregulation of the economy, trade liberalization, the dismantling of the public sector [such as education, health, and social welfare], and the predominance of the financial sector of the economy over production and commerce" (Vilas, 1996). In particular, the consequences for education are similar to that for all public goods and services. Tabb (2002) writes that neo-liberalism stresses the privatization of the public provision of goods and services—moving their provision from the public sector to the private—along with deregulating how private producers can behave, giving greater scope to the single-minded pursuit of profit and showing significantly less regard for the need to limit social costs or for redistribution based on nonmarket criteria. The aim of neoliberalism is to put into question all collective structures capable of obstructing the logic of the pure market. (p. 7) Efforts to privatize public services, then, are occurring worldwide, partly in response to the U.S. dominated World Bank and International Monetary Fund requirement that national governments develop economic policies that emphasize economic growth and property rights over social welfare and personal rights. In some countries, such a Chile, social security, health care, higher education and, to some extent, elementary and secondary education have been highly privatized (Collins and Lear, 1995). Such global changes led Stephen Gill to conclude that “[t]he social settlements and forms of state created after World War II have been transformed and in some respects destroyed” (Gill, 2003, p. 9). Efforts to dismantle the public sector have significant implications for educational policy. While some policy makers may desire to reduce funding for education, education remains significant as a means of developing productive workers and legitimizing current inequalities. As Roger Dale (Fall, 2000) notes, government policies need to support continued economic expansion while “providing a basis for legitimation of the system as a whole” (437). Increasing educational opportunity or reifying inequality? A system of standards, high-stakes testing and accountability has been implemented partly because it draws on continuing frustrations over public schools. Progressives have criticized schools for reproducing inequality through tracking working-class students and students of color into academically inferior courses and unequal funding (Apple 1982). Conservatives have criticized schools for their lack of standards and rigor and economic inefficiency (Apple 2001). Critics continually point out that the U.S. spends more per student than other countries but is not highly ranked when its academic results are compares with other countries. For example, Secretary of Education Paige recently used the newly released Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development report “Education at a Glance” to note that "[T]his report documents how little we receive in return for our national investment. This report also reminds us that we are battling two achievement gaps. One is between those being served well by our system and those being left behind. The other is between the U.S. and many of our higher achieving friends around the world. By closing the first gap, we will also close the second" (Ed Review, Sept. 26, 2003 ). Consequently, US policy makers at the state and federal levels have called for reforms such as standards, standardized testing, and accountability as a way to improve educational efficiency and ensure all students learn. Secretary of Education Paige describes NCLB as striving “to provide every boy and girl in America with a high quality of education—regardless of his or her income, ability or background” (US Dept of Ed, September 2002, p. 3). In this section we will examine the official claims that testing and accountability are improving education and argue that the evidence shows that the quality of schooling for most students is declining. The first rationale—that these reforms are necessary to ensure that all students learn— is reflected in policy statements as the state and federal levels. In New York, the state’s educational policy makers, including the past Chancellor, Carl Hayden, and present Commissioner of Education, Richard Mills, justify the testing and accountability regime on the grounds that standards and standardized testing are the only way to ensure that all students, including students of color and those living in poverty, have an opportunity to learn. They argue that it is these same students who, because of the end of industrialization and the rise of globalization, can no longer be permitted to fail. All students must succeed educationally to ensure that the individual and the nation succeed economically. They also point out, as progressives have, that our educational system has better served those students who are already advantaged. In New York State, the Regents exams originated in the mid-1800s as both a college entrance exam and as one means of standardizing the curriculum (New York State Education Department, 2002). However, over the last century the New York State educational system evolved into a two-track system, with Regents exams and curricula for college bound students and non-Regents courses for non-college bound students, with the latter courses dominated by working-class students and students of color.

### Federal Government Key

#### Federal government spends 3.3 billion on charters

Persson 15 — Jonas Persson is a writer at the Center for Media and Democracy, focusing on education policy, 5-12-2015 ("Feds Spent $3.3 Billion on Charter Schools, with Few Controls (Part 1)", PR Watch, Accessed Online at http://www.prwatch.org/news/2015/05/12830/federal-billions-fuel-charter-school-industry, Accessed on 7-19-2017, SV)

“The waste of taxpayer money—none of us can feel good about,” Education Secretary Arne Duncan told the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health & Human Services and Education just last month.

Yet, he is calling for a 48% increase in the U.S. Department of Education’s (ED) quarter-billion-dollar-a-year ($253.2 million) program designed to create, expand, and replicate charter schools—an initiative repeatedly criticized by the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) for suspected waste and inadequate financial controls.

CMD’s review of appropriations reveals that the federal government has spent a staggering sum, $3.3 billion, of taxpayer money creating and expanding the charter school industry over the past two decades, but it has done so without requiring the most basic transparency in who ultimately receives the funds and what those tax dollars are being used for, especially in contrast to the public information about truly public schools.

Even more tellingly, other documents reveal that ED has knowingly awarded charter grant to states with no statutory oversight of charter authorizers and schools as the grant applications are evaluated based on how much "flexibility" from state laws charter schools enjoy.

This lack of oversight, which is a design feature rather than a bug, is a recipe for disaster for far too many American school children, and for taxpayers, when large chunks of the money end up either missing in action or in the corporate coffers of charter school "management organizations" exempt from democratic control.

Federal charter school funding has expanded 60-fold since its inception in 1995, and—despite statements by ED and others of regret regarding enormous amounts squandered by incompetent or greedy charter school operators—very little has been done by the government to require strong financial controls to protect the educational opportunities of kids attending charters and to protect our tax dollars from rip-offs and waste.

1. New Finding: The U.S. Government Has Spent $3.3 Billion on Charters Since 1995

The Center for Media and Democracy, a national non-profit investigative watchdog group, launched a review of how U.S. tax dollars are being spent by the charter school industry, in light of news reports of numerous criminal indictments for fraud of charter school operators.

Especially troubling were the findings of the Center for Popular Democracy’s April 2015 review, showing how criminal misuse in 14 states and Washington D.C. has cost taxpayers at least $203 million—a figure, they conclude, that might be “just the tip of the iceberg.”

That’s a huge sum but there’s a lot more that is unknown about how federal tax dollars are spent by charters.

CMD calculates that in the past twenty years the U.S. has spent $3,352,841,281 specifically for charter school development, with many millions more in grants that have flowed to charters.

How did so much money get spent without more people realizing it? Created as an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the Charter Schools Program has seen an almost 60-fold increase in the past twenty years: from $4.5 million awarded in 1995 to $253 million in the last fiscal year. Congress is considering a FY 2016 budget for charters under the ESEA of $375 million, an increase of 48%.

This sweeping expansion, under the banner of bipartisanship, is surprising given the fact that academic studies—independent of charter school advocates and its industry—have consistently found mixed results in terms of charter schools and learning outcomes.

And even the most glowing reports funded by school privatization interests have had to admit that the worst charter schools perform much worse than any traditional public school.

Some charter operators have siphoned funding for their own benefit by locating schools in strip malls and other inappropriate locales, including even letting the school double as a nightclub after hours.

Despite these findings and numerous examples of abject failure of particular charter schools, many policymakers have bought into the PR that charters are a panacea for “reforming” traditional public schools.

Yet, as Professor Diane Ravitch has shown empirically, the notion that public schools are failing is not true. And, anti-regulatory charters that evade public accounting about spending tax dollars are not the solution. Neither is a quarter-million-a-year system of federal grants designed, in part, to reward states that do not hold charter schools and their authorizers accountable.

## Lopez

### Doesn’t Solve

#### The counterplan gives states jurisdiction over charter schools—each state could lose $1.8 billion each year alone

Washington 16 — (Brian Washington, 6-1-2016, "New Report: Taxpayers lose $216 million to charter waste, fraud, and abuse," Education Votes, http://educationvotes.nea.org/2016/06/01/new-report-taxpayers-lose-216-million-to-charter-waste-fraud-and-abuse/, Accessed 6-28-2017, JWS)

According to the report, with the rapid growth of charters nationwide, local and state governments are not equipped to adequately oversee the public’s investment in these schools. It adds that state, local, and federal governments nationwide could lose more than $1.8 billion this year due to deficiencies related to oversight. That’s up from losses totaling $1.4 billion in 2015. The report claims the bulk of these losses will go undetected because of the inability of government at every level to adequately monitor and regulate charters. Public funding for charter schools (including local, state and federal expenditures) has reached over $30 billion annually,” states the report’s executive summary. “Yet despite this tremendous ongoing investment of public dollars to charter schools, government at all levels has failed to implement a system that proactively monitors charter schools for fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement. The report states that within the last 20 years, the federal government has given more than $3.3 billion to states to increase its number of charter schools. However, it has not laid out any significant requirements for oversight.

#### States mismanage charter schools when they are given regulation over them

Smyth and Franko 17 — (Julie Carr Smyth and Kantele Franko, 5-26-2017, "States struggle with oversight of online charter schools," Fox Business, http://www.foxbusiness.com/markets/2017/05/26/states-struggle-with-oversight-online-charter-schools.html, Accessed 6-29-2017, JWS)

As U.S. children flock to virtual charter schools, states are struggling to catch up and develop rules to make sure the students get a real education and schools get the right funding. The future of virtual schools is part of the larger school-choice debate seeing renewed attention since the installation of Education Secretary Betsy DeVos, an online charter investor and advocate who sees them as a valuable option for students. While some perform well, the sector has been plagued by accounts of low standards, mismanagement, and inflated participation counts at schools that are reimbursed based on the number of enrolled students. Ohio's largest online charter school, the Electronic Classroom of Tomorrow, this month lost the latest round of its battle over $60 million the state says is owed for enrollment that cannot be justified. Findings of underperformance at e-schools have been so prevalent that even supporters have called for policymakers to intervene. "There's overwhelming consensus that these schools are performing terribly poor and yet, you know, nothing's happening," said Gary Miron, a Western Michigan University professor who researches online charters for the National Education Policy Center at the University of Colorado and believes such schools can work, but not under the current model. Nationwide, enrollment in virtual schools has tripled over the past decade, and some 278,000 students as young as kindergarteners were enrolled in 58 full-time online schools across 34 states for the 2015-16 school year, according to data from the policy center. Other groups' estimates put virtual enrollment even higher. Half the virtual schools are charters and the rest are district-run, but charters have most of the students. The schools' supporters say they fill a gap by meeting the needs of nontraditional students — those with challenging schedules, severe health issues, troubles with focus or bullying, or who are working or traveling or parenting children of their own. Ninth-grader Celiah Aker, 14, is an honors student who has attended the Electronic Classroom of Tomorrow since the fifth grade. "I wanted the flexibility to do other things, instead of just school," Aker said. "I have a lot of friends who are in regular public school, and they always get bombarded with so many hours of homework. I get to hang with my family and go to sports events and go and do my dance classes." Nowhere have regulators' struggles been on display more than Ohio, which ranks among the states with the most students enrolled in virtual charters. The state had broader charter-school rules but didn't outline many specific e-school standards or enrollment limits for them until more than a decade after ECOT opened. Now the school is locked in a protracted legal battle with the state over how it tracks students' hours, a dispute that traces to before the state had any online charter regulations on the books. A hearing officer recently recommended the state education board take action to collect millions from the Electronic Classroom of Tomorrow due to undocumented enrollment. Jeremy Aker, Celiah's dad, said implications that ECOT students are chronically absent and the school is undeserving of state assistance are discouraging for his daughter. "You were a 4.0 student during the 2015-2016 school year, in the National Honor Society, and because you didn't sit logged into a screen for 5 hours a day, we're actually going to call you truant and we want our money back," he said. Finding the balance has also tripped up other states. In Colorado, where an Education Week investigation found only a quarter of the students at one online school were using the software on a typical day, recent Democratic legislative proposals to have the state certify authorizers of cyber schools and study data have fizzled without a full vote. A lack of uniform attendance tracking also muddied the development of virtual schools in Oklahoma earlier this decade. One charter school, Epic, was referred to state fraud investigators for issues including how it counted students — though nothing came of the review. In 2015, legislators overhauled the law requiring closure of poor-performing charters, instituting a more rigorous application process and stepping up requirements for sponsors. Epic's performance rankings are now high. Republican Gov. Frank Keating is speaking at Epic's graduation next month. States have been slow to respond to red flags, in part because lobbying by for-profit operators and other supporters hampered legislative proposals aimed at improving accountability, Miron said. DeVos was herself a major donor to those efforts before becoming education secretary. What influence her appointment will have on states' efforts to regulate charter schools is not yet clear. The department didn't respond to interview requests. In Ohio, state records show ECOT founder William Lager has donated about $765,000 to state-level campaigns. Nationwide, charter school owners, operators and advocacy groups have donated almost $89 million to state-level campaigns over the past decade, according to data collected by the nonprofit Institute for Money in State Politics. A report last summer from the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, the National Association of Charter School Authorizers and the nonprofit 50-State Campaign for Achievement Now called for policymakers and school authorizers to intervene to address problems with online charters. "Left unchecked, these problems have the potential to overshadow the positive impacts this model currently has for some students," the report said.

#### Increased state regulations kill the educational benefit from charter schools

Allen 17 — (Jeanne Allen, 2-6-2017, "Regulations Are Strangling Charter Schools," Education Week, http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2017/02/08/regulations-are-strangling-charter-schools.html, Accessed 6-29-2017, JWS)

Panic struck the education establishment over the election of President Donald Trump and his selection of school choice advocate Betsy DeVos for U.S. secretary of education. There was fear that she would preside over a dramatic expansion of nontraditional forms of education, including charter schools. But even senators who opposed DeVos' nomination concede that charters have become mainstream in the education world. While charters' continued expansion is important, it's also clear that their progress has come at a price. Charters are suffering from regulatory strangulation—not from foes, but from so-called friends. As a devoted advocate of charter schools, DeVos, once confirmed, could make her most important contribution to education by restoring sanity in charter school policy. Charter schools began as a state effort to disrupt districts' exclusive franchise over education. Since the first charter school law was passed in Minnesota a quarter-century ago, this school choice option has united people from diverse backgrounds and lifestyles who have wanted more personalized and innovative public education to meet student needs in ways that traditional public schools have often failed to do. Between 1991 and 1999, Democrats and Republicans joined forces to enact charter school laws in 35 states and the District of Columbia. It was the beginning of a competitive environment that shook the education establishment. In fact, the rise of charter schools mirrors disruptive innovation, a term coined by the Harvard Business School professor Clayton Christensen. The theory explains how technology allows for the creation of better services, which eventually replace those of well-established competitors. Traditional public schools, for example, are focused on low-risk, sustainable improvements. They lost their dominance in the market to cutting-edge charters that worked to transform labor, capital, materials, and information to better meet consumer needs. For more than 2.5 million students in almost 7,000 schools, 43 states, and the District of Columbia, charter schools have ignited innovations in how education is delivered, measured, and structured, by lengthening school days, emphasizing project-based learning, and using new and creative models for classroom management. That traditional public education has adopted many of the same notions first tried in charters is cause for celebration. The more established innovations become, the greater their impact. But charters also run the risk of losing the very conditions that made them able to innovate in the first place. That is the precarious position in which the charter sector finds itself today. The operational freedom initially afforded to charters through law, in exchange for performance-based accountability, caught a regulatory fervor that its own advocates invited. Charters are slowly morphing into bureaucratic, risk-averse organizations fixated on process over experimentation. Such organizational behavior is called isomorphism, allowing once-innovative organizations to resemble those they disrupted. The root cause has been a regulatory push of laws at both the state and federal levels. These have empowered state agencies to micromanage everything from the approval to the authorization of charters. Some call it accountability. Others know it better as bureaucracy. Sociologists Walter W. Powell and Paul DiMaggio discuss the effect of isomorphism on systems of organization in their 1991 book The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis. They argue that "once a field becomes well-established ... there is an inexorable push toward homogenization." In charters' case, the push toward regulation was a result of stinging critiques in both the media and research, often from inconclusive data. The critiques of charters are spearheaded largely by a 2009 report from the CREDO Institute, an independent research group at Stanford University, which found that nearly half of charter schools nationwide had academic-performance results that were no different from those of public schools. The group's report produced the famous and frequently quoted (but incorrect) finding that charter schools do no worse or better than regular public schools and resulted in widespread calls to close charter schools, without third-party vetting of the data. Ultimately, this response started the path toward increased regulation and the stifling of innovation for charter schools. Even leading advocates of charters, such as the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools and the National Association of Charter School Authorizers, have embraced misleading data points about charters and have begun to allow bureaucratic forces to strangle the charter sector's innovation. They increasingly advocate one-size-fits-all charter laws and accountability systems. State legislators adopt education laws that are rife with top-down compliance, discouraging the growth of new charter schools. That's where the next education secretary could turn the key to reverse this isomorphic trend, starting with gutting the regulatory requirements of the once-simple federal charter-grant program and repealing a bevy of nonregulatory guidance that restricts how states do business. But the new secretary must also be discriminating in personnel selections; even the most prominent leaders in the charter sector have isomorphic tendencies. If charter schools do not reject isomorphism, they will cease to be the laboratories of innovation that made them successful in the first place and will instead become part of the education establishment they were once built to reject.

State oversight threatens to

Sundquist 16 — Director of Faculty Research and Scholarship, Professor of Law at Albany Law School (Christian Sundquist, 5-6-2016, "Positive Education Federalism by Christian Sundquist :: SSRN," No Publication, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2169455, Accessed 6-30-2017, JWS)

The recent enactment of ESSA creates the possibility of further exacerbating race and class-based educational inequalities. While retaining the core principles of NCLB, ESSA diminishes federal oversight of school performance while further expanding consumer choice and deregulated teacher preparation programs. As Marian Wright Edelman observes, such a “gutting [of] a strong federal role in [an] education policy designed to protect [African-American and Latino] children… jeopardiz[es] their opportunity for a fair and adequate education.” Civil rights groups, including the Southern Poverty Law Center and the New York chapter of the NAACP, fear that decreased “federal oversight of education will be much too weak to ensure [equal] education for Black and Latino students” in many states. The prominent education and urban planning researcher Gary Orfield further opines that with ESSA “we’re going to get something that’s much worse [than NCLB]- a lot of federal money going out for almost no leverage for any national purpose.”150 Education advocate Kalmann Hettlemann similarly views ESSA as “a massive retreat from our national interest and commitment to equal educational opportunity, especially for poor and minority children.” The education federalism forged by the original ESEA and Brown envisioned federal regulation of public education to the extent necessary to promote social equality and racial integration. Such robust federal oversight was necessary in light of the historical practice of states to undermine educational opportunity for poor and minority children. The devolution of the federal role in public education following ESSA - coupled with its continued emphasis on standardized testing, choice and market competition - threatens to increase race and class based disparities in education.

## Lottery

### Doesn’t Solve

#### Lottery fails—proximity and unequal resources

Williams 14 — (Conor Williams, 3-20-2014, "What Applying to Charter Schools Showed Me About Inequality," Atlantic, https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2014/03/what-applying-to-charter-schools-showed-me-about-inequality/284530/, Accessed 6-27-2017, JWS)

Charters’ lotteries respond to zip-code inequity in public education by randomizing a school’s enrollment. As a process, they don't favor wealth or other privilege. Lotteries are neutral. My son, with his two highly educated, almost-middle-class, white parents, gets no lottery advantage over his friend whose mother dropped out of high school and is raising her child alone. As far as the lottery is concerned, both kids are just numbers. But lotteries don’t exist in a vacuum. If each one is neutral, a system of lotteries can still tilt in favor of families with sufficient resources and free time to get around town and apply to as many as possible. A student entered in ten charter school lotteries has a better chance at enrolling at one than a student entered in just one. And while D.C. unified its district and charter pre-K lotteries this year, a handful of high-performing charters stayed outside the system. You’d better believe that my wife and I applied to every one of those within two miles of our house. On a related note: some charter schools rank their waitlist in terms of the order in which they receive lottery applications. Guess what? Parents line up outside these schools as early as 3:00 am to be first in line on the day they begin accepting applications. Lotteries also reward families who can afford to live close to high-performing charter schools. When it comes to school choice, parents frequently cite proximity as a critical factor in their decision. My wife and I didn’t bother applying to charter lotteries that would have sent our son to Capitol Hill—it would have required an hour-long commute during rush hour. Even though living nearby doesn’t officially or directly improve a student’s chance of admission, students living far away are much less likely to apply. There are practical limits to the openness of charter school enrollment. This is a particularly pressing issue in D.C., where rapid gentrification is overrunning charters in neighborhoods that were once filled with a majority of low-income families.

#### A lottery system isn’t about choice, its about chance

Cullen 9 — (Catherine Cullen, 4-7-2009, "Choice and Chance," American Institutes for Research, https://www.air.org/edsector-archives/blog/choice-and-chance, Accessed 6-27-2017, JWS)

E.L. Haynes is a public school of choice, open to all residents of the District. But its enrollment lottery isn’t about choice. It’s about chance. Few students choose to leave E.L. Haynes from year-to-year, and the school gives enrollment preference to siblings. That means there were no spots available for new families in Kindergarten, 1st grade or 2nd grade. In Pre-Kindergarten, after siblings, only 14 spaces remained. As I drew 154 names for those 14 spots, the E.L. Haynes staff dutifully recorded who was 98th on the waiting list and who was 105th. The school regularly enrolls some students from the waiting list, but can’t provide parents with much information about how many or when. One woman and her toddler whooped and celebrated when they were chosen. The room buzzed when I drew a twin as #9, guaranteeing the sibling a spot. With one draw I had given away two spots! The pressure grew. I looked at the faces of the waiting parents and began to wonder which card in the box was theirs. Had I inadvertently buried it? Was it stuck against the side of the box? How much fishing was appropriate, or should I just draw whatever card was on top? If you move to the block of Otis Place NW where E.L. Haynes’s shiny new building is located with a 6-year-old child, enrolling is extremely unlikely. In fact, the parents who lost in this year’s Pre-K lottery might have better odds of getting their child into E.L. Haynes if they have another child and enter the Pre-K lottery again, hoping to sneak the older child into a primary grade as a sibling. When I drew the last name for an official Pre-K berth, a woman in the crowd drew a sharp breath. I had drawn her son’s best friend. She sat quietly as I started to draw the waiting list. When I hit #20, tears began to run down her face. Sometime after #50, she left the room.

#### Counterplan increases segregation, deters parents from signing up, and it can’t solve the achievement gap

Thomas 15 — (Jacqueline Rabe Thomas, 9-10-2015, "Is school choice really a choice, or a chance?," CT Mirror, https://ctmirror.org/2015/09/10/magnet-school-choice-or-chance/, Accessed 6-27-2017, JWS)

Bronin is frustrated with a lottery system that he says is confusing, lacks transparency and is not helpful to traditional neighborhood schools. His feelings are shared by many Hartford parents — some of whom regularly come before the State Board of Education to express their concerns. “Our children are more segregated now than ever,” Hyacinth Yennie of Hartford told the state board earlier this year. “They are cast aside like they’re not really important, ‘Oh, only magnet schools are important, because you know what? We are funding them more money.'” “It’s not fair to our children,” she said. The state annually publishes a guide to help parents navigate the system. However, it does not outline performance results of the schools; or which schools have historically had lower acceptance rates; or how many new seats, by grade or school, are available the following year. Each school also has its own policy for deciding which applicants get priority in the lottery for considerations like living in a certain part of the city or having a sibling already attending the school. In Bronin’s case, “We were promised, assured at the time … that sibling preference was almost a guarantee, that our daughter would get in the next year,” he told the Hartford Courant. At last week’s debate, Bronin told the crowded room that the lottery is broken. “It wasn’t until days before the school year started that we found out where our kids were going to go. And that kind of thing just doesn’t work,” he said. Additionally, there are separate lotteries in which parents may enter their children, depending on whether they want to go to a magnet school run by the Capitol Region Education Council or by Hartford Public Schools, a vocational-technical high school or charter school. The Sheff Movement, a coalition of advocates who support expanding school choice to integrate city schools, agrees there are major problems with how the state runs the lottery. “Anyone that has gone through the school choice process in Hartford knows that the system is complicated,” the nonprofit wrote in a policy brief last summer. “When there isn’t clear information about how the system works, parents can question the fairness of the process… The more complicated the system appears to be, the more likely it is to deter parents who have less time or who are less experienced at dealing with complex forms.”

## K

### Pragmatism

#### Pragmatic solutions to combat the neoliberal imaginary in education are best—anything else reinforces the status quo and entrenches greater social differentiation

Angus 12 — Member of the American Educational Research Association (Lawrence Angus, 10-30-2012, "School choice: neoliberal education policy and imagined futures," Taylor & Francis, http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01425692.2013.823835?src=recsys, Accessed 7-13-2017, JWS)

Forms of social imaginary are essential to various notions of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ schools. The task for educational sociology is therefore to problematize and ‘re-imagine’ the prevailing neoliberal imaginary in order to think into existence alternative, more democratic and more educationally appropriate futures that will not discriminate against less-privileged families who are already disadvantaged within the education system. It is essential to think about, and to assert, a counter-hegemonic ‘socially democratic imaginary’ (Angus 2012) that would be an educative and socially just alternative. Further analysis of the subtle effects on people, schools and society of currently hegemonic education policies needs to draw out the identity implications of school choices through an examination of families’ aspirations and expectations, their family capitals, and social imaginaries. Of course, identities and imagined futures are never static. They are continually emerging in relation to social contexts and life-experiences. Shifts in one’s sense of self and sense of one’s possible future occur as a result. This paper is intended to illustrate that school choice is not merely a matter of parents and children calmly thinking about schools on offer and rationally deciding upon which seems best. In the neoliberal world, choices are actively shaped not only by schools marketing themselves, but also through the pervasiveness of the neoliberal social imaginary in education and throughout contemporary society. By this I mean the consolidation of the various elements of neoliberalism into a set of discourses and practices that, as illustrated by the prominence given to the My School website in Australia, cohere around concepts of competition, market, accountability and choice. This social imaginary, according to Rizvi and Lingard (2010), has overwhelmed other possible imaginaries that might be considered more ‘educational’ and socially democratic. The theoretical framing of this paper has employed a number of interrelated conceptual tools that may be able to inform an innovative and contemporary engagement with the social contexts of school choice-making. Zipin, Sellar, and Hattam make the further point that: In much of the recent policy and media discourse, the aspirations of communities, parents and students are represented as culture-neutral, individual and primarily economic desires, such as for financial or career advancement, or for material goods. The view of culture and aspiration being presented within twenty- first-century political discourse is bland and seemingly settled according to the norms and preferences of capital and the dominant social class. This has the effect of inducing ‘less powerful groups to subscribe to a future defined in terms of passively received dominant norms’ (Zipin, Sellar, and Hattam 2012, 186). Promoting ‘aspiration’ in education therefore encourages everyone to succeed in neoliberal terms. For the less-advantaged in society, this means aspiring to what their ‘betters’ have. This is the future that is presented to us through social institutions such as government, the media and, increasingly, education. As Thomson, Lingard, and Wrigley (2012, 2) explain: ‘reductive conceptualizations of schooling for human capital development legitimate a limited range of solutions, which always include more standardized approaches to schooling, more competition and more public accountabilities’. The essential criticism of the neoliberal imaginary, then, is that: … it is not the planetary scale of modern economies, communications and cultures that is the problem, but the global dominance of capitalism, particularly in its fortified neoliberal version, and the gross inequalities and injustices that it produces. (Wrigley, Lingard, and Thomson 2012, 98) Within such capitalist logic, education, like other services, is treated as a commodity, and its inherent complexity is reduced to managerial simplicity and blind faith in market solutions and the capacities of self-interested consumers. Most importantly, such commodification, not just of education but of social life in general, as Lipman argues: represents not only a capital accumulation strategy but a social imaginary of a market-driven [society] in which ‘citizens’ are differentially rewarded competitive consumers whose success depends on their entrepreneurship and individual effort … Looked at this way, neoliberalism is a process that works its way into the discourses and practices of society through the actions of not just elites, but also marginalized and oppressed people acting within the constraints and limitations of the present situation. (2011, 230) The neoliberal social imaginary may be future-oriented in terms of economic aspiration, but the standardized, backward-looking assessment, curriculum and pedagogy that it fosters in education are likely to make schools more boring places for all students – but particularly for less-advantaged and minority students whose cultural dissonance with traditional, mainstream, conservative schooling practices and high-stakes testing is most pronounced (Lipman 2011). These schooling practices explicitly reinforce the status quo. The problem for those who are less advantaged is that they are ‘structurally constrained’ in achieving neoliberal aspirations because, ‘when pursuing a future defined in relation to the axioms of capital, those with less access to social, cultural or economic resources must aspire in competition with those who have greater access’ (Zipin, Sellar, and Hattam 2012, 187) and who are competing on a much more comfortable and familiar terrain. The competition is stacked. The hegemony of neoliberalism: makes it difficult for the less powerful to imagine and articulate designs for futures that are not defined in dominant terms. Indeed, to not aspire in capitalist terms is to risk appearing as though one has no aspiration at all. (Zipin, Sellar, and Hattam 2012, 187) This situation militates against teachers, students and communities re-imagining new possibilities and alternative futures. This is not to argue that schools can do nothing to redress the situation for less-advantaged and minority students, but it is to argue that schools serving students who have been put at a disadvantage are unlikely to achieve much by simply trying to compete in neoliberal terms. Such an approach merely entrenches greater social and economic differentiation. Although my emphasis in this paper has been on critique of normalized neoliberal values and positions, my colleagues and I (along with many others) have discussed elsewhere ways of working in educational and political ways to provide better recognition and opportunities for young people who have been put at a disadvantage by the prevailing societal norms and power structures (Smyth et al. 2008, 2009; Angus 2012; Smyth and McInerney 2012; see also Thomson, Lingard, and Wrigley 2012). These authors employ positive conceptual tools that are consistent with the notion of a ‘social democratic imaginary’ in education (Lingard 2010; Rizvi and Lingard 2010). As I have elaborated elsewhere (Angus 2012), these include radical versions of funds knowledge, assets-based education, anti-deficit discourse, inclusion of diversity, and critical thinking about the multiple purposes of schooling in terms of social justice, economic opportunity and democratic outcomes. Hence there is an urgent need to continue to build ‘alternative theoretical resources for thinking about education at systemic, policy, school and pedagogic levels’ (Thomson, Lingard, and Wrigley 2012, 2). That is the intention of this paper.