## Segregation

### 1NC Frontline

#### 1. Integration isn’t key to school quality

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 52-53, Accessed on 7-6-2017, SV)

CHARTER STUDIES

The observational and intervention studies we have reviewed suggest, first, that the observed association between racial and economic segregation at the school level and academic achievement are largely a function of the socioeconomic background of families rather than race. Poverty at the school level is a strong correlate of academic achievement and academic gains. The intervention studies suggest that a significant portion of the association between school level poverty and academic achievement is mediated by school quality. In other words, it is that poor children get poor schools rather than poor children produce poor schools.

This hypothesis is strengthened considerably by research on charter schools, which are publicly-funded schools of choice that are managed outside the traditional school district system. As we described in our introduction, charter schools across the nation perform only slightly better than regular public schools.127 But there is a subset of charter schools serving overwhelmingly black and poor students in large cities using a so-called “no excuses” education model in which students have experienced dramatically higher achievement than comparable students attending regular public schools. The impact of these schools has been examined in gold standard randomized designs based on comparisons of lottery winners who receive an offer of admission to their preferred charter school vs. lottery losers who typically remain in their neighborhood traditional public school.128 The impact of these schools, including those that are not oversubscribed and thus not subject to a lottery for admissions, has also been examined in matched comparison designs in which academic gains are compared for similar students in these charter schools vs. the traditional public schools that most frequently lose students to these charters.129 It is important to note that these schools educate a small proportion of students compared to traditional public schools and that there are caps on their growth in many states.

The research literature on charter school impacts is extensive and recent. We cite in the previous paragraph a meta-analysis, five random assignment lottery studies, and a national matched student comparison study. We will not provide a detailed analysis of these studies. Rather, we focus on the outcomes that are most important with respect to the impacts of school quality and racial/economic segregation on student achievement. These are that:

• Student achievement is substantially higher in urban charter schools, in particular those that focus on academic achievement, than in comparison traditional public schools serving the same neighborhoods and students. The national quasi-experimental study finds that students enrolled in urban charter schools experience 0.06 standard deviations greater growth in math and 0.04 standard deviations greater growth in reading per year than their matched peers in traditional public schools.130 A study of Boston charter middle schools using a random assignment lottery design found that they generate gains of about 0.36 of a standard deviation per year in math and 0.12 of a standard deviation in reading.131 These are very large impacts, and they can cumulate from year to year.

• Charter school impacts are substantially larger for low-income and minority students than for more advantaged students. A study carried out by the federal government’s Institute of Education Sciences included virtually every charter nationally that was oversubscribed, subject to a lottery, and had achievement test scores available. The study found that the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals in a charter school was positively and significantly related to impacts on mathematics scores. In other words, the poorer the student body, the better the school performed. In contrast, charter schools serving fewer disadvantaged students had statistically significant negative impacts on both reading and mathematics.132 Similarly, a study of Massachusetts charters found that urban charter middle schools generate much larger positive effects for non-whites and freelunch-eligible applicants than for white applicants. At the same time, nonurban charters do not seem to be raising scores for the same type of student. The authors conclude that, “this suggests that something about the schools themselves rather than the student body composition drives large urban charter gains.”133

• The urban charter schools producing these substantive academic gains are often more segregated than traditional public schools serving the same general catchment areas, according to the studies described in the previous section. Urban charters disproportionately serve low-income and minority, particularly black, students.

The takeaway from the charter studies, when combined with the research previously reviewed, is that school quality is the primary determinant of student achievement. Race matters primarily through its association with poverty, and poverty matters primarily through its association with school quality. As seen in the charter studies, high-quality schools can exist and thrive with little racial or economic diversity. In fact, some of the high-performing charters have a curriculum and approach that is tailored to the unique needs of a relatively culturally, racially, and economically homogenous student body. Note in this regard that white students see limited or no academic gains in the very same Boston charter schools in which gains for black students are impressively large.134

These findings and conclusions do not, of course, support an argument for more racially and economically segregated schools. They do, however, provide evidence that supports a focus on quality schools for students and suggest that economic and racial integration of schools is an indirect route to that goal, and not necessarily essential to its achievement**.**

#### 2. Segregation is culture affirming

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)**

**But is racial isolation necessarily a bad thing?**

Stewart**, who also is a regular contributor to the Citizen Ed blog,** described a “homegrown” charter system in his home state of Minnesota **that’s divided by choice, where the top priority is educating students and meeting their needs in ways the school district has not.**

**“**We have Somali schools, we have Hmong schools, we have schools for Native American kids**,” Stewart said. “And** those communities don’t really see their schools as segregated or as isolated, they see them as kind of culturally affirming environments for kids that they can’t get in a very white state like Minnesota**.”**

**Stewart later added, “**When the government assigns you by race to inferior schools, that is traditionally what we have considered to be segregation. When parents pick a culturally affirming program for their child and they are from a historically marginalized population like Indians or black people—I happen to be a black Indian—that is so far from the traditional understanding of segregation that it’s almost insulting to call it that**.”**

**But while Orfield sees nothing wrong with a school of choice emphasizing and celebrating a culture, he said charter schools should not be designed to limit entry to students who are not of that race and culture.**

**“**They have a right to have schools of their own on their reservation, on tribal lands**,” he said of Native Americans. “They don’t have a right to have a school for just one race using public funds and public spaces. That’s against our Constitution. That’s what the [Brown v. Board] decision is about.”**

#### 3. Meta-study proves No Excuses is best

Cheng et al. 15 — Albert Cheng is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at Harvard University. He has a Ph.D. in Education Policy from the University of Arkansas, Collin Hitt is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Medical Education and the Research Director of Continuing Professional Development at the Southern Illinois University School of Medicine. He has a Ph.D. in Education policy from the University of Arkansas, Brian Kisida is an Assistant Research Professor in the Department of Economics and the Truman School of Public Affairs at the University of Missouri. He has a Ph.D. in Education policy from the University of Arkansas, Jonathan N. Mills is a Non-Resident Research Fellow with the Education Research Alliance for New Orleans and Senior Research Associate at the Department of Education Reform at the University of Arkansas. He recieved a Ph.D. in education policy from the University of Arkansas, July 2015 ("No Excuses Charter Schools: A Meta-Analysis of the Experimental Evidence on Student Achievement", EDRE, Accessed Online at http://www.uaedreform.org/downloads/2014/12/no-excuses-charter-schools-a-meta-analysis-of-the-experimental-evidence-on-student-achievement.pdf, Accessed on 7-6-2017, SV)

Summary of Results

The results presented in the previous section confirm the descriptive findings presented in the previous section: Both oversubscribed No Excuses charter schools and charter schools more generally appear to have positive effects on student math and ELA achievement. While our findings for the overall sample of random assignment studies on charter schools largely confirm the findings of a 2011 meta-analysis by Betts and Tang on charter school effects, our study adds to the literature on charter school achievement impacts by focusing on No Excuses charter schools. The results highlight the relative success of No Excuses charter schools, as the estimated grand effect sizes for the sample of No Excuses charter schools are consistently higher than those estimated for the more general sample of random assignment charter school studies. Math achievement for students who attend No Excuses charter schools is 0.25 standard deviations higher than those who attend traditional public schools. Reading achievement for students who attend No Excuses charter schools is 0.15 standard deviations higher than those who attend traditional public schools. Analogous differences for students who attend other types of charter schools are 0.15 standard deviations for math achievement and 0.07 standard deviations for reading achievement.

Consistent with other research, we also find some evidence of heterogeneity in charter school effects (Betts & Tang, 2011). For instance, No Excuses charter schools are more effective in improving math than in improving reading achievement, a pattern that is borne out in the literature. Other research has also found that charter schools are more effective in urban areas than in nonurban arears. Our findings may partially explain this pattern. Specifically, No Excuses schools do better than other types of charter schools, and at the same time, are primarily located in urban areas. Finally, our results suggest that No Excuses schools are more effective in middle and high schools. This pattern appears to differ from the broad literature which indicates that charter schools are more effective at the elementary school level. However, it is important to note that the number of studies of No Excuses schools at the elementary level is very limited. Most No Excuses schools only serve students starting in the middle school grades, precluding any confident claims about their effectiveness at the elementary school level.

The claim that No Excuses charter schools are more effective than other types of charter schools holds insofar as the overall sample of charter schools serves as an appropriate comparison group to appraise the effectiveness of No Excuses charter schools. One way to ensure a proper comparison group is to compare No Excuses charter schools to a nationally representative sample of other types of charter schools. We point out that one of the studies in the overall sample of random assignment studies is national in scope. The Gleason et al. (2010) study evaluates 36 charter middle schools across 15 US states. As it turns out, that study documents negative effects in the range of 0.05 to 0.10 standard deviations in math and reading achievement for charter schools. Furthermore, CREDO’s (2013) nonexperimental analysis of a majority of charter schools across 27 US states documents positive effects of 0.01 standard deviations in reading achievement and no differences in math achievement. These effects are clearly much lower than those produced by No Excuses charter schools. Moreover, most studies in our overall sample of charter schools evaluate schools that are largely located within the same state or even city as the No Excuses charter schools in our sample. That location is held constant in comparing No Excuses schools to other charter schools provides additional justification for using the other charter schools in our analysis as a comparison group to appraise the effectiveness of No Excuses charter schools. It appears, therefore, that No Excuses charter schools not only outperform other types of charter schools within the same jurisdictions but also far greatly outperform other types of charter schools throughout the US.

Magnitude of the Effects of No Excuses Charter Schools

We interpret the effects of No Excuses charter schools to be large and meaningful. The Black-White math achievement gap is often equated to one standard deviation on standardized test scores, while Black-White literacy achievement gap ranges from about 0.7 to 0.8 standard deviations (Hill et al., 2007). The No Excuses approach to schooling aims explicitly to close this gap. To reiterate, we find that attending a No Excuses charter school for approximately one year increases student achievement by 0.25 and 0.16 standard deviations in math and literacy, respectively, net of the typical annual growth that students experience. According to Hill et al.’s (2007) standards, attending a No Excuses charter schools for one year closes approximately 25% of the Black-White math achievement gap and approximately 20% of the Black-white literacy achievement gap. A straightforward extrapolation of these results suggests that attending a No Excuses charter school for four to five years could eliminate the achievement gap.

To provide another sense of the effect size of No Excuses charter schools, one can observe the magnitude of the additional gains in learning from attending a No Excuses charter school relative to the magnitude of typical learning gains that students experience annually. Hill et al. (2007) document that average learning gains in math for students in grades 5 through 12 – the typical age of No Excuses charter school students – is 0.23 standard deviations per year. The same group of students gains about 0.21 standard deviations in reading per year. Thus, the additional gain of 0.25 standard deviations in math that No Excuses charter schools provide is over double the amount of annual learning that the average student experiences. Similarly, the additional gain of 0.16 standard deviations in reading that No Excuses charter schools provide is approximately three-quarters of the annual learning that the average student experiences. The magnitude of these additional learning gains relative to typical annual learning gains, together with the proportion of the Black-White achievement gap that is closed, suggests that the effect size of No Excuses charter schools on math and literacy is large and meaningful.

#### 4. They have no charter specific evidence that integration is good

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)

Potter acknowledges that there have been few, if any studies, looking specifically at integrated charter schools, which largely came onto the scene after the desegregation efforts of earlier decades.

At Brooklyn Prospect, the results, at least as measured by standardized reading and math test scores, are mixed. A measure of student growth from 2011–13 suggested that the school was about average in English and above average in math.2

More recent data shows that the school’s black, Hispanic, and low-income students perform about the same as students from similar backgrounds who attend surrounding neighborhood schools. Brooklyn Prospect’s white and more middle-class students score worse.

“A three-year look at the data shows that we have remained quite close to district proficiencies for white and non-low income students — sometimes a tiny bit higher, sometimes a tiny bit lower,” Brooklyn Prospect’s Deputy Executive Director Penny Marzulli said in an email. “We believe the numbers are really much too close to draw any conclusions about the quality of instruction for non-low-income students.”

#### 5. Alt causes to segregation

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 94-102 Accessed on 7-13-2017, SV)

B. Local Legislation and Student

Sorting Local legislation substantially controls charter school administration, while federal law merely holds charter schools to the same anti-discrimination law as all federal funding recipients. Without stricter, local civil rights protections that mandate particular methods for inclusivity, charter schools may reinforce segregation originating from parental selection biases and disparate access to educational opportunities.82 In addition to civil rights legislation, there are a variety of factors in local legislation that may also influence racial stratification among charter schools. Beyond enrollment standard and admissions manipulation, anomalies in the day-to-day operations of charter schools include variances in charter responsibility to provide transportation, administer special services, and answer to oversight authorities. Both legislation and the individual nature of schools can lead to practices that encourage excluding difficult or expensive-to-educate students and including advantaged students more likely to achieve better academic outcomes.

i. Location

Location undoubtedly affects parents’ school selection, but location also impacts the information parents receive and how aware they are of different school options. A study of charter school enrollment in Washington, D.C., concluded that proximity was one of the highest determinants of enrollment and found, therefore, that de facto housing segregation is strongly reflected in the makeup of surrounding charter schools.83 Although racial isolation in a charter school may certainly be a result of the surrounding racial make-up, charter schools in areas identified as “urban” also offer an alternative for more affluent families to opt-out of local schools while sparing them private school expenses.84 Locating a charter school in a neighborhood already experiencing a racial transition will likely exacerbate segregation trends in the local school system.85

Many charter schools, either by mission or by legislation, locate in areas with larger populations of minority students, which accounts for the disproportionately high enrollment of Black students in charter schools nationwide.86 Oftentimes, legislation either gives preferences to, or incentives for, charter management applicants who propose to focus on “at-risk” or “challenging” student populations.87 While strategic location may allow a charter school to become a competitive alternative to underperforming and underfunded public schools, a charter school located in an area with higher concentrations of poverty may serve a population that lacks the information required to make a meaningful decision.88 Charter schools locating in low-income areas should assert their presence to local parents and work to present themselves as accessible to all students from the immediate area and any surrounding neighborhoods, maximizing the odds of attracting a diverse student body.

ii. Auxiliary Services

In order for charter schools to be a meaningful option for all families, they must offer all the services that students may need for an appropriate and adequate education.89 One major advantage of charter schools’ departure from typical district regulations—where only those assigned to the school may enroll—is their ability to attract outside students. Families from other public school districts may require an assurance that free transportation is available before they will consider enrolling their child. Siegel-Hawley and Frankenberg’s analysis revealed that four states do not explicitly require charter schools to provide transportation.90 Further, where charter schools present an opportunity to override urban-suburban segregation, only eleven states have legislation that provides for transportation across district lines (and often, only in special cases).91

Choice of charter school is further constrained by limited special education accommodations, English language services, or free and reduced lunch programs. While federal law requires that charter schools abide by disability rights protections and the standard of the free and reduced lunch program, charter schools may be exempt from state or district-wide mandates that go beyond the federal minimum. Schools also may cite a lack of facilities or staff which insulates the school from offering the service unless specifically requested.92 For example, federal law requires that charter schools make all their materials disability-accessible, but they only must provide translation services upon request.93 Charter schools may also offer fewer free and reduced lunch options. The Education Law Center (ELC) in Philadelphia, for example, found that slightly over 70% of charter schools offer free and reduced lunch programs, compared with over 80% of traditional public schools in the district.94 Another nationwide study estimated that in 2012 only 72% of charter schools enrolled in the National School Lunch Program, which was below the national average.95 Researchers use enrollment in free and reduced lunch programs to estimate the number of low-income students charter schools serve; thus, these lower free and reduced lunch percentages may indicate fewer lowincome students attending charter schools.96 Since their autonomous nature does not always require that schools provide essential services cost-free, charter schools without such services may not represent a realistic choice for many low-income families.

Researchers with the ELC also found that charter schools enroll a lower proportion of English-language learners (ELL) than is expected from a typical public school district.97 While federal and state civil rights protections should prohibit charter schools from rejecting students on discriminatory bases, charter schools may point to a lack of certified personnel in the area, or more comprehensive services at the district public school, to discourage enrollment by students who are more costly to educate.98 Parents may be immediately dissuaded from application or enrollment if the school cannot offer translation services or a certified English-language teacher upon their arrival.

iii. Admissions and Outreach

Two barriers to equity in school choice—information and access— often result from legislation dictating authorization procedures and requirements for charter applications. Some states mandate that charter applicants include plans for community outreach and recruitment efforts, but others are vague or purposefully flexible in the ways they permit charter schools to attract and recruit their desired student body.99 Under the federal CSP, schools receiving CSP money should employ a random lottery if more students apply to enroll than the school has capacity to admit.100 Weighted lotteries are permitted in some cases to target traditionally disadvantaged students, so long as the charter school explains that intention in its charter application.101 While a random lottery seems like the most equitable admissions procedure, the lottery provisions can be watered down. For example, some schools may assign higher weights to students living within a certain radius, students with siblings at the schools, or children of faculty and staff. Some schools may even automatically admit students who paid for pre-school services with the same charter organization.102

A study by the Annenberg Institute also found inequitable practices in the use of application requirements and enrollment periods that effectively discriminated against low-income students.103 The study cites examples of schools who limited applications by providing an enrollment window of only one hour or requiring parents to promise a minimum number of volunteer hours.104 These practices dissuade parents working multiple jobs or with excessive childcare responsibilities, who feel they could not meet such stringent requirements.

As public institutions receiving public funding, charter schools are accountable to the taxpayers they serve and should therefore remain a viable option for all types of families. Charter schools that impose parental-involvement clauses, lengthy applications, mandatory extra-curricular commitments, and harsh discipline policies play an enormous role in eliminating equal access to charter schools for low-income and minority students.105 Once enrolled, charter schools may continue to further manipulate their student body through harsh discipline policies or other “counseling-out” strategies.106

iv. Quality and Number of Authorizers

It is difficult to draw a broad conclusion about the impact of charter school admissions policies or outreach practices, as such methods vary based on the requirements of the school’s authorizer.107 Where some states provide that only the local school district or state board of education may authorize new charter schools, others allow thirdparty authorizers, such as higher education institutions or non-profit organizations.108 While theoretically the presence of multiple authorizers may incentivize competition to provide high-quality oversight and accountability services, in reality, the myriad of options allows charter applicants denied by one authorizer to shop for another with more lax guidelines.109 Charter schools therefore could first design their admission or outreach policies and then shop for an authorizer willing to approve the application.

States charge authorizing bodies with developing criteria for charter applications (also called ‘petitions’ or ‘proposals’).110 Many states use the application process as the means by which charter schools must fulfill self-defined diversity goals or state-mandated racialbalancing provisions. Florida, for example, provides that one criterion for approval must be based on the school’s purported plan to achieve a racial balance reflective of the community the school serves.111 Connecticut goes further to allow the Commissioner of Education to place on immediate probation any charter school that establishes an environment of racial and economic isolation.112 Other states, such as North Carolina, are far more lax in their request for diversity plans. North Carolina, for example, merely mandates that charter school enrollment “reasonably reflect” the racial and economic composition of the surrounding school district.113

To maximize social benefits from charter school authorization, some non-profits in the industry, such as the National Association of Charter School Authorizers, provide guidelines authorizers should follow when reviewing charter applicants.114 The guidelines, however, only vaguely explain optimal provisions, such as a “clear and compelling mission” and “sound business plan.”115 An authorizer then typically forms a five-year contract with the charter applicant’s board of directors, which provides periodic monitoring and accountability evaluations.116 Charter authorizers should establish a set of high-quality standards to ensure scrutiny in the authorization process; however, the NACSA guidelines are essentially silent on the subject of diversity and community impact. The guidelines discourage schools from creating neighborhoodbased connections and direct authorizers to ignore political or community influences when making renewal decisions.117 Variations in renewal and closure policies may therefore have a disparate impact on communities who begin to build connections with their local school, only to have the operations overturned or shuttered for poor or inconsistent performance.

Furthermore, authorizing agencies may have an incentive to impose lax policies in order to attract and contract with more charter applicants, as each authorizer enters into a paid contract with the schools they charter.118 The contract, or “charter” between an authorizer and school, lasts for a multi-year period for each charter school, yet the authorizers rarely assume any risk in the event that a school fails to perform.119 The authorizer has the power to deny the charter for renewal and then grant use of the school facilities to a new applicant.120 Without more consistent mandates for charter approvals, the combination of monetary incentives and relaxed authorizer duties and can encourage the proliferation of inequitable charter schools.

#### 6. Existential risk mitigation comes first—future generations

Bostrom 12 — (Nick Bostrom, 3-6-2012, "We're Underestimating the Risk of Human Extinction," Atlantic, https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/03/were-underestimating-the-risk-of-human-extinction/253821/, Accessed 5-13-2017, JWS)

Ross Anderson: Some have argued that we ought to be directing our resources toward humanity's existing problems, rather than future existential risks, because many of the latter are highly improbable. You have responded by suggesting that existential risk mitigation may in fact be a dominant moral priority over the alleviation of present suffering. Can you explain why? Nick Bostrom: Well suppose you have a moral view that counts future people as being worth as much as present people. You might say that fundamentally it doesn't matter whether someone exists at the current time or at some future time, just as many people think that from a fundamental moral point of view, it doesn't matter where somebody is spatially---somebody isn't automatically worth less because you move them to the moon or to Africa or something. A human life is a human life. If you have that moral point of view that future generations matter in proportion to their population numbers, then you get this very stark implication that existential risk mitigation has a much higher utility than pretty much anything else that you could do. There are so many people that could come into existence in the future if humanity survives this critical period of time---we might live for billions of years, our descendants might colonize billions of solar systems, and there could be billions and billions times more people than exist currently. Therefore, even a very small reduction in the probability of realizing this enormous good will tend to outweigh even immense benefits like eliminating poverty or curing malaria, which would be tremendous under ordinary standards.

#### 7. Charter schools are not segregated and have little effect compared to public schools

Ritter et al. 14 - Gary W. Ritter is an Associate Professor of Education and Public Policy and holder of the Endowed Chair in Education Policy in the Department of Education Reform at the University of Arkansas. Gary earned a Ph.D. in Education Policy in 2000 from the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania, Nathan C. Jensen, Brian Kisida is an Assistant Research Professor in the Department of Economics and the Truman School of Public Affairs at the University of Missouri. He has a Ph.D. in Education policy from the University of Arkansas, Jonathan N. Mills is a Non-Resident Research Fellow with the Education Research Alliance for New Orleans and Senior Research Associate at the Department of Education Reform at the University of Arkansas. He recieved a Ph.D. in education policy from the University of Arkansas, Daniel Bowen primarily researches the impacts of K-12 school-sponsored arts and humanities interventions on student outcomes. His methodological expertise is in randomized controlled trials and program evaluation. Dr. Bowen earned his Ph.D. in education policy from the University of Arkansas, 2014 ("Urban School Choice and Integration: The Effect of Charter Schools in Little Rock", Education and Urban Society, Accessed Online at http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0013124514546219, Accessed on 7-10-2017, SV)

Conclusion

In this article, we ask two questions related to charter schools using the city of Little Rock, Arkansas, as a backdrop. First, we ask a static question about the current levels of racial segregation in charter schools as compared with Little Rock TPS. This question is important to many who are concerned that the increasing prevalence of charter schools in the United States might lead to increased segregation of various sorts in our schools, as critics of school choice fear that families will choose to further segregate themselves if given the opportunity. Proponents of school choice, however, contend that by detaching the choice of school from the choice of neighborhoods (most of which are segregated), charter schools may actually decrease levels of segregation. A review of the literature in this area reveals numerous claims and some empirical evidence; however, as we argue above, most of these analyses are built on flawed methods and, unfortunately, we still know very little about whether choosing charter schools is likely to result in increased segregation.

With the benefit of student-level data, we focus our analysis on the Little Rock metropolitan area and find that charter schools in the region are less likely to be hyper-segregated than TPS, but TPS have racial compositions that more closely reflect the regional averages. In each of these cases, however, the differences are slight. Thus, in Little Rock at least, the concerns of charter critics—that charter schools are far more likely to be racially segregated—are not supported by the data.

Nevertheless, choice critics continue to make the claim that charter schools are more segregated (e.g., Orfield, 2007) and further claim that charters lead to greater segregation in TPS. The first piece of data germane to this question is simple but nonetheless important—very few students actually leave Little Rock TPS each year for charter schools. For example, in 2004-2005, 0.4% of the students in Little Rock TPS transferred to charter schools; this figure grew to only 1.2% of the Little Rock TPS student population in the 2009- 2010 school year. Furthermore, and even more importantly, the students who transferred from Little Rock TPS to charter schools were more likely to be minority students than White students. It is difficult to imagine that this small number of diverse students leaving Little Rock TPS is having the negative impact on the desegregation efforts of the entire district.

Our second research question examines the impact of student transfers from TPS to charter schools on the racial composition of schools in the metropolitan area. When we look only at students who left Little Rock TPS for charters, we find that the majority of these transfers actually improve the levels of racial integration at the TPS from which they transferred. This finding is attributed to the fact that the majority of transfers involve minority students leaving predominately above-average minority schools or White students leaving above-average White schools. In all of these cases, the student transfers help the exiting school because the Little Rock TPS is left less segregated.

We also do not find a disproportionate number of student transfers that would be of particular concern to critics of school choice, such as only White students exiting from high-minority schools (“white flight”). If we found that only these types of transfers occurred, there would certainly be cause for concern. However, these types of transfers were actually quite infrequent when compared with the majority of beneficial transfers that have occurred since 2006-2007. Thus, we can find little evidence that the charter schools had a negative impact on the racial balance of Little Rock TPS.

In general, it seems that proponents of increased racial integration are focusing on the wrong target when attacking charter schools. Sadly, most students living in inner cities attend intensely segregated minority schools, whether they attend charter schools or TPS. Yet, across the United States, only 2.5% of public school children roam the halls in charter schools each day; the remaining 97.5% attend TPS (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2011). Those who claim to be truly concerned about limiting segregation should be focusing on the segregation in TPS to address this problem.

Finally, and perhaps more important, the fact that poor and minority students exit segregated TPS for, in some cases, similarly segregated charters, does not imply that charter school policy is imposing segregation upon these students. Rather, the racial patterns we observe in charter schools are the result of the active choices these students and families make to seek more attractive schooling options. Clearly, the student attendance patterns that emerge from these increased choices offered to minority families are quite different than attendance patterns that resulted from the forced segregation of our nation’s past. Indeed, it is likely that the parents who are now able to choose charter schools for their students view these options as ones that enhance, rather than undermine, their civil rights.

### Not key

#### Integration fails

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 University, 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)**

**For her part, Dragon said “**integration in and of itself will not solve anything**,” and described** integrated schools that look diverse on paper **but** operate on two separate tracks based on students’ race—one college-bound and the other not**.**

**While her charter network is committed to matching the demographics of the neighborhoods that surround its schools, that’s not the same thing as integration, she said. Families who send their children to Citizens of the World charter schools are pursuing a diverse learning environment, and their buy-in makes a difference.**

**“**There are a lot of things that need to be considered … because even with a genuine desire to bring families together, we’re still living in a country that has real income disparity and a long—I would say dark—history around race and race relations**,” Dragon said. “**Both of those things will be present in these integrated schools**.”**

**Ultimately, Stewart said, “**durable, enduring white privilege” is fat the root of segregation**, and** he sees “no basis” for claims that charters drive or aggravate segregation in schools**.**

#### Status quo solves—charter schools have been a force for integration—all other studies rely on flawed methods

Note: TPS is the local public school district

Ritter et al 14 — (Gary W. Ritter, Nathan C. Jensen, Brian Kisida, Daniel H. Bowen, 8-7-2014, "Urban School Choice and Integration: Education and Urban Society," Sage Journals, http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0013124514546219, Accessed 7-13-2017, JWS)

In this article, we ask two questions related to charter schools using the city of Little Rock, Arkansas, as a backdrop. First, we ask a static question about the current levels of racial segregation in charter schools as compared with Little Rock TPS. This question is important to many who are concerned that the increasing prevalence of charter schools in the United States might lead to increased segregation of various sorts in our schools, as critics of school choice fear that families will choose to further segregate themselves if given the opportunity. Proponents of school choice, however, contend that by detaching the choice of school from the choice of neighborhoods (most of which are segregated), charter schools may actually decrease levels of segregation. A review of the literature in this area reveals numerous claims and some empirical evidence; however, as we argue above, most of these analyses are built on flawed methods and, unfortunately, we still know very little about whether choosing charter schools is likely to result in increased segregation. With the benefit of student-level data, we focus our analysis on the Little Rock metropolitan area and find that charter schools in the region are less likely to be hyper-segregated than TPS, but TPS have racial compositions that more closely reflect the regional averages. In each of these cases, however, the differences are slight. Thus, in Little Rock at least, the concerns of charter critics—that charter schools are far more likely to be racially segregated—are not supported by the data. Nevertheless, choice critics continue to make the claim that charter schools are more segregated (e.g., Orfield, 2007) and further claim that charters lead to greater segregation in TPS. The first piece of data germane to this question is simple but nonetheless important—very few students actually leave Little Rock TPS each year for charter schools. For example, in 2004-2005, 0.4% of the students in Little Rock TPS transferred to charter schools; this figure grew to only 1.2% of the Little Rock TPS student population in the 2009- 2010 school year. Furthermore, and even more importantly, the students who transferred from Little Rock TPS to charter schools were more likely to be minority students than White students. It is difficult to imagine that this small number of diverse students leaving Little Rock TPS is having the negative impact on the desegregation efforts of the entire district. Our second research question examines the impact of student transfers from TPS to charter schools on the racial composition of schools in the metropolitan area. When we look only at students who left Little Rock TPS for charters, we find that the majority of these transfers actually improve the levels of racial integration at the TPS from which they transferred. This finding is attributed to the fact that the majority of transfers involve minority students leaving predominately above-average minority schools or White students leaving above-average White schools. In all of these cases, the student transfers help the exiting school because the Little Rock TPS is left less segregated. We also do not find a disproportionate number of student transfers that would be of particular concern to critics of school choice, such as only White students exiting from high-minority schools (“white flight”). If we found that only these types of transfers occurred, there would certainly be cause for concern. However, these types of transfers were actually quite infrequent when compared with the majority of beneficial transfers that have occurred since 2006-2007. Thus, we can find little evidence that the charter schools had a negative impact on the racial balance of Little Rock TPS. In general, it seems that proponents of increased racial integration are focusing on the wrong target when attacking charter schools. Sadly, most students living in inner cities attend intensely segregated minority schools, whether they attend charter schools or TPS. Yet, across the United States, only 2.5% of public school children roam the halls in charter schools each day; the remaining 97.5% attend TPS (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2011). Those who claim to be truly concerned about limiting segregation should be focusing on the segregation in TPS to address this problem. Finally, and perhaps more important, the fact that poor and minority students exit segregated TPS for, in some cases, similarly segregated charters, does not imply that charter school policy is imposing segregation upon these students. Rather, the racial patterns we observe in charter schools are the result of the active choices these students and families make to seek more attractive schooling options. Clearly, the student attendance patterns that emerge from these increased choices offered to minority families are quite different than attendance patterns that resulted from the forced segregation of our nation’s past. Indeed, it is likely that the parents who are now able to choose charter schools for their students view these options as ones that enhance, rather than undermine, their civil rights.

### Child Push Out

#### Charters push out low performing students
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What Is the Motivation for “Pushing Out” Students

Theoretically, a charter school’s motivation to push out low-performing students could come from at least three sources. First, charter schools are schools of choice. As such, they need to attract students. Students are not assigned to charter schools like neighborhood schools and only can survive to the extent students choose to enroll. Therefore, charter schools feel market pressure to recruit students. One way to recruit students is through the academic reputation of the school (Ravitch, 2012), which is in part a function of the academic achievement of its students.3 Therefore, a school would have an incentive to push out below average students to improve the overall average achievement level of the school.

Second, low-performing students may be more expensive to educate (Miron, Urschel, & Saxton, 2011). For instance, low-performing students may be more likely to be a special education or limited English proficient (LEP) student requiring greater resources, and previous research has shown that charter schools have lower percentages of special education and LEP students (Center for Research on Education Outcomes [CREDO], 2011; GAO, 2012; Nichols-Barrer, Gill, Gleason, & Tuttle, 2012; Zimmer et al., 2003).4 Given the need for charter schools to be financially viable and that the reimbursement for at least some of these low performing students may not be adequate (Miron et al., 2011), charter schools may again have an incentive to push out below-average students.

Third, charter schools may feel strong accountability pressures. Most charter schools, like TPSs, have to meet academic targets to avoid sanctions under the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) or other state accountability programs. There has been a fair amount of research suggesting that accountability pressures can alter decisions by schools and lead to unintended consequences. For instance, in Chicago, Jacob (2005) found evidence that teachers excluded low-ability students from testing by placing them in special education in response to accountability pressures, whereas Jacob and Levitt (2007) found evidence of outright cheating by teachers. Other researchers have found that because schools are generally held accountable for the percentage of students making proficiency thresholds, schools and teachers will focus more attention on students near this cutoff threshold than on students at other parts of the distribution (Booher-Jennings, 2005; Krieg, 2008; Neal & Schanzenbach 2010). As another example, Figlio (2006) found evidence that schools assign long suspensions for low-performing students near test-taking periods. All this evidence suggests that schools and teachers sometimes respond to accountability pressure in unintended and even insidious ways. In particular, schools just above or below the proficiency threshold that determines whether they make adequate yearly progress (AYP) have the greatest incentive to push out low-performing students. Schools significantly above or below the threshold may have less incentive to push out low-performing students because pushing out a subset of students is unlikely to affect the odds of the schools making AYP. These schools would gain little in terms of accountability and lose the revenue associated with losing students. Later, we will examine whether low-performing students are more likely to exit when schools are near the AYP threshold.

### No Excuses Solves

#### Still no excuses
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Still, across most networks, schools look and feel about the same as they did a few years ago.

Students still learn in rigorous classroom environments, adhere to strict uniform codes, and are held accountable for their behavior using rigid merit and demerit systems. An untucked shirt can still earn a demerit at Achievement First. Success Academy gives students infractions for slouching. Chewing gum means the loss of paycheck dollars at KIPP.

### 2NC Trick – Leaving No Excuses

#### We are shifting from no excuses
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A few years ago, if a student arrived at an Ascend elementary school wearing the wrong color socks, she was sent to the dean’s office to stay until a family member brought a new pair.

Now, the school office is stocked with extra socks. Students without them can pick up a spare pair before heading to class.

It’s a simple shift, but part of a revolution in the culture at Ascend, which oversees five charter elementary schools, three middle schools, and a high school in Brooklyn. Making sure students and parents were sweating the small stuff, once integral to the network’s philosophy, was simply producing “too many unhappy children,” Ascend’s CEO Steve Wilson explained recently.

“We’ve moved sharply away from a zero tolerance discipline approach,” Wilson said. “We believe a warm and supportive environment produces the greatest long-term social effects.”

Parallel shifts are happening across New York City, as some charter school leaders take a second look at discipline policies they put in place when they opened. Those policies, connected to a broader set of ideas referred to as “no excuses,” combine teachers’ high academic expectations for students with strict behavior rules meant to ensure an orderly learning environment.

Some schools have tweaked those policies after seeing the effects on students, particularly as they exit their charter schools for more lenient environments. Others aim to distance themselves from the harsh practices that have grabbed headlines and generated fears that they could erode crucial political and parental support for charter schools. And some have changed simply because the charter sector’s swift growth has made faithful implementation of original practices impossible.

From Elizabeth Green: Inside the emotional debate about ‘no excuses’

We asked, you answered: What happened when teachers went too far?

Ongoing coverage of charter schools and school discipline

The schools often reject labels like zero tolerance or no excuses. But they generally have firm guidelines for everything from how students walk down hallways to what they wear.

While some charter schools never subscribed to a similar theory, those ideas still form the backbone of the culture at the charter schools that belong to networks like Achievement First, KIPP, and Ascend. Teachers say they’re key to allowing students to focus in class and net high scores on state tests. But as the sector grows — and issues of school discipline make national headlines — many schools are pulling back slightly as they search for the right balance.

“There is a broad movement away from no excuses discipline policies,” said Mary Wells, the co-founder of Bellwether Education Partners, a nonprofit that advises charter schools. “I’m not privy to all [charter management organizations’] conversations, but I would say most are having conversations about how and how much should we adjust our culture.”

#### No excuses is bad
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The limits of a philosophy

The former leader of Brooklyn Ascend Lower School remembers a moment when he realized the school’s focus on rigor and discipline had gone too far.

“It was horrible for me to walk out to dismissal and the first conversation I would hear parents having with their children is, ‘What color are you on?’” said Brandon Sorlie, now the chief academic officer at Ascend, referring to a tool used to track students’ behavior. The conversations were always about behavior as opposed to learning, he said.

Achievement First now has 17 schools in the city; Uncommon has 21. Success Academy, the largest network in New York City, has 34 different schools. The growth of the networks has made it difficult to strike the delicate balance between rigor and warmth in every charter classroom.

“Look at D.C.,” New York City Charter Center CEO James Merriman said, referring to the roughly 45 percent of students in the nation’s capital who attend charter schools. “Size has made these conversations about how the sector deals with discipline impossible to avoid.”

Harsh discipline practices at some schools have also made headlines, providing fodder for critics and concerned parents. A Chalkbeat analysis found that charter schools suspended students in 2011-12 at a rate of almost three times the rate of traditional public schools. Critics have long held that strict discipline prevents these charter schools from educating the highest-needs students, since they implicitly encourage unruly students to leave the school.

That shift comes as charter schools face more pressure than ever to serve high-needs students. A “Got to Go” list of student names at a Success Academy school sparked widespread outrage last year. The teachers union has made it a legislative priority to pressure charter schools to do more. Even the governor, a longtime supporter of charter schools, has made reference to “troubling practices.” Plus, both Achievement First and Success Academy face lawsuits for their treatment of students with disabilities.

An Achievement First school in Hartford made students wear a white shirt over their uniform signaling they were in “re-orientation” as a discipline tool, according to a 2013 Hartford Courant article. The shirt forbade students from interacting with their peers or participating in music and special physical classes. (A spokeswoman from Achievement First said the practice has changed.)

At KIPP Star Washington Elementary School, students were placed in a “calm-down” room, a padded room about the size of a walk-in closet, according to a 2013 New York Daily News story. A spokesman for KIPP said that as of January 2014, KIPP stopped referring students to the calm-down room.

Individual teachers have also occasionally crossed lines. Recently, the New York Times published a video of a Success Academy teacher harshly criticizing a student who answered a math question incorrectly.

Network leaders have said that cases like these do not represent their overall school culture. But behind the scenes, some leaders also began to question whether, in their quest to balance joy and academic rigor, the scale was too often weighted towards rigor.

“You’ve got to get them all right like it’s a symphony,” said Doug McCurry, co-CEO and superintendent of Achievement First, about the principles at the core of Achievement First. “I think, over the last few years, we’ve been playing the focus and rigor notes maybe more loudly than the investment and thinking notes.”

One former Uncommon administrator explained the struggle of those at her school to balance enforcing consequences for small offenses without allowing rules to become the end goal. (She did not want to be named in order to maintain relationships with those at Uncommon.)

“When you carry a weight of anger with talking in the hallway, a child interprets that [as] being universally wrong,” she said.

Others have raised questions about whether the tight control of student behavior actually sets all students up for success, especially before heading off to college, where few people will be making sure students do their work.

If students are confined to a tight structure in elementary and high school, it is no wonder they might find college “unfamiliar and overwhelming,” Wilson said.

#### That means the squo solves
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What’s actually changed

Some of the changes at schools are easy to see. The color boards that used to hang in Ascend elementary schools to designate students by behavior are no longer there. At its high school, Ascend has begun experimenting with restorative justice, an approach to discipline meant to focus on problem-solving instead of punishment. (A number of district schools are experimenting with those ideas, too.)

On a recent afternoon, one student addressed his peers for putting an inappropriate image on the desktop of student computers. His peers were then given the opportunity to ask why he would do that.

“It’s one of those things where in another school that had a different philosophy, he could have been suspended,” said Shannon Ortiz-Wong, an English teacher at Brooklyn Ascend High School, who previously worked at Achievement First Brooklyn High School and a district high school. Instead, his family members were brought in for a meeting, he apologized to his peers, and wrote a reflection.

When Dakarai Venson, a ninth-grader at Brooklyn Ascend High School was in middle school, he said he would be sent to the dean’s office for reading in class. Now, the teachers would not respond in the same way.

“I’ve gotten older, so I know it’s not the time to be reading. But also, teachers — they wouldn’t just overreact now,” Venson said.

Years ago, KIPP schools used to have students eat lunch in silence, but that practice is gone. The paycheck system used to track student behavior and progress toward character goals has “dramatically increased” the number of ways students can earn dollars for positive dollars, through showing character traits like curiosity and zest, said Allison Willis Holley, the principal at KIPP Infinity in Harlem.

Explore, a network of four charter schools, still has “soar sticks” in some elementary schools, which have student names on clothespins that move up and down based on a student’s behavior. But the practice is only used sporadically and schools are trying to find ways to eliminate extrinsic reward and consequence systems, chief academic officer Sam Fragomeni said in an email.

#### AT No shift
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What has changed, many say, is how these rules are emphasized and applied.

Schools have taken steps to give more positive feedback, deemphasize the tiniest behavior infractions, differentiate how they treat student misbehavior, and ensure students are learning from their consequences.

In short, it’s about working within the network’s original framework to improve the balance between a “warm and demanding” learning environment, KIPP’s Dave Levin said.

In terms of discipline, that means students are now taught to learn from their mistakes instead of simply receiving a consequence, KIPP principal Holley said.

Before, a student at KIPP might get a zero for failing to complete an assignment and that is still the reality today, Holley said. But now, teachers are more deliberate about following up with students and helping them learn from their mistakes, she explained.

KIPP schools also run their own advisory groups now called KIPP circles. Students are tasked with setting character and behavior goals — and also with having a little fun.

“There’s time for kids to be kids and to wiggle and to have time to talk and have social interactions and do all those things which contributes to a happier place,” Holley said.

At Achievement First, one change is that if students are off-task, teachers are now trained to tell students exactly how to fix the problem instead of simply scolding them, said Cristina Lopez del Castillo-De La Cruz, a dean at Achievement First Brooklyn High School.

“A lot of that shift is about helping [students] feel like we’re on the same team and we have the same goals,” said Chris Bostock, the principal at Achievement First Brooklyn High School.

#### Alt causes
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B. Local Legislation and Student

Sorting Local legislation substantially controls charter school administration, while federal law merely holds charter schools to the same anti-discrimination law as all federal funding recipients. Without stricter, local civil rights protections that mandate particular methods for inclusivity, charter schools may reinforce segregation originating from parental selection biases and disparate access to educational opportunities.82 In addition to civil rights legislation, there are a variety of factors in local legislation that may also influence racial stratification among charter schools. Beyond enrollment standard and admissions manipulation, anomalies in the day-to-day operations of charter schools include variances in charter responsibility to provide transportation, administer special services, and answer to oversight authorities. Both legislation and the individual nature of schools can lead to practices that encourage excluding difficult or expensive-to-educate students and including advantaged students more likely to achieve better academic outcomes.

i. Location

Location undoubtedly affects parents’ school selection, but location also impacts the information parents receive and how aware they are of different school options. A study of charter school enrollment in Washington, D.C., concluded that proximity was one of the highest determinants of enrollment and found, therefore, that de facto housing segregation is strongly reflected in the makeup of surrounding charter schools.83 Although racial isolation in a charter school may certainly be a result of the surrounding racial make-up, charter schools in areas identified as “urban” also offer an alternative for more affluent families to opt-out of local schools while sparing them private school expenses.84 Locating a charter school in a neighborhood already experiencing a racial transition will likely exacerbate segregation trends in the local school system.85

Many charter schools, either by mission or by legislation, locate in areas with larger populations of minority students, which accounts for the disproportionately high enrollment of Black students in charter schools nationwide.86 Oftentimes, legislation either gives preferences to, or incentives for, charter management applicants who propose to focus on “at-risk” or “challenging” student populations.87 While strategic location may allow a charter school to become a competitive alternative to underperforming and underfunded public schools, a charter school located in an area with higher concentrations of poverty may serve a population that lacks the information required to make a meaningful decision.88 Charter schools locating in low-income areas should assert their presence to local parents and work to present themselves as accessible to all students from the immediate area and any surrounding neighborhoods, maximizing the odds of attracting a diverse student body.

ii. Auxiliary Services

In order for charter schools to be a meaningful option for all families, they must offer all the services that students may need for an appropriate and adequate education.89 One major advantage of charter schools’ departure from typical district regulations—where only those assigned to the school may enroll—is their ability to attract outside students. Families from other public school districts may require an assurance that free transportation is available before they will consider enrolling their child. Siegel-Hawley and Frankenberg’s analysis revealed that four states do not explicitly require charter schools to provide transportation.90 Further, where charter schools present an opportunity to override urban-suburban segregation, only eleven states have legislation that provides for transportation across district lines (and often, only in special cases).91

Choice of charter school is further constrained by limited special education accommodations, English language services, or free and reduced lunch programs. While federal law requires that charter schools abide by disability rights protections and the standard of the free and reduced lunch program, charter schools may be exempt from state or district-wide mandates that go beyond the federal minimum. Schools also may cite a lack of facilities or staff which insulates the school from offering the service unless specifically requested.92 For example, federal law requires that charter schools make all their materials disability-accessible, but they only must provide translation services upon request.93 Charter schools may also offer fewer free and reduced lunch options. The Education Law Center (ELC) in Philadelphia, for example, found that slightly over 70% of charter schools offer free and reduced lunch programs, compared with over 80% of traditional public schools in the district.94 Another nationwide study estimated that in 2012 only 72% of charter schools enrolled in the National School Lunch Program, which was below the national average.95 Researchers use enrollment in free and reduced lunch programs to estimate the number of low-income students charter schools serve; thus, these lower free and reduced lunch percentages may indicate fewer lowincome students attending charter schools.96 Since their autonomous nature does not always require that schools provide essential services cost-free, charter schools without such services may not represent a realistic choice for many low-income families.

Researchers with the ELC also found that charter schools enroll a lower proportion of English-language learners (ELL) than is expected from a typical public school district.97 While federal and state civil rights protections should prohibit charter schools from rejecting students on discriminatory bases, charter schools may point to a lack of certified personnel in the area, or more comprehensive services at the district public school, to discourage enrollment by students who are more costly to educate.98 Parents may be immediately dissuaded from application or enrollment if the school cannot offer translation services or a certified English-language teacher upon their arrival.

iii. Admissions and Outreach

Two barriers to equity in school choice—information and access— often result from legislation dictating authorization procedures and requirements for charter applications. Some states mandate that charter applicants include plans for community outreach and recruitment efforts, but others are vague or purposefully flexible in the ways they permit charter schools to attract and recruit their desired student body.99 Under the federal CSP, schools receiving CSP money should employ a random lottery if more students apply to enroll than the school has capacity to admit.100 Weighted lotteries are permitted in some cases to target traditionally disadvantaged students, so long as the charter school explains that intention in its charter application.101 While a random lottery seems like the most equitable admissions procedure, the lottery provisions can be watered down. For example, some schools may assign higher weights to students living within a certain radius, students with siblings at the schools, or children of faculty and staff. Some schools may even automatically admit students who paid for pre-school services with the same charter organization.102

A study by the Annenberg Institute also found inequitable practices in the use of application requirements and enrollment periods that effectively discriminated against low-income students.103 The study cites examples of schools who limited applications by providing an enrollment window of only one hour or requiring parents to promise a minimum number of volunteer hours.104 These practices dissuade parents working multiple jobs or with excessive childcare responsibilities, who feel they could not meet such stringent requirements.

As public institutions receiving public funding, charter schools are accountable to the taxpayers they serve and should therefore remain a viable option for all types of families. Charter schools that impose parental-involvement clauses, lengthy applications, mandatory extra-curricular commitments, and harsh discipline policies play an enormous role in eliminating equal access to charter schools for low-income and minority students.105 Once enrolled, charter schools may continue to further manipulate their student body through harsh discipline policies or other “counseling-out” strategies.106

iv. Quality and Number of Authorizers

It is difficult to draw a broad conclusion about the impact of charter school admissions policies or outreach practices, as such methods vary based on the requirements of the school’s authorizer.107 Where some states provide that only the local school district or state board of education may authorize new charter schools, others allow thirdparty authorizers, such as higher education institutions or non-profit organizations.108 While theoretically the presence of multiple authorizers may incentivize competition to provide high-quality oversight and accountability services, in reality, the myriad of options allows charter applicants denied by one authorizer to shop for another with more lax guidelines.109 Charter schools therefore could first design their admission or outreach policies and then shop for an authorizer willing to approve the application.

States charge authorizing bodies with developing criteria for charter applications (also called ‘petitions’ or ‘proposals’).110 Many states use the application process as the means by which charter schools must fulfill self-defined diversity goals or state-mandated racialbalancing provisions. Florida, for example, provides that one criterion for approval must be based on the school’s purported plan to achieve a racial balance reflective of the community the school serves.111 Connecticut goes further to allow the Commissioner of Education to place on immediate probation any charter school that establishes an environment of racial and economic isolation.112 Other states, such as North Carolina, are far more lax in their request for diversity plans. North Carolina, for example, merely mandates that charter school enrollment “reasonably reflect” the racial and economic composition of the surrounding school district.113

To maximize social benefits from charter school authorization, some non-profits in the industry, such as the National Association of Charter School Authorizers, provide guidelines authorizers should follow when reviewing charter applicants.114 The guidelines, however, only vaguely explain optimal provisions, such as a “clear and compelling mission” and “sound business plan.”115 An authorizer then typically forms a five-year contract with the charter applicant’s board of directors, which provides periodic monitoring and accountability evaluations.116 Charter authorizers should establish a set of high-quality standards to ensure scrutiny in the authorization process; however, the NACSA guidelines are essentially silent on the subject of diversity and community impact. The guidelines discourage schools from creating neighborhoodbased connections and direct authorizers to ignore political or community influences when making renewal decisions.117 Variations in renewal and closure policies may therefore have a disparate impact on communities who begin to build connections with their local school, only to have the operations overturned or shuttered for poor or inconsistent performance.

Furthermore, authorizing agencies may have an incentive to impose lax policies in order to attract and contract with more charter applicants, as each authorizer enters into a paid contract with the schools they charter.118 The contract, or “charter” between an authorizer and school, lasts for a multi-year period for each charter school, yet the authorizers rarely assume any risk in the event that a school fails to perform.119 The authorizer has the power to deny the charter for renewal and then grant use of the school facilities to a new applicant.120 Without more consistent mandates for charter approvals, the combination of monetary incentives and relaxed authorizer duties and can encourage the proliferation of inequitable charter schools.

### Housing Alt Cause

#### Housing is intimately intertwined with school integration – only resolving “white flight” solves the aff
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In a study by Maria Krysan at the University of Illinois, white viewers were asked to watched short clips of scenes from identical neighborhoods. The white subjects were more likely to rate the neighborhood with white actors portraying the residents positively, while they reacted negatively to the same scenes in the same neighborhood when the scene was played out with black actors (The Washington Post). This study suggests that whites have a negative attitude towards living in neighborhoods that are not racially compromised of a vast majority of those who are like themselves. When whites move into more racially segregated towns to distance themselves from their black and low income neighbors, the vacancies they leave are rarely filled by whites, as whites are no longer choosing to live in integrated communities (The Washington Post). Therefore, as time goes on, previously integrated communities become more and more segregated. A realtor working in a suburb of Chicago recounts how she has encountered this phenomenon of purposeful segregation by whites. She consistently meets clients who immediately make it clear that they will not live on the eastern side of town, the part of the suburb that borders a poor black neighborhood (The Washington Post). These white families are making a conscious effort to keep themselves as distanced from different racial and socioeconomic groups as possible. Ferguson, Missouri offers insight into a specific town where white flight has occurred over the last twenty years. In that twenty year period, the racial composition of Ferguson changed from 25% black to 67% black. As this change has occurred over time, whites have mostly left Ferguson for suburban communities that are more racially segregated and further from the center of St. Louis (American Sociological Association). Although segregation decreased within Ferguson, this was simply the result of a massive exodus of white families into racially homogenized communities elsewhere. Another study involved an interview with a black mother in Mobile, Alabama. When asked what type of neighborhood she wanted to live in, she said that living in an all black neighborhood was “trouble,” and she went on to say that “if you’ve got a mixture it’s less trouble (Why Poor People Move).” When asked about the advantages of an all black neighborhood, her answer was simple; “No advantage at all (Why Poor People Move).” This mother revealed an attitude that has been studied amongst minority racial groups whose preferences are geared to integrated neighborhoods. They often do not seek the homogeneity sought out by white families.

The introduction of school choice options in the South after the Brown decision resulted in a failure at desegregation as few blacks enrolled in white schools, and virtually no whites enrolled in black schools. A lack of choice to integrate in these early years of school choice by black families can be attributed to factors such as a distrust for white schools and communities and a pride in their own schools, viewed as an achievement accomplished through their own willpower and work. The choice to remain integrated by white families was accomplished through violent attacks, threats, and intimidation meant to scare black students from integrating into their previously all white schools (Cecelski, 9). When school choice options, such as charter schools, appeared they hoped to be centers of racial and socioeconomic integration (Kahlenberg, 13). Despite this, families of all races are often choosing schools based on racial composition rather than academic quality of the school. Unfortunately, charter schools have become home to some of the most deeply segregated public schools. According to a study by researchers at UCLA, charter schools are more racially isolated than traditional public schools in virtually every state and large metropolitan area in the nation (Choice Without Equity). The cause of this segregation can be partly explained by the fact that parents are, in many cases, choosing to only apply to charter schools where a majority of the students are of their own race (National Education Policy Center). Middle school parents were 12% more likely to choose a school where the race of their child was represented by at least 20% of the student body than a school on a similar academic scale where their child’s race made up 10% of the student body (Slate). Parents of all races have preferences to send their children to schools that are racially similar to themselves when given the choice. This being said, studies indicate that white and high income applicants to charter schools had the strongest preferences that their children stay in schools that are racially and socioeconomically homogenized. When the proportion of latino and black students in a school increases, white parents become less likely to apply to these schools. This is untrue for black and latino families, suggesting that school choice is the method by which white and affluent families perpetuate racial segregation in schools (Scholars Strategy Network). The 2000’s were a period of sharp increases in the segregation of the extremely wealthy across school districts, indicating that affluent families, not just white families, are choosing to attend schools that isolate themselves from those different in different wealth brackets than them (Trends in School Economic Segregation, 1970 to 2010). School choice, originally intended to speed up integration, has become a tool of affluent and white families to further segregation and keep their children in racially and socioeconomically homogenized schools.

After the Brown ruling, there was hope that American public schools would be filled with children that represented the actual demographics of the country. More than half a century later, this dream remains unrealized, and the process towards integration remains unfinished. In a system of neighborhood schools, segregated housing perpetuated by the choices of whites to live in homogenous neighborhoods prevents schools from replicating the diversity of the nation, but rather forces them to represent demographics that are the result of individual choice. In hopes of combating this roadblock, school choice options have evolved over the last half century in hopes of tackling a problem that wouldn’t seem to go away. Original forms of school choice in Southern states were thwarted by threatening whites who intimidated blacks from taking advantage of integrated schools. In more modern times, school choice options such as charter schools have failed to live up to their promise of integration, as families, and particularly white and affluent families, are choosing to apply only to schools whose student bodies look like their children. Integration efforts since the Brown ruling have not been a complete failure. Particularly in the South, schools saw massive increases in racial integration in the few decades after the landmark case. Despite this, trends towards housing segregation caused by white flight from increasingly minority cities into racially homogenized suburbs during the 1970’s and 1980’s introduced an era of resegregation during the 1990’s. As housing became segregated, education followed suite. It is not completely clear why this trend of resegregation waited until 1990 to occur, as housing segregation and white flight became significant issues in the 1970’s. Further research into why this delay occurred may offer clearer insight into how trends in housing segregation correlate to trends in school segregation over long periods of time. Housing segregation, School choice, and School segregation are separate entities, but one cannot be understood without first understanding the others. To finish the job that began more than half a century ago in the Supreme Court, the reality of purposeful segregation by whites in homogeneous neighborhoods and racially motivated choices about which schools their children will attend must be confronted, and these practices must be challenged by the prospect of a society in which education truly is a place of equal opportunity for all.

## Inequality/Neoliberalism Add-On

### 1NC Frontline

#### 1. School choice is the most effective way to improve K-12 education — the best meta-study proves.

Wolf 16 — Patrick J. Wolf, Distinguished Professor of Education Policy and 21st Century Endowed Chair in School Choice in the Department of Education Reform at the University of Arkansas College of Education and Health Professions, Principal Investigator of the School Choice Demonstration Project, holds a Ph.D. in Government from Harvard University, 2016 (“School Choice Boosts Test Scores,” *Jay P. Greene’s Blog*—a scholarly education blog, May 10th, Available Online at <https://jaypgreene.com/2016/05/10/school-choice-boosts-test-scores/>, Accessed 06-19-2017)

Private school choice remains a controversial education reform. Choice programs, involving school vouchers, tax-credit scholarships, or Education Savings Accounts (ESAs), provide financial support to families who wish to access private schooling for their child. Once declared dead in the U.S. by professional commentators such as Diane Ravitch and Greg Anrig, there are now 50 private school choice programs in 26 states plus the District of Columbia. Well over half of the initiatives have been enacted in the past five years. Private school choice is all the rage. But does it work? M. Danish Shakeel, Kaitlin Anderson, and I just released a meta-analysis of 19 “gold standard” experimental evaluations of the test-score effects of private school choice programs around the world. The sum of the reliable evidence indicates that, on average, private school choice increases the reading scores of choice users by about 0.27 standard deviations and their math scores by 0.15 standard deviations. These are highly statistically significant, educationally meaningful achievement gains of several months of additional learning from school choice. The achievement benefits of private school choice appear to be somewhat larger for programs in developing countries than for those in the U.S. Publicly-funded programs produce larger test-score gains than privately-funded ones. The clarity of the results from our statistical meta-analysis contrasts with the fog of dispute that often surrounds discussions of the effectiveness of private school choice. Why does our summing of the evidence identify school choice as a clear success while others have claimed that it is a failure (see here and here)? Three factors have contributed to the muddled view regarding the effectiveness of school choice: ideology, the limitations of individual studies, and flawed prior reviews of the evidence. School choice programs support parents who want access to private schooling for their child. Some people are ideologically opposed to such programs, regardless of the effects of school choice. Other people have a vested interest in the public school system and resist the competition for students and funds that comes with private school choice. No amount of evidence is going to change their opinion that school choice is bad. A second source of disputes over the effectiveness of choice are the limits of each individual empirical study of school choice. Some are non-experimental and can’t entirely rule out selection bias as a factor in their results (see here, and here). Fortunately, over the past 20 years, some education researchers have been able to use experimental methods to evaluate privately- and publicly-funded private school choice programs. Experimental evaluations take the complete population of students who are eligible for a choice program and motivated to use it, then employ a lottery to randomly assign some students to receive a school-choice voucher or scholarship and the rest to serve in the experimental control group. Since only random chance, and not parental motivation, determines who gets private school choice and who doesn’t, gold standard experimental evaluations produce the most reliable evidence regarding the effectiveness of choice programs. We limit our meta-analysis to the 19 gold standard studies of private school choice programs globally. Each of the gold standard studies, in isolation, has certain limitations. In the experimental evaluation of the initial DC Opportunity Scholarship Program that I led from 2004 to 2011, the number of students in testing grades dropped substantially from year 3 to year 4, leading to a much noisier estimate of the reading impacts of the program, which were positive but just missed being statistically significant with 95% confidence. Two experimental studies of the Charlotte privately-funded scholarship program, here and here, reported clear positive effects on student test scores but were limited to just a single year after random assignment. Two recent experimental evaluations of the Louisiana Scholarship Program found negative effects of the program on student test scores but one study was limited to just a single year of outcome data and the second one (which I am leading) has only analyzed two years of outcome data so far. The Louisiana program, and the state itself, are unique in certain ways, as are many of the programs and locations that have been evaluated. What are we to conclude from any of these individual studies? Meta-analysis is an ideal approach to identifying the common effect of a policy when many rigorous but small and particular empirical studies vary in their individual conclusions. It is a systematic and scientific way to summarize what we know about the effectiveness of a program like private school choice. The sum of the evidence points to positive achievement effects of choice. Finally, most of the previous reviews of the evidence on school choice have generated more fog than light, mainly because they have been arbitrary or incomplete in their selection of studies to review. The most commonly cited school choice review, by economists Cecilia Rouse and Lisa Barrow, declares that it will focus on the evidence from existing experimental studies but then leaves out four such studies (three of which reported positive choice effects) and includes one study that was non-experimental (and found no significant effect of choice). A more recent summary, by Epple, Romano, and Urquiola, selectively included only 48% of the empirical private school choice studies available in the research literature. Greg Forster’s Win-Win report from 2013 is a welcome exception and gets the award for the school choice review closest to covering all of the studies that fit his inclusion criteria – 93.3%. (Greg for the win!) Our meta-analysis avoided all three factors that have muddied the waters on the test-score effects of private school choice. It is a non-ideological scientific enterprise, as we followed strict meta-analytic principles such as including every experimental evaluation of choice produced to date, anywhere in the world. Our study was accepted for presentation at competitive scientific conferences including those of the Society for Research on Education Effectiveness, the Association for Education Finance and Policy, and the Association for Policy Analysis and Management. Our study is not limited by small sample sizes or only a few years of outcome data. It is informed by all the evidence from all the gold standard studies. Finally, there is nothing arbitrary or selective in our sample of experimental evaluations. We included all of them, regardless of their findings. When you do the math, students achieve more when they have access to private school choice.

#### 2. Schools Not Key To Inequality — Finland proves.

Bruenig 14 — Matt Bruenig, Freelance Writer specializing in Poverty and Political Theory, has written for *The Washington Post*, *Los Angeles Times*, *The Atlantic*, *The New Republic*, *The American Prospect*, *In These Times*, *Jacobin*, and *Dissent*, 2014 (“America’s dangerous education myth: Why it isn’t the best anti-poverty program,” *Salon*, May 12th, Available Online at <http://www.salon.com/2014/05/12/americas_dangerous_education_myth_no_it_isnt_the_best_anti_poverty_program/>, Accessed 06-19-2017)

If you’ve followed the education reform debate in this country, the Finland story should be familiar by now. Almost as if engaged in an elaborate troll, Finland has apparently organized its educational system in exactly the opposite way as the reform movement here claims is necessary. The reformers say we need longer school days, but the Finns have short ones. The reformers say we need extensive standardized testing, but the Finns have almost none. The reformers say we need to keep a close leash on teachers, but the Finns give their teachers considerable freedom. Despite all of these pedagogical mistakes, the Finns consistently find themselves at the top of the international education scoreboard.

Normally, the suggested lesson of the Finland story is that the education reformers’ proposals are at minimum unnecessary and perhaps even counterproductive. Whether this lesson actually falls out of the Finland story is the subject of hotly contested arguments that are insufferably boring. However, flying under the radar of these Finland debates is a much less contestable and interesting lesson: Education cannot deliver economic equality.

If ever there was an opportunity to show that education can fix inequality and poverty, Finland is it. The children come into its education system with the lowest poverty rates in the world. In addition to its overall excellence, Finland’s education system is also extremely egalitarian in the way that it instructs its pupils. There are almost no private schools, college is free, and an ethos of total inclusion seems to reign. It is the closest thing to the liberal education utopia as you will probably ever find.

Despite all of this, Finnish economic inequality and poverty is still quite high, at least when you look at the market distribution of income. In 2010, Finland’s market poverty rate (defined as those with incomes below 50 percent of the median income) was 32.2 percent. By comparison, the United States’ market poverty was actually lower at 28.4 percent. When it comes to overall inequality, Finland’s Gini coefficient in 2010 was 0.479. This was only slightly lower than the U.S.’ Gini coefficient, which stood at 0.499.

Education boosters bizarrely think that providing everyone a high-quality education will somehow magically result in them all having good-paying jobs. But, as Finland shows, this turns out not to be true. Apparently, it’s not possible for everyone to simultaneously hold jobs as well-paid upper-class professionals because at least some people have to actually do real work. A modern economy requires a whole army of lesser-skilled jobs that just don’t pay that well and the necessity of those jobs doesn’t go away simply because people are well-educated.

The reason Finland’s ultimate distribution of income is so equal is not because its great education system has made everyone receive high paychecks (an impossible task), but because Finland has put in place distributive policies that make sure its national income is shared broadly. In 2010, Finland’s tax level was 42.5 percent of its GDP, which was nearly double the tax level of the U.S. By strategically spreading that tax money around through a host of cash transfer and benefit programs, Finland’s high market poverty rate of 32.2 percent fell to just 7.3 percent. Its child poverty rate, which Finland focuses extra attention on, fell down to 3.9 percent. Overall economic inequality took a similar dive.

The real lesson that the Finland story teaches us is not the one about pedagogical techniques that draws so much fierce debate. Rather, it’s a lesson about what very successful pedagogy and excellent education can actually do for a society. Good education can make your society well-educated and more productive, but it cannot generate a labor market in which everyone works a high-paying job. It cannot ensure that market income is distributed evenly or adequately. It cannot even come remotely close to doing those things.

The upshot of this lesson is that the fixation on education as a solution to poverty, inequality or any other distributional problem is totally wrongheaded. Good and equitable education is a huge plus for all sorts of things, but it doesn’t create an egalitarian society. Those who say it will – a group that includes reformers and their opponents – have no idea what they are talking about and, through their ignorant distractions, help sow the seeds of never-ending stratification and low-end material insecurity.

#### 3. Status Quo Solves — ESSA promotes equity.

Cook-Harvey et al. 16 — Channa M. Cook-Harvey, Senior Researcher at the Learning Policy Institute, former Research and Practice Associate at the School of Education at Stanford University, holds a Ph.D. in Race, Inequality, and Language in Education from Stanford University, et al., with Linda Darling-Hammond, President of the Learning Policy Institute, Charles E. Ducommun Professor of Education and Faculty Director of the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education at Stanford University, former President of the American Educational Research Association, former Senior Social Scientist and Director of the RAND Education and Human Resources Program at the RAND Corporation, holds an Ed.D. in Urban Education from Temple University, Livia Lam, Senior Policy Advisor at the Learning Policy Institute, Charmaine Mercer, Director of the DC office and Senior Researcher at the Learning Policy Institute, and Martens Roc, Policy and Outreach Advisor at the Learning Policy Institute, 2016 (*Equity and ESSA: Leveraging Educational Opportunity Through the Every Student Succeeds Act*, Published by the Learning Policy Institute, Available Online at <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Equity_ESSA_REPORT.pdf>, Accessed 06-18-2017, p. 2)

ESSA and Its Implications for Educational Equity

A critical role for the federal government is to promote equity for underserved children and youth, and the nation’s most prominent education laws have long had equal educational opportunity as a central mission. However, equity is still far from accomplished in the United States.4 Fortunately, there is greater attention to these issues than has been true for many years.

The recent passage of ESSA is intended to address many of the shortcomings of NCLB. ESSA explicitly calls for the teaching of higher-order thinking skills, and allows states to replace the sanctions that narrowed the curriculum and caused good teachers to flee from low-performing schools with strategies for continuous improvement.5 However, its emphasis on state control of accountability systems to achieve these goals has raised concerns among advocates that states may overlook the needs of low-performing schools or fail to address the achievement gap between traditionally underserved students and their peers. This has led some advocates to question if equity has been lost under ESSA.

These concerns are legitimate given the long history of unequal educational opportunity in the United States, from the time of slavery— when it was a crime to teach an enslaved person to read—through segregated systems offering dramatically different resources for learning. At the same time, it is clear that a new strategy is needed to ensure a high-quality education for all. In fact, a close examination of ESSA shows that, in many respects, it provides more leverage for equity than NCLB. For example, it is more insistent that states illuminate and address inequalities in resources, students’ access to a full and rich curriculum, and the distribution of effective, properly assigned, and experienced teachers. In addition, the law offers broader opportunities for states to consider what schools and educators need to inspire the kinds of student learning outcomes that our nation’s most privileged children enjoy.

#### 4. No Inequality-Based Mortality Gap — it’s already closed.

Currie and Schwandt 16 — Janet Currie, Henry Putnam Professor of Economics and Public Affairs and Director of the Center for Health and Well Being at Princeton University, Director of the Program on Children at the National Bureau of Economic Research, holds a Ph.D. in Economics from Princeton University, and Hannes Schwandt, Assistant Professor in the Department of Economics at the University of Zurich, holds a Ph.D. in Economics from Universitat Pompeu Fabra (Spain), 2016 (“Falling inequality in mortality in the US,” VoxEU.org—the Centre for Economic Policy Research’s policy portal, July 2nd, Available Online at <http://voxeu.org/article/mortality-inequality-good-news-county-level-approach>, Accessed 06-19-2017)

Overall, our results show that the health of the next generation in the poorest areas of the US has improved tremendously and that the race gap has largely closed. It is surprising how little attention has been paid to this health success story in either the academic or the public discussion.

Likely drivers for the strong decline in mortality inequality are social policies that helped the most disadvantaged families. One of the most important may be expansions of public health insurance to poor pregnant women and children that took place in the late 1980s and 1990s. Other important factors include reductions in smoking prevalence, expansions of food and nutrition programs, and reductions in pollution. Overall, these findings show that even in times of great economic inequality, inequality in health outcomes is not inevitable but is strongly mediated by policy.

#### 5. Neoliberalism good for 4 reasons—Creates ways to protect the environment, reduces inequalities, improves value to life, and promotes growth in developing countries

Pirie PhD 17 — Economics MPhil from Cambridge University and PhD in philosophy from St. Andrew’s (Madison Pirie, 4-5-2017, "The neoliberal mind," Adam Smith Institute, https://www.adamsmith.org/research/the-neoliberal-mind, Accessed 5-17-2017, JWS)

Neoliberals are committed to economic growth and believe there are no limits to its potential. They believe the world can continue indefinitely to become richer, and that there are no limits to growth. This is in sharp contrast to many environmentalists and those on the left who suppose that growth equates with greed and a profligate lifestyle. The supposition by many of them is that growth is the expression of a materialism that values possessions more than human values and experiences. The person who wishes to have more material possessions is often derided as someone lacking in spirituality or the ability to appreciate life’s non-material rewards. It is further assumed by some that the Earth’s limited stock of minerals, elements and other resources is being drained by the headlong dash for growth, and that we are in danger of depleting this stock and leaving “nothing left for our grandchildren.” Some cite statistics which purport to show that even though we are twice as wealthy on average as we were a generation ago, we are no happier, and conclude that therefore there is no point to economic growth. Others point to the increase in the world’s population and claim the planet cannot bear the load of all the extra people and the drain they impose upon the Earth’s resources. The call from such people is for us to put limits on economic growth, to curb increases in population, and to live more simply, leaving a smaller footprint on the planet. There seems to many neoliberals an assumption behind this that human beings are a form of pollution, and that the world would be better off and “more natural” without them. The neoliberal outlook is completely different. It treats humanity itself as a resource, and a limitless one at that. It is optimistic enough to believe that the ingenuity and creativity that characterize human beings can solve any and all of these apparent problems. In the first place it does not accept the notion that we are using up Earth’s scarce resources. Advancing technology enables us to access resources which were formerly unreachable. Coupled with our ability to use fewer resources in manufacture, and our ability to develop substitutes, it means that our ability to supply resources is exceeding our demands made upon them. They point to a decline in the cost in real terms of most major resources. In a famous wager made in 1980, Julian Simon, author of “The Infinite Resource,” bet Paul Erlich, author of “The Population Bomb,” that a basket of scarce resources would be cheaper in 10 years’ time than at the time of the wager. Simon won and Erlich duly paid up. One of them was copper, then vital for telecommunications, with a reserve supply estimated at a handful of years. It was superseded by carbon fibre cables and is now present in greater reserves than it was then. Neoliberals see the world as dynamic, not static. There is not a fixed supply of resources that is used up. There is resource use that fluctuates in price as demand and supply vary. If demand jumps ahead of available supply, prices will rise and people will use less and try to access reserves that were previously unprofitable. They will turn to and develop substitutes in their place. This is one reason why carbon fibre and laminates are now used instead of steel in many manufactures. A generation ago it took a roomful of equipment to do all of the things a smartphone now does. It is a record player, a movie camera and projector, a computer, a video recorder and player. It is a telephone of course, and a calculator, a watch, a compass, a flashlight, a dictation machine, a word processor, and a great deal more besides. Yet it sits in the pocket using a tiny fraction of the resources it took only recently to make all of the equipment that it has replaced. The argument that growth does not increase happiness fails to resonate with neoliberals. They point out that surveys of happiness are necessarily subjective, asking people to rate how happy they are. The people answering now are not the same people who answered a generation ago, and standards and expectations change in the interim. What growth does is to help remove the unnecessary causes of unhappiness such as a grandparent starving to death in winter, or a child dying of disease or malnutrition. Growth helps fund adequate diets and medical advances. On the subject of population growth neoliberals look at real world developments and find little cause for alarm. Global population has increased because medical advances and increased food supply have kept alive people who would previously have died. In underdeveloped countries people have many children because they need the child’s contribution to family budgets, and they depend on their children to support them in old age. As countries experience economic growth, however, they become rich enough to put children into education instead of work, and they can afford social services to support the aged. Because of this population increase declines as countries become richer. The world now has just over 7 billion people. The above trends suggest that the increase will gradually level off, reaching perhaps 10 billion and then staring to decline. This is far from the alarmist figures of 30 billion or even 50 billion that are tossed about, and it is a figure that the Earth can easily support in terms of food and resources. The answer to charges of crass materialism is straightforward. A neoliberal wants people to be able to allocate their resources as they see fit, mostly by their individual spending, but some of it through the governments they elect. Growth has brought material prosperity, it is true, with cars and televisions and smartphones now the norm. But it has also brought museums and art galleries and symphony orchestras. It has brought sanitation and medical breakthroughs. It has bought the exploration of space and increased or knowledge of the working of the physical and natural worlds. It has achieved these non-material things because people have used it individually or voted to use it collectively to achieve these things. Growth brings the wealth that brings these choices. TRADE AND WEALTH At the very core of the neoliberal worldview is the knowledge that the wealth of the world is not fixed, but is continuously created by specialization, trade and exchange. And it is an essential part of this view that value does not reside in objects but in the mind of the beholder. It is somewhat ironic that one of the few things that Adam Smith was wrong about, indeed, the only significant thing he was wrong about, was something that Karl Marx took and made central to his system – this was the labour theory of value. The error is to suppose that value resides in objects. Our language leads us into this error. We say that an object has value, whereas what we mean is that we value the object. Value does not reside in an object as something that inheres to it in addition to its physical properties. Value is in the mind of the beholder, not in the object. We value it, and because we are all different, we value things differently. If it were indeed true that the value of an object consists of the labour it took to produce it, including the labour it took to produce its components, then value could be measured. It would be objective. We would calculate the man or woman hours it took to produce it, and would know its value. That value could be seen, and would be the same for everyone precisely because it would be an objective measure. Marx erected a whole superstructure upon this error. He spoke of “surplus value” when something is sold for more than the labour cost of its production, and regarded this profit as exploitation, with the capitalist gaining more than the value put into it by those whose labour produced it. In fact value is subjective. We value things differently because we have different preferences and priorities. Something might take many hours of labour to produce, but if no-one wants it, then its value is zero. Value derives from demand, not from production. And it is because we value things differently that trade takes place. If value were indeed objective and measurable, we would have no reason to trade. We trade because we want what the other party has more than what we have to give in exchange for it. There would be no reason to trade objects that had equal, external value because nothing would be gained from the process. We trade because we place different valuations on things, and when we do so we create wealth. People speak of one party “getting the best of a bargain” when an exchange takes place, but this again is a misunderstanding. People trade because each party values what the other party has, and values it more than what they are giving up in exchange. They each gain something they value more than what they are giving up for it. In other words each has gained more value than they had. Wealth has been created by the exchange and both parties have something of greater value to them. Neither has gained the best of the bargain because both have gained value. Trade is a winwin situation that creates wealth for both. It is pertinent that it is an inherently social activity. Far from being predatory or exploitive as some claim trade to be, it is essentially co-operative, with both parties working together for mutual advantage. It was specialization and the application of external power to boost productivity that characterized the Industrial Revolution. The trade it made possible created wealth first for Britain which pioneered it, then for others as they followed suit. It is part of the neoliberal programme to spread the benefits of this process as widely as possible. They regard trade as benign, unlike some critics who think of it as somehow demeaning and corrupting. When the Left deride trade, much as Napoleon derided Britain as “a nation of shopkeepers,” they echo the aristocratic voices of the past who regarded trade as shabby, unworthy of a gentleman who would better spend his time in hunting or improving his swordsmanship. On the contrary, neoliberals regard trade as a worthy, even uplifting activity that improves the lot of humankind. To them it is the key that unlocks the door to the wealth on which so many human advances have depended. Although some affect to despise its materialism, trade has generated the wealth that has funded cultural pursuits, as well as the health and sanitation it has made possible along with its material prosperity. Neoliberal ideas have been instrumental in helping poorer countries embark on the road that led Britain first, and then others, into the wealth that turned it from a predominantly agricultural economy into a modern, developed industrial nation. It is part of the neoliberal ethos that under-developed countries should be helped and encouraged to embark on a similar journey, and it is a part of that ethos that the lives of their peoples will be improved when they do so. It is this which has lifted so much of the world’s population from subsistence and starvation into self-sufficiency and survival. Critics may affect to value indigenous cultures and to praise the simplicity of their traditional lifestyles, but the fact is that when peoples from under-developed nations have been given the choice, they have opted for the upward path into modern developed status. Some, indeed, have left those simple and traditional lifestyles to seek the comparative affluence that life in the developed world can bring. Adam Smith spoke of the urge people have to improve their condition, an urge that can be seen at work in every country climbing out of desperate poverty into a more secure and wealthier position. MAKING POOR PEOPLE RICHER Neoliberals have often been accused of being the friends of international bankers and executives of multinational corporations. Some of their critics allege that they are little more than apologists for the rich and powerful, for whom they provide the gloss of intellectual cover. It is claimed that behind their philosophy lies only the interest of a powerful ruling class which has the world’s economy rigged in its favour. The truth is almost the opposite. Neoliberals concern themselves most of all with the lot of the poor, and with the global poor as well as with the poor of their own country. They regard the main legitimate aim of politics to be the improvement of the condition of those at the low end of the socioeconomic scale, for it is there that the difference matters most. At the bottom end it is the difference between starvation and survival, whereas higher up it can be the less important difference between comfort and affluence. This concern with the world’s poor is greater with neoliberals than it is with most conservatives or libertarians. It is a concern that is shared, however, by the more benign socialists, even though the methodology they advocate is vastly different. Neoliberals favour fair and open markets, not cronyism, which they regard as rent-seeking, the use of political power to gain greater return than they would receive in a fair and open market. Neoliberals are vociferous opponents of attempts by established and powerful corporations to lobby governments into making it difficult for newcomers to enter the market to compete with them. Similarly they oppose taxpayer subsidies direct or indirect to further corporate interests. They are also against bailouts of failing firms, except perhaps in isolated cases where special circumstances prevail, generally taking the view that the markets should punish failure just as it rewards success. Taking a realistic, rather than an idealized view of the world, neoliberals recognize that businesses might find it easier to influence laws in their favour than to compete successfully in an aggressive market. Money spent in lobbying for laws to limit competition might be more successful than money spent in improving their products or processes. This is regarded by neoliberals as an illicit activity, and they seek laws and institutions to restrain it. The biggest barrier to such activity is openness, because where companies and legislators are required to declare their interests publicly, corrupt or sweetheart dealings between government and business are less likely to take place. The problem is even more serious on an international scale because many multinational corporations operate in countries where corruption is endemic and even tolerated. Eternal vigilance against such distortions of market activity is even more required in these cases than it is in the developed countries. Where neoliberals diverge from socialists is in methodology. The latter believe that wealth must be redistributed to help those at the bottom, whereas the former believe that it must be created. Neoliberals do not suppose that wealth is fixed. On the contrary, it is constantly being created. The countries which have become richer have done so by creating wealth, not by having it redistributed from richer ones. Neoliberals, much more so than conservatives or libertarians, are ready to endorse a degree of redistribution within developed countries as a means of lifting up the condition of the poorest in society, but on the international scale they note that it has been economic growth by trade and exchange, rather than foreign aid, which has uplifted the world’s poor. Within developed countries many neoliberals look for ways of making redistribution more efficient as well as more humane. They look at ideas such as a Negative Income Tax or a Minimum Income Guarantee as ways of rationalizing the myriad of confusing and sometimes conflicting benefits which have somehow proliferated in developed economies. Some of them look with interest at experiments with a Citizens’ Income, given to all citizens to ensure that those at the bottom have an acceptable living standard. There is no unanimity among neoliberals about the best method by which welfare can be delivered to the needy, but there is an open-minded readiness to experiment and to accept whatever works in practice. Neoliberals note the longstanding problem with welfare – that of reconciling help for those who need it without creating disincentives for those who might otherwise have been motivated to improve their lot. They favour opportunity, wanting to make it easier for new jobs to be created by removing some of the regulatory barriers that inhibit the process. They accept that help may be needed with retraining or relocation to help people into new types of jobs or those further afield. They accept as basic that it is important not to have people trapped in welfare, unable to earn more money for fear of losing the welfare benefits they currently receive. However, even in developed economies neoliberals take the view that the growth of the economy is a way to improve the condition of poorer people. A growing economy creates job and opens opportunities. Unlike socialists who favour higher taxes so more might be redistributed to create a more equal society, neoliberals favour lower taxes so more investment can take place and the economy can expand.

### School choice good

#### School choice is key to equal opportunity and integration.

Ford 17 — Virginia Walden Ford, Executive Director of D.C. Parents for School Choice—the political grassroots organization that successfully lobbied for voucher legislation in DC, 2017 (“School choice the fastest track to integration,” *The Hill*, May 23rd, Available Online at <http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/education/334608-school-choice-the-fastest-track-to-integration>, Accessed 06-19-2017)

Access to a quality education shouldn’t depend on where you live, where you came from or how much money you make. As a mom who fought like heck to make sure my son was in the right schooling environment for him, I believe education is a basic American right that keeps our nation on the right track. But recent history has shown that public schools are increasingly segregated not just by race, but also by income. Families too often are forced to send their child to a default school, regardless of the quality of the education or the achievement level of their peers. It wasn’t supposed to be this way. The landmark Supreme Court case Brown vs. the Board of Education of Topeka — a unanimous decision that ended the deplorable “separate-but-equal” statutes that had been in place — turns 63 this month. In the 1960s and 1970s, the decision worked to integrate schools, especially as neighborhoods became more racially integrated. But by the 1980s, neighborhoods continued becoming more integrated, but public schools went in the opposite direction. Between 1970 and 2009, income-based segregation more than doubled, with the percentage of families residing either in “affluent” or “low-income” neighborhoods going from 15 percent to 33 percent. When it comes to residential real estate, schools often wind up linked to property values. That means the price of renting or owning in a “good” district continues to rise, making economic integration an impossibility for many families. Worse, there are those who use the economic segregation of education to reverse the original intent of the justices in Brown. Take, for example, the recent case of Gardendale, Ala., a predominantly white suburb that’s attempting to separate itself from the much more diverse Jefferson County school district to which it belongs. A number of minority students from other parts of Jefferson County have taken advantage of intradistrict school choice to attend school in Gardendale. Instead of embracing these students, families in Gardendale want to create their own district, and some have openly admitted their motivation is race-based. The Jefferson County students may soon be denied the access to a quality education that we have repeatedly said defines our nation. The reality is that Brown didn’t get us where we need to be: It broke down barriers but failed to establish new pathways. That’s why I strongly believe that we must have a robust system of state-based educational choice if we ever intend to empower every K-12 student in America. School choice addresses the problem of deepening segregation in two ways: First, it uncouples the decisions about where to live and where to send children to school. Second, it allows schools to provide different educational offerings to different audiences, empowering families to choose schools based on what their students actually need. If we truly want to desegregate our schools and promote academic achievement, here are three easy ways to get started: First, enact universal school choice programs that allow all families to access the funds that are set aside by state governments to educate their students. Programs can be scaled to ensure greater access for lower-income and special needs families, but universality helps erode non-economic barriers and makes sure all families have shared interests in the sustainability of these programs. Second, work with education providers, community groups, policymakers and other stakeholders to promote accountability and prevent fraud using a common-sense system of checks and balances. Finally, make sure families are aware of and understand the schooling options available to their students, including information available in multiple languages, outreach from community groups and services to help with application forms along with other administrative support. We know this approach works. State-based choice programs across America have been proven to improve academic outcomes, raise parental satisfaction and produce more civic-minded, tolerant students. As Congress prepares to ask Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos next week about the Trump administration’s education budget, Members should consider the importance of school choice policies made at the local and state level as opposed to being dictated by the federal government. Two decades ago, as a single mom trying to find the best educational fit for my kids, I didn’t know where to turn. My son was only able to access a great education because he received a private scholarship that paid his private school tuition. I know how drastically different — and worse — his life would be without that education. When the Supreme Court unanimously decided in Brown more than six decades ago, the justices surely didn’t anticipate desegregation followed by intense re-segregation and self-segregation. Until the system of haves and have-nots, historically and presently defined by race and money, is upended, American K-12 education will continue to exist as a separated, unequal enterprise. True school choice — making sure all students can get in where they fit in — will help solve the K-12 integration dilemma.

#### School choice improves schools.

Forster 16 — Greg Forster, Senior Fellow with the Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice, holds a Ph.D. in Political Philosophy from Yale University, 2016 (*A Win-Win Solution: The Empirical Evidence on School Choice*, Fourth Edition, May, Available Online at <http://www.edchoice.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/A-Win-Win-Solution-The-Empirical-Evidence-on-School-Choice.pdf>, Accessed 06-19-2017, p. 4)

Meanwhile, the idea that school choice might improve public schools is dismissed as ideological claptrap. In fact, the empirical evidence consistently shows it is the case, and the reasons are not hard to explain. One reason choice would improve public schools is that it allows parents to find the right particular school for each individual child. Every child is unique and has unique educational needs.

But probably the most important reason school choice would improve public schools is because it gives parents a meaningful way to hold schools accountable for performance. Under the current system, if a school is not doing a good job, the only ways to get a better school—purchase private schooling or move to a new neighborhood—are expensive and impractical.

The current school system is especially unjust to low-income and disadvantaged families. As a government monopoly, the system is most likely to provide good services to, and be responsive to the concerns of, politically powerful parents, which means wealthier, better-educated, and (let’s face it) whiter parents. Poor and otherwise disadvantaged families too often get the least attention from the system. And they are the least likely to have the means to seek private schooling or move. Seventy percent of black workers, for example, make less than $50,000 per year, compared to 52 percent of white workers.2 Indeed, a decreased ability to exit the system only reinforces the system’s tendency to deliver poor services. They are captive clientele.

Thus, in the absence of parental choice, schools lack the healthy, natural environment of client empowerment that is essential to producing better performance in most other service institutions. Hospitals know they must do a good job or lose patients. Professionals like doctors and lawyers must provide good services or lose clients. Stores must provide good value or lose customers. This system is so critical to keeping institutions mission-focused that we take it completely for granted—everywhere but in K–12 schooling.

It is widely agreed that monopolies generally provide poor quality because nothing bad will happen to them if they do not serve their clients well. When they get bad service, customers say, “I’ll take my business elsewhere,” because they know that is what will prompt better service. They do this to nonprofit institutions the same way they do it to businesses, because they know it is not profit that creates better performance; it is client choice.

The failure of education policy to embrace the American principle that people should have stewardship over their own lives and make their own choices is a great hindrance to reform. One way opinion leaders can rectify this problem is by making the public aware of the large body of empirical research that examines how choice affects participants, public schools, and the civic community at large.

#### School choice achieves integration and closes opportunity and achievement gaps — aff authors are wrong.

D’Amato 17 — David S. D’Amato, Adjunct Professor of Law at DePaul University, Member of the Board of Policy Advisors at the Heartland Institute and the Future of Freedom Foundation, holds a J.D. from New England Law | Boston and an L.L.M. from Suffolk University Law School, 2017 (“Integrating schools by expanding choice,” *The Hill*, March 20th, Available Online at <http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/education/324886-integrating-schools-by-expanding-choice>, Accessed 06-19-2017)

Last spring, a report from the U.S. Government Accountability Office revealed several disturbing, interrelated trends in U.S. public education. The GAO found that racial segregation is growing in America’s public schools and that the color divide predictably tracks another, the troubling concentration of poor students in these schools. The GAO’s findings, based on a survey of data from the 2000-2001 to 2013-2014 school years, show that schools that “had high percentages of poor and Black or Hispanic students grew from 9 to 16 percent.” And these schools are “the most racially and economically concentrated” overall, with 75 to 100 percent of students being either black or Hispanic and eligible for free or reduced-price lunches. In the ‘60s and ‘70s, following the Supreme Court’s 1954 decision in Brown v. Board of Education, schools steadily desegregated, the plans often compelled and overseen by the courts. But American public schools have seen a recrudescence of racial segregation since the ‘80s, even as other social institutions and areas of life have become more integrated. In a report for EdChoice, economist Benjamin Scafidi suggests that this increased race and class segregation may be the result of “growing programmatic homogenization” in American public schools. As public schools across the country grow more alike, students sort by race and class rather than according to interest or school specialization, which has effectively been precluded. A large and growing body of evidence suggests that introducing more choice and autonomy for parents would help to reverse the harmful resegregation trend of the last few decades. In assigning students to their schools based on their physical addresses, the government education system reinforces ethnic, social, and economic homogeneity — and thus segregation — as a matter of course. Among the most powerful and obvious arguments for school choice is that it breaks this cruel pattern, allowing parents and their children an escape from the underperforming, indeed second-class, schools to which American society has relegated poor and minority students. School choice options (for example, voucher programs) allow students from low-income homes, often in predominantly-minority urban communities, to attend better public schools in the suburbs or even private schools that would otherwise have been too expensive. The relationship between race issues and the cluster of discrete policies grouped together under the term “school choice” has long been a source of controversy. Such choice-expanding policies have followed a wide range of plans, and the desegregation impact of school choice will naturally depend on the design of the particular program under consideration. Considered as a whole, the empirical evidence on school choice programs recommends them as a potent remedy to the problem of segregation. In fact, school choice policies are doubly beneficial, providing students in the worst schools better alternatives and furthering integration in some of the most racially segregated areas of the country. Indeed, as a two-part installment of NPR’s This American Life titled “The Problem We All Live With” illuminated, some critics of school choice oppose is precisely because it integrates schools; the series highlighted a Missouri town hall meeting in which several parents express their disapproval of a school choice policy that allowed students from a mostly-black neighboring district with failing schools to opt for a different school. It’s easy to explain how school choice policies promote school desegregation; they break the connection between location on a map and assigned school, a connection that has systematically disadvantaged students of color. As reporter Nikole Hannah-Jones observed on This American Life, “In most of the thousands of poor, segregated schools in America, that would be it. Your zip code is the anchor that traps you.” School choice stands to benefit these poor, minority students far more than advantaged students, those from more affluent communities whose parents already have choices and whose public schools tend to meet or exceed standards. In 2013, education scholar Greg Forster surveyed the findings of eight studies on the racial integration effects of school choice — specifically, means-tested voucher programs — in Cleveland, Milwaukee, and Washington, DC. In seven of the eight, voucher programs that allowed parents to send their children to private schools were shown to increase racial integration. These findings stand to reason. Because public school segregation tends to coincide with geographical segregation, private schools — unbound to a fixed locale — tend to be more integrated. All of this is to say nothing of the myriad other benefits of school choice. As mechanisms for achieving accountability and strong student performance, choice and competition have been proven themselves more effective than either further centralizing testing and curriculum standards or throwing more money at the problem. Human capital and institutional culture are far more important to successful K-12 education than is the number of dollars spent per student. And as in any other human enterprise, accountability requires choice, options from which an individual may freely choose. Comparisons, to be relevant and actionable from a policy perspective, must be made between the known facts about school choice and the public education status quo as it actually exists and has existed. It is idle to compare school choice to a counterfactual version of government-monopoly education in which segregation has not steadily increased for more than thirty years. At the very least, expanding the range of options available to underprivileged parents and their children, minorities in particular, compares quite favorably to the broken status quo. Choice and competition are inherently disruptive to the status quo, and no one is entitled to the continuation of the way things are, whether it’s the school administrators and union bosses invested in it or the Missouri parent who believes she’s entitled to a segregated school.

#### Multiple studies support the benefits of choice.

Miller 15 — Chad Miller, Director of Education Policy at the American Action Forum—a nonprofit issue advocacy group, former Senior Director for Federal Advocacy at the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, 2015 (“Providing Equality Of Opportunities: A Review Of School Choice 2015,” American Action Forum, January 27th, Available Online at <https://www.americanactionforum.org/insight/providing-equality-of-opportunities-a-review-of-school-choice-2015/>, Accessed 06-19-2017)

Results

With the number of students participating in choice programs increasing, parents from all economic backgrounds are seeing the benefits of sending a child to a better-fit school. It is also important to note that a majority of families involved in publically funded school choice programs come from low-income communities. Meanwhile, public school systems in low socioeconomic status communities are often under-resourced, negatively affecting students’ academic progress. Multiple research studies have shown that providing educational options creates a more competitive, productive school system for all and leads to improved academic outcomes.

One such report by education expert Paul E. Peterson, summarizes the positive impact of providing education options to disadvantaged students and the long-term academic effects. Referencing a study conducted on high school test performance at the University of Chicago, he notes the positive effect of a private Catholic education on student achievement. Using test results, the private education yielded positive impact for all students. Specifically, socio-economically disadvantaged minority students received an even greater private school advantage. Peterson also notes the private sector has shown positive impacts on education attainment, especially for minority students.

Another study in Washington, D.C. examined the effects of the DC Opportunity Scholarship Program on high school graduation rates. The DC Opportunity Scholarship Program allowed students to use a voucher up to $7,500 to cover tuition, books, and transportation for a better school choice. In 2009, 5,547 students qualified for a voucher. Of the 5,547 students, 2,281 students were awarded the scholarship and used it within the 2009 year. 91 percent of these students graduated high school. This was thirty percent higher than the average graduation rate of D.C. Public Schools. The findings from this scholarship program study promote the positive effects of school choice in academic achievement, which then creates a more highly educated community.

In New York, a study by the Brookings Institution and Harvard University shows African American participants in a private school choice program were 24 percent more likely to enroll in college as a result of receiving a voucher. The study also shows that African American enrollment rates in selective colleges more than doubled among voucher students, and the rate of enrollment in full-time colleges increased by 31 percent.[3]

There are others, and more studies are released each year, but overall the findings are the same. School choice programs are providing a growing number of students the opportunity to achieve academic success.

Conclusion

With the rise of different educational options, school choice remains an important factor in ensuring equal opportunities for disadvantaged children. As concluded by multiple research studies, school choice and supporting financial aid programs allow disadvantaged students a better chance to receive a high-quality K-12 education. Moreover, choice programs offer economic benefits to the state through scholarship tax programs and even promotes a competitive, productive atmosphere among different types of schools. Simply put – school choice yields positive results.

### Schools not key to inequality

#### Econometric data in the U.S. proves.

Rothstein 17 — Jesse Rothstein, Professor of Public Policy and Economics and Director of the Institute for Research on Labor and Employment at the University of California-Berkeley, Faculty Research Fellow at the National Bureau of Economic Research, Fellow at the National Education Policy Center at the University of Colorado, former Senior Economist for the Council of Economic Advisers, former Chief Economist at the U.S. Department of Labor, holds a Ph.D. in Economics from the University of California-Berkeley, 2016 (“Inequality of Educational Opportunity? Schools as Mediators of the Intergenerational Transmission of Income,” Institute for Research on Labor and Employment Working Paper #105-17, April, Available Online at http://www.irle.berkeley.edu/files/2017/Inequality-Of-Educational-Opportunity.pdf, Accessed 06-19-2017, p. 35-36)

8 Conclusion

Chetty et al.’s (2014) pathbreaking work showed that there is dramatic variation in intergenerational income mobility across geographic areas within the United States. This raises the intriguing possibility that we can identify policies that account for this variation and, by exporting these policies from high- to low-mobility areas, move closer to equality of opportunity.

CHKS presented suggestive correlations that indicated that school quality might be an important contributing factor. This paper has investigated this suggestion further, by asking whether high- and low-income children’s academic outcomes are more equal in areas where their adult economic outcomes are more equal – that is, in areas with more intergenerational mobility. I find that there is statistically significant variation across commuting zones in the gradients of educational attainment, academic achievement, and non-cognitive skills with respect to parental income. Intergenerational income transmission is reasonably strongly correlated with the educational attainment gradient and with the labor market return to education, but does not covary strongly with either academic achievement or non-cognitive skill gradients (with the exception of gradients computed from teacher reports of children’s non-cognitive skills).

I find that only about one-tenth of the across-CZ variation in intergenerational income [end page 35] mobility is attributable to differences in children’s earnings deriving from differences in skill accumulation. A slightly larger share is attributable to differences in the labor market returns to children’s skills. About one-third is attributable to differences in the labor market return to parental income holding skills (and the returns to skills) constant. The remaining, largest portion derives from differences in spousal and non-labor income, primarily reflecting differences in the likelihood of having a working spouse.

Although this evidence is observational rather than causal, it strongly suggests that differences in elementary and secondary school quality are not an important determinant of variation in income mobility. (This is not to say that school quality is not important for other reasons, of course, or even that it does not contribute to overall mobility in a way that is roughly constant across CZs.) There appears to be more of a role for access to higher education in driving economic mobility, though even here the contribution is not large relative to the overall variation. Further investigation into the determinants of local intergenerational mobility should focus on differences in the returns to education, in the returns to family income conditional on children’s human capital, and in the relative propensity of children from high- and low-income families to have working spouses. Plausible factors driving the former might include institutions determining local income inequality, such as state income taxation and union density. The second, reflecting direct effects of parental income on children’s earnings conditional on children’s human capital, might reflect variation in the importance of labor market networks or in spatial or social stratification of the labor market. The third seems to reflect differences in the likelihood of marriage rather than variation in assortative mating; insofar as this reflects differences across CZs in the likelihood that romantic partners will be formally married rather than differences in the likelihood of partnership, it may not represent meaningful variation in equality of opportunity.

\* CHKS = Chetty et al. 2014

#### Labor DA—Labor policies overwhelm education.

Mishel 11 — Lawrence Mishel, President of the Economic Policy Institute—an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan think tank that researches the impact of economic trends and policies on working people in the United States and around the world, holds a Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Wisconsin, 2011 (“The Overselling of Education,” *The American Prospect*, February 7th, Available Online at <http://prospect.org/article/overselling-education-0>, Accessed 06-18-2017)

What is the Role of Education in Prosperity?

It's certainly true that America needs better-educated citizens beginning with pre-K and public education, stronger community colleges, more affordable paths to higher education, and comprehensive training policies that increase skills and lead to better-paid jobs. But none of these education policies are the primary cure either for the widening income inequality of the past three decades or the current crisis of joblessness. The income distribution was much more equal during the postwar boom when most young workers had only a high school diploma -- because we had strong institutions of worker representation and wage-setting as well as tax and regulatory policies that constrained the greed at the top.

More education and training are necessary to obtain the long-term growth we desire and to provide equal access to job opportunities for the entire population and workforce. Individuals deciding whether to pursue more education and training would be wise to enhance their human capital, as it will place them in a better position as wage earners and citizens.

That being said, the challenge we face with persistent unemployment exceeding 9 percent is not better education and training for those currently unemployed. Rather, we need more jobs.

The huge increase in wage and income inequality over the last 30 years was not caused by a skills deficit. Rather, workers face a "wage deficit." The key challenge is to provide good jobs and re-establish the basis for wages and compensation to grow in tandem with productivity, as they did before 1979.

We do need more investment in education at all levels, so that the children of the working class have a better opportunity to compete for good jobs. We also need what Europeans call an active labor-market policy, so that the money we invest in training is directly connected to re-employment at good wages, rather than operating in a vacuum.

The nation's productivity increased by 80 percent from 1979 to 2009, and good productivity growth can be expected in the future. It is not education gaps that have caused nearly all of those gains to be captured by the top but rather economic policies that redistributed economic and political power.

#### Alt causes to solving inequality—education is just one issue

Bruenig 17 — Matt Bruenig, Freelance Writer specializing in Poverty and Political Theory, has written for *The Washington Post*, *Los Angeles Times*, *The Atlantic*, *The New Republic*, *The American Prospect*, *In These Times*, *Jacobin*, and *Dissent*, 2017 (“Education Is Just Another Issue,” *Matt Bruenig’s blog*, May 3rd, Available Online at http://mattbruenig.com/2017/05/03/education-is-just-another-issue/, Accessed 07-04-2017)

In his piece about DC’s failed school voucher program, David Leonhardt had this to say:

[E]ducation isn’t just another issue. It is the most powerful force for accelerating economic growth, reducing poverty and lifting middle-class living standards. Well-educated adults earn much more, live longer and are happier than poorly educated adults. When researchers try to tease out whether education does much to cause these benefits, the answer appears to be yes.

Two things here.

First, the poverty part I’ve bolded is just wildly untrue. The most powerful force for reducing poverty in a rich country like the US is distributive policy. I’ve written on this dozens of times before, so I won’t belabor the point here. But let me give one example.

We could, in an instant, eliminate extreme child poverty, cut deep child poverty by 50 percent, and cut overall child poverty by 40 percent by implementing a $250/month universal child benefit program that would have a fiscal cost of less than 0.5 percent of GDP. How long do you think it would take higher overall educational attainment to accomplish that? Would it ever?

Second, Leonhardt’s proof that education delivers the goods does not actually show that at all. He links to a prior write up he did of a study that compared individuals who barely got into college to those who barely failed to get into college. The study showed that the individuals who barely got in did substantially better in life than the ones who barely failed to get in. Leonhardt quickly concludes from this both that it is the college education that is responsible for the gain and, implicitly, that this effect is universalizable such that you could push more and more people through college and the result would just be more and more people getting more and more good jobs.

But the study does not support these conclusions.

An alternative explanation for why those who barely get into college do so much better than those who barely fail to get into college is that education credentials are used to filter individuals for later job placement. If this is true, it is not that the education caused new good jobs to come into existence that the college-attenders then occupied. Rather, it is that the college-attender’s credentials made them out-compete the non-attender for the scarce number of good jobs that exist. That is to say, the education of the attenders gave them positional gains that allowed them to enter the labor market at a higher spot than the non-attenders.

And, no, this is not a fanciful alternative explanation. It is one of the most prominent arguments made by those who criticize education optimists like Leonhardt. And it is obviously true, at least in some cases. For instance, people who get law degrees have much higher incomes than those without them. But even Leonhardt would certainly admit that giving everyone a legal education would not usher in a country whose labor market purely consisted of highly-paid people suing one another for stuff. Yet that is precisely the reasoning Leonhardt works off of when talking about college education as a whole.

Despite what folks like Leonhardt tell you, education is not the centerpiece of all that is good in the world. It is not the universal salve for all that ails society. This is a bizarre rhetorical strategy education reformers have adopted to inflate the importance of their political project. But it’s bogus. Education is just another issue.

### Status quo solves

#### ESSA bolsters equity — four reasons.

Cook-Harvey et al. 16 — Channa M. Cook-Harvey, Senior Researcher at the Learning Policy Institute, former Research and Practice Associate at the School of Education at Stanford University, holds a Ph.D. in Race, Inequality, and Language in Education from Stanford University, et al., with Linda Darling-Hammond, President of the Learning Policy Institute, Charles E. Ducommun Professor of Education and Faculty Director of the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education at Stanford University, former President of the American Educational Research Association, former Senior Social Scientist and Director of the RAND Education and Human Resources Program at the RAND Corporation, holds an Ed.D. in Urban Education from Temple University, Livia Lam, Senior Policy Advisor at the Learning Policy Institute, Charmaine Mercer, Director of the DC office and Senior Researcher at the Learning Policy Institute, and Martens Roc, Policy and Outreach Advisor at the Learning Policy Institute, 2016 (*Equity and ESSA: Leveraging Educational Opportunity Through the Every Student Succeeds Act*, Published by the Learning Policy Institute, Available Online at <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Equity_ESSA_REPORT.pdf>, Accessed 06-18-2017, p. 2-3)

ESSA offers at least four ways to strongly advance equity, if it is thoughtfully regulated and implemented.

First, Title I establishes a set of expectations for states to design standards and assessments that develop and measure higher-order thinking skills, and provides some of the resources in Title II for professional learning that could make these rights real. Just as W.E.B. Du Bois argued for a rich, liberal education for black children, when most wanted to relegate them to training for menial labor, so ESSA insists on a 21st-century curriculum focused on critical thinking and problem-solving for the children it is intended to serve, rather than a rote-oriented education that prepares disadvantaged students for the factory jobs of the past. This means teachers and school leaders must learn to provide that kind of education, along with the assessments that develop and measure it, and use these assessments for ongoing improvement, rather than punishment. ESSA provides a means for the nation to take up this work. [end page 2]

Second, ESSA requires states to use multiple measures to evaluate student and school progress—both overall and for subgroups of students. These could include not only measures of student outcomes—such as test score gains, English learner progress, and graduation rates—but also measures of students’ opportunities to learn. For example, how many students receive and complete a college preparatory sequence or a high-quality career technical pathway? Does the school have experienced and effective teachers well-qualified in the areas they teach? Do teachers have access to relevant, job-embedded, high-quality professional development aligned to their needs and the needs of the students? Do student and parent survey results indicate there is a safe, supportive school climate that offers high-quality learning opportunities to students? Has the school reduced high and disproportionate rates of suspension and expulsion or chronic absenteeism that impede student success? Such measures can shine a light on inequities as well as poor learning conditions and help diagnose the steps required to close the opportunity gap.

Third, for the first time, a number of features of the law directly address the resource gaps among our schools. States must report schools’ actual per-pupil spending on school report cards, which should raise awareness about the fair distribution of state and local dollars. ESSA maintains the “supplement, not supplant” requirement, which is intended to ensure that schools receiving Title I funds get at least as much state and local funding as they would have otherwise received were they not funded by Title I. ESSA also establishes a new weighted student-based funding pilot that would reward up to 50 districts for innovative funding based on student needs—offering more resources for students who are from low-income families, English learners, migratory, or neglected, delinquent, or otherwise at risk, such as homeless or foster youth. A new Student Support and Academic Enrichment authorization can also be used to target funds to implement strategies and supports that address some of these needs.

Finally, the law supports the use of evidence-based interventions to increase achievement generally and as strategies for improving schools that are struggling. Defining this requirement thoughtfully and treating it seriously could lead to significantly wiser investments in high-need schools and concomitantly better outcomes.

If thoughtfully leveraged, these four features of the law can serve as pillars of opportunity that help create a bridge from our inequitable, old-style, factory-models school to much more engaging and equitable learning communities (see Figure 1).

#### ESSA funds social services beyond the classroom — they’re key.

Galmiche and Cardinali 15 — Jack Galmiche, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Nine Network of Public Media—the national coordinator of American Graduate, an organization working to support community-based solutions to the dropout crisis, and Daniel Cardinali, President of Communities In Schools, Inc.—the U.S.’s largest dropout prevention organization, 2015 (“The promise of the Every Student Succeeds Act,” *The Hill*, December 18th, Available Online at <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/education/263633-the-promise-of-the-every-student-succeeds-act>, Accessed 06-18-2017)

It’s far too soon for anyone to say exactly how the Every Student Succeeds Act will affect American education. But in the wake of its passage, we’re hopeful the new law will deliver on its promise to address one of the toughest challenges we face: enabling more of our students to get a high school diploma.

To be sure, there’s good news these days around graduation rates. The U.S. Department of Education just released a report showing that a higher proportion of America’s students graduated from high school in the 2013 – 2014 school year (82 percent) than ever before, about a one percent increase over the previous year.

While the national graduation rate is on a trajectory to reach 90 percent by 2020, we find a much different—and more discouraging—picture among students from low-income households. As GradNation points out, “Low-income students are graduating at a rate that’s almost 15 percentage points below the rate for their non-low-income peers.” Indeed, poverty is by far the most predictive indicator when it comes to low graduation rates. It cuts across all other demographic and social factors, including ethnicity and race.

The question for all of us, then, is: what can we – educators, parents, leaders and people from across the community – do to equip more poor, at-risk students with the tools and support they need to stay in school and graduate? How can we ensure that they will be as prepared as possible to excel in the world beyond graduation?

ESSA includes at least two new provisions that we think could be enormously helpful.

First, local high schools now must use the graduation rate as one of several measures of success. This provision recognizes something we have emphasized for several years: that a young person today cannot afford to enter the work force without at least the foundational skills and knowledge that come with a high school diploma. Moreover, our communities and our country suffer when young people don’t finish high school.

With that as a guiding light, more and more groups like ours are identifying and sharing evidence-based approaches that work to keep students in school through graduation. While there are no silver bullets to improving graduation rates, one proven intervention is sustained and substantive help from caring adults willing to support students’ difficult journeys in the classroom and in other parts of their lives. Don’t our students, especially those most at-risk of dropping out, deserve this nation’s most effective prevention and intervention initiatives?

We have mountains of data to prove that mentoring and guidance can be the key to success, especially for low-income youth who so often wrestle with severe personal and academic challenges.

Secondly, ESSA allows the use of Title I funds, which are specified for the poorest schools and districts, for “integrated student supports,” a broad array of social services that can help at-risk students successfully navigate the barriers they face on the way to graduation. Title I and new competitive grant programs can give schools and community partners many more options for providing mentoring, parental engagement programs, violence and trauma prevention, drug abuse counseling, and other services proven to reduce dropout rates.

This is important because, even in places where such services exist, they can be fragmented and out of the line of sight of the students who need them most. What’s needed often are trained, caring adult who in partnership with principals, teachers, and parents will identify the most at-risk students and connect them to community programs and services they need to graduate high school career and be post-secondary ready. That’s the kind of local customization of intervention that so many of our partners have been talking about and putting into practice all over the country.

The Every Student Succeeds Act, the first major national education overhaul since the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001, has the potential to breathe new life into approaches that many groups like ours have recognized as effective and essential for student’s to succeed. But it’s only part of the equation of success. It’s now up to people around the country to seize that opportunity and put its resources to effective use, particularly in communities that need it most.

### No mortality gap

#### No Inequality-Based Mortality Gap — it’s already closed.

Currie and Schwandt 16 — Janet Currie, Henry Putnam Professor of Economics and Public Affairs and Director of the Center for Health and Well Being at Princeton University, Director of the Program on Children at the National Bureau of Economic Research, holds a Ph.D. in Economics from Princeton University, and Hannes Schwandt, Assistant Professor in the Department of Economics at the University of Zurich, holds a Ph.D. in Economics from Universitat Pompeu Fabra (Spain), 2016 (“Falling inequality in mortality in the US,” VoxEU.org—the Centre for Economic Policy Research’s policy portal, July 2nd, Available Online at <http://voxeu.org/article/mortality-inequality-good-news-county-level-approach>, Accessed 06-19-2017)

Overall, our results show that the health of the next generation in the poorest areas of the US has improved tremendously and that the race gap has largely closed. It is surprising how little attention has been paid to this health success story in either the academic or the public discussion.

Likely drivers for the strong decline in mortality inequality are social policies that helped the most disadvantaged families. One of the most important may be expansions of public health insurance to poor pregnant women and children that took place in the late 1980s and 1990s. Other important factors include reductions in smoking prevalence, expansions of food and nutrition programs, and reductions in pollution. Overall, these findings show that even in times of great economic inequality, inequality in health outcomes is not inevitable but is strongly mediated by policy.

#### The mortality gap is already being eliminated — aff evidence is based on flawed projections that ignore recent improvements.

Phelan 16 — Meagan Phelan, Executive Director of the Science Press Package at the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 2016 (“Science: Life Expectancy Gap Is Narrowing Between Rich and Poor American Youth,” American Association for the Advancement of Science, April 20th, Available Online at <https://www.aaas.org/news/science-life-expectancy-gap-narrowing-between-rich-and-poor-american-youth>, Accessed 06-19-2017)

The life expectancy gap between America's rich and poor is shrinking for the young, a new study published in the 29 April issue of Science reports. In fact, life expectancy at birth has been improving for virtually all income groups born in 1990 onward.

"These results are extremely hopeful in that they suggest that today's children are going to grow up into healthier adults with less inequality in health in the future," said lead author Janet Currie, the Henry Putnam Professor of Economics and Public Affairs at Princeton University.

"We were surprised at how large the reductions in mortality have been for younger people," she continued, "and at how these reductions extend all the way into young adulthood; at how extraordinarily large the declines in African-American mortality have been; and finally, at how little attention anyone has paid to this incredible health success story."

The results of Currie and her colleagues suggest that many of the U.S. policies directed at improving the health of the young and the poor in recent decades may have been effective.

Previous research suggests that mortality inequality — differences in how long people live compared to their peers — has grown since the start of the 21st century, with Americans in the top income bracket having gained several years of life expectancy while those at the bottom have gained almost nothing, or have even experienced a decline in life expectancy.

Critically, however, much of this work was based on studies that calculate life expectancy of people starting at age 40 or age 50, ignoring improvements that have been occurring at younger ages — and that have been shown to be important predictors of a group's health and mortality later in life.

"The reason we got interested in this project," Currie said, "was that we knew that there have been tremendous improvements in the health of poor American children over the past 20 years. These improvements are due to specific policies such as expansions of public health insurance, improvements in food and nutrition programs, and expansions of the Earned Income Tax Credit. Yet, the dominant narrative has completely ignored these improvements."

## Charter Schools DA

### 1NC Shell

#### Overregulation of charter schools results in their collapse

Lindquist 17 — Benjamin J. Lindquist is the program director for the Character and K12 Education Programs at the Kern Family Foundation. Lindquist graduated Magna Cum Laude with a Bachelor’s Degree in English from St. John's University in Central Minnesota. He earned his Master’s Degree in Business Administration (MBA) from the Leeds School of Business at the University of Colorado Boulder (CU), 3-22-2017 ("The Achilles Heel of charter growth—overregulation", Thomas B. Fordham Institute, Accessed Online at https://edexcellence.net/articles/the-achilles-heel-of-charter-growth%E2%80%94overregulation, Accessed on 7-11-2017, SV)

Why is charter school growth slowing? Greg Richmond at the National Association of Charter School Authorizers recently announced that charter applications have declined 48 percent since 2012. According to his report, the national approval rate has held steady for years, with authorizers approving 35 percent of the applications that they receive. Why are they receiving so many fewer? This is no trivial matter. “There are still way too many parents waiting for the chance to send their children to a high quality public school of their choice,” writes Susan Aud Pedagrass at the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools in a recent blog post. Many existing charters have waiting lists. Lottery-based admissions—so memorably depicted in the film Waiting for Superman—still yield tearful faces. Why is this once-so-vibrant movement now struggling to meet the obvious demand? One key problem is overregulation. This issue may represent the biggest threat to the charter sector today because it undermines its ability to offer distinctive, high-quality options to students and families with differing needs and preferences. If charter entrepreneurs are compelled to deliver the same one-size-fits-all education as other public schools, why start new charters at all? To confront the magnitude of this challenge, consider Arkansas, where I was a charter operator from 2011 to 2016. The Arkansas State Board of Education authorizes the state’s open-enrollment charters. Since each is its own “local education agency,” charters report directly to the Arkansas Department of Education much like traditional districts. To gain autonomy from state laws and rules, charters request specific waivers, but the state is reluctant to approve these. In 2013, lawmakers created a Charter Authorizing Panel as the oversight body for open-enrollment charters. It comprises the Department’s deputy commissioners—meaning that charter schools report directly to the officials who oversee statewide reporting for district schools, too. The Panel’s decisions can be appealed to the State Board, but only under exceptional circumstances. 374 separate reports and nine reporting systems…really? In 2014–15, Arkansas charters were each expected to submit 374 separate reports as part of the standard compliance calendar. Even when a school had waivers, it was still required to complete all reports; never mind whether they apply to its activities. Each time a submission is made, the school leader must attest to its legal completeness and accuracy. Incomplete reporting can result in delays in state payments to the school or other penalties. As part of the reporting load, charters must navigate at least 4 and as many as 6 major reporting events every year, including (but not limited to) the following: Major reporting events Independent audits of finance and reporting compliance Arkansas Consolidated School Improvement Plans (ACSIP) Annual parent involvement plans Charter amendment requests, including changes in facility locations Accreditation standards reviews Nutrition reporting audits Charter renewal applications. Each of these events requires thirty to eighty hours of labor from school administrators depending on the level of state scrutiny. At the start of the 2014–15 school year, charter administrators were required to attend twelve state-administered trainings over a five-month period, thus compelling key school administrators to be off-site for nineteen days. To fulfill all these obligations, the State required charters to input their reporting data into nine separate reporting systems. Due to the lack of cross-platform functionality, manual entry had to be done into eight of the nine systems. If charters have their own knowledge management systems, they must make duplicate entry into them. Burdensome? It gets worse. Thirteen monitoring bodies Arkansas charters are monitored by thirteen different units spread over four state agencies. Each unit has its own primary contacts and deliverables, as described below: Field Liaisons for Student & Financial Information. Finance directors meet with them biweekly on accounting and student information entry. Charter Schools Office. School directors interact with representatives monthly to arrange site visits, charter reviews, and respond to inquiries from parents, employees, or the public. Division of Learning Services. Charters administer state-required special education tests, early childhood tests, language acquisition tests, and state proficiency tests, on which they’re accountable for meeting state-determined annual targets. Office of Educator Effectiveness. Charters report on HR requirements including teacher licensing, staff qualifications and evaluations, and professional growth plans. Arkansas charters must comply with most certification requirements. School Nutrition Unit. Charters meet strict federal and state nutrition guidelines. Standards & Accreditation Unit. Charters post required reports and disclosures to their website, including teacher salary schedules and contracts. They demonstrate compliance with over one hundred regulations. Fiscal & Administrative Services. Charters submit their budgets, monthly financial statements, and meet to respond to special accounting requests. Office of School Improvement. Charters demonstrate that they are using federal funds to meet students’ remedial needs within tight guidelines and according to a state-approved school improvement plan. Charter Authorizing Panel. Charters appear before the Charter Authorizing Panel to seek changes in location, make charter amendment requests, seek charter renewal, and defend their waivers. State Legal Counsel. Charters seek legal approval of long-term debt obligations, including copier leases, facilities financing, and any loan financing beyond a year. Teacher Retirement. Charters participate in the Arkansas Teacher Retirement System. Employee Benefits Division. Charters participate in the state health insurance plan. Legislative Audit Committee. Independent audits of charter finances are subject to legislative review. Significant findings result in live hearings before a panel of state legislators. These thirteen bodies actively monitor, review, and audit all of the electronic and paper reporting that charters do over the academic year. Teacher evaluation In 2011, Arkansas lawmakers began requiring all public schools, including charters, to implement a standardized teacher evaluation and professional development program. The average charter school with 475 students would employ thirty-five teachers. Following the evaluation process requires a minimum 195 hours of time from the school principal and director of curriculum. Total reporting load In addition to state requirements, charters are subject to the Freedom of Information Act, Open Meetings law, IRS 990 reporting, and corporate filings with Arkansas’s Secretary of State. They must cooperate with the fire marshal, police department, and Department of Human Services on such issues as safety, custody disputes, and child abuse. For a school with 475 students, the total estimated salary cost for charter administrators to meet the standard state reporting obligations in 2014-15 was $370,305, or 10.3 percent of public operating revenue (at $7,600 per pupil). That is the time necessary for administrators, such as the curriculum director, dean of students, principal, finance director, executive director and office manager, to manually enter data, prepare reports, confirm reporting accuracy, and complete other reporting tasks. In other words, charters were required to spend a tenth of their budget on reporting rather than instruction. But the dollar cost isn’t the biggest challenge; it’s the loss of precious time serving students and families. In 2014–15, administrators at an Arkansas charter school spent an estimated 1,431 hours, which equates to 179 full-time days, just completing reports. And that’s without taking into account the time associated with supporting the school’s governing board. While a school’s leadership team is completing these tasks, it is forfeiting the time needed to build relationships with students and parents, handle behavior issues, support teachers in their classrooms, supervise transition periods, and otherwise improve school performance. This is particularly problematic in underserved communities where students and families have more intensive needs. Arkansas is not unusual. In a recent article, Joey Gustafson reported that 90 percent of charter authorizers are traditional school districts or state departments of education. Only 10 percent are higher education institutions, independent chartering boards, non-profits, or municipalities. Key takeaways Authorizers have the power to impose reporting requirements that dictate every major aspect of what charter schools do. When their compliance mandates force conformity with regular district schools, they defeat the very purpose of chartering, which is to provide a variety of high-quality, distinctive options to learners and families with differing needs and preferences. One size does not fit all! Yet the scale and burden of overregulation are easily overlooked. No national watchdog produces a rigorous tally of the reporting burden across cities and states so that charter operators can properly account for this issue when choosing where to open new schools. Because reporting practices vary by state and authorizer, charter operators face an inordinate amount of complexity when expanding across jurisdictions. Frequently, charter founders are not properly trained on the reporting load and therefore must learn on the job, which compounds the difficulty of executing an effective school startup. Charter opponents understand only too well that overregulation is a lethal tool. Last week, for instance, an L.A. Times article reported that the Los Angeles teachers union introduced a bill to regulate charters more heavily. If overregulation isn’t fixed, it won’t just stifle the charter sector’s growth. It will erode the performance and sustainability of existing schools because they’ll gradually lose the capacity to perform in a flexible, responsive fashion.

#### Charter schools are necessary for English-language learners – competition for vouchers and minimal oversight fuel innovative curriculum.

Deruy 15 – Emily Deruy, former senior associate editor at The Atlantic, MA in journalism from Stanford University, BA in Political Science from the University of California at San Diego, 2015 (“Charter Schools Are Especially Good for ELL Students,” July 30th, *The Atlantic,* Available Online At <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/07/charter-schools-are-especially-good-for-ell-students/432432/>, Accessed 7-12-2017)

Charter schools, it turns out, are doing a better job of educating English-language learners than traditional public schools. That's a bright spot in an otherwise bleak report on Texas charters.

And that's an interesting finding because, as the number of English-language learners in the United States, and in Texas specifically, has climbed so have the theories about how best to serve these students. According to government data, these students made up more than 9 percent of all students nationally in 2012 and more than 15 percent of the student body in Texas.

The report, from Stanford University's Center for Research on Education Outcomes, finds that English-language learners in charter schools come away with 50 more days of learning in reading and 22 in math compared with their peers in traditional public schools. Children living in poverty, particularly Latino students, also showed greater gains at charters.

Certainly, the controversial charter model is no cure-all, and the overall report paints a relatively somber picture of charter schools in Texas. For example, Texas charter students are at a disadvantage that equals 14 fewer days of learning in reading in a 180-day school year and 29 fewer days in math. But, given that about one in every six Texas students is an English-language learner, it's worth examining what charters are doing that benefits the students who civil rights advocates say are too often left behind.

Steve Mancini, director of public affairs for the Knowledge is Power Program charter schools, better known by the acronym KIPP, says some of the gain likely has to do with an extended learning day. Kids at KIPP charters, which started two decades ago in Texas, literally spend more hours learning. The schools — there are now 162 across the country — are also "run locally," he said, meaning principals and teachers have the ability to tailor programs to their students, so teachers and administrators have greater flexibility than some of their traditional public-school counterparts.

That's one of the criticisms often lobbed at charter schools — that they operate with more freedom from the bureaucracy that bogs down public schools while pulling in federal dollars. But advocates like Mancini point out that when it works, innovation happens; and when it doesn't, charters in Texas are closed. Last year, the state said it would shut down more than a dozen charter-school operators that did not meet academic standards laid out in a 2013 law.

Seth Winick, a spokesperson for the Texas Charter School Association, isn't completely sure what's working, but he says it likely has to do with how intensely focused charters are on serving English-language learners, students in poverty, and other underserved populations.

That creates a built-in incentive for charters to provide the scaffolding that helps their students succeed. Agree or not, KIPP defines success as getting kids to and through college, and they offer services many traditional public schools don't to help students get a degree.

Freddy Gonzalez, who previously served as the principal of KIPP Austin College Prep and now works as the KIPP Foundation's chief learning officer, said the schools incorporate literacy into every class, including science and math. They check in with graduates toward the end of summer to make sure they're all set to show up to the first day of college. They get kids tutors and help alumni find summer internships. KIPP has partnerships with 70 universities to help students achieve what it calls "aspirational goals."

Those are things Gonzalez didn't get as a student. Upon arriving at Brown University from South Texas, he thought he was ready for college. Reality quickly set in, and he realized he "didn't know how to study like everybody else."

"I wanted to help students not be me in college," he said, of his decision to join KIPP.

KIPP also collects and analyzes lots of data on subgroups of students, including English-language learners, as a diagnostic tool. And they post the results online.

"Freedom for accountability," Mancini said, invoking a common phrase.

At a time of great division over accountability measures and what they should look like, many successful charter networks have backed testing and other assessments as a critical tool for gauging progress.

Rich Harrison, chief academic officer for Uplift Education, a charter network that serves 14,000 students in the Dallas-Fort Worth area, says his charters focus on English-language learners as a priority. Like KIPP, Uplift schools serve a disproportionate percentage of such students. At many schools in both networks, the figure is above 40 percent, more than double the state average.

The schools, Harrison said, are required to have an hour-long enrichment block of "flexible programming," where students who are low-performing or high-performing meet in small groups. And like KIPP, Uplift "aggressively" looks at data points by demographic group, Harrison said.

#### Effective ESL education is vital to social justice and student agency.

Westerlund 13 — Ruslana Westerlund, Associate Adjunct Professor of Education at Hamline University, Associate Researcher in the Division of Research and Development at the WIDA Consortium—an educational consortium of state departments of education, Associate Adjunct Professor of Education at Bethel University, former English Learner and Refugee Student Education Specialist at the Minnesota Department of Education, holds an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership from Bethel University and an M.A. in Teaching English as a Foreign Language from the Cherkassy School of Pedagogy (Ukraine), 2015 (“What Does Language Have to Do with Social Justice?,” *Reclaiming The Language for Social Justice*—a blog, March 13th, Available Online at <https://reclaimingthelanguage.wordpress.com/2015/03/13/what-does-language-have-to-do-with-social-justice/>, Accessed 07-21-2017)

A fourth essential component of social justice is creating a learning environment that promotes critical thinking and supports agency for social change. Nieto further adds that for education to be rooted in social justice, it needs to be responsive to the language needs of the fastest growing student population in our schools: linguistically diverse children (National Center for Education Statistics). The injustices against our linguistically diverse children are framed by the national English-only language ideologies. Schools are nestled in the society which primarily promotes English at the expense of students’ first languages which leads to disengaged learning and fragmented identities. By stripping away children’s languages, we strip them of their true identities.

Social justice may start in the classroom but always goes beyond the classroom walls because schools are situated in a society with values and ideologies that impact the classroom. If we are aware of the injustices perpetrated against many linguistically and culturally diverse learners, we can not remain neutral, paraphrasing Paulo Freier: an educator can never be neutral.

Despite the demands the academic standards place on students, students are deprived of the opportunities to engage in cognitively demanding curriculum. In the current era of standardized testing (thanks to the NCLB), teaching methods in many ESL departments have shifted from employing natural language learning techniques toward strict test-prep strategies. These methods have one goal: get students to score well on standardized tests. Grant (2004) sums up the consequences of high-stakes testing as follows, “high-stakes testing reduces teaching and learning for [many students] to simple routine procedures. It marginalizes their effort to learn and engage in a critical examination of themselves and society and detours their pursuit to become reflective and critical citizens” (p.11). In “Teach to the Test” Robbing Newcomer Students of Precious Language-Learning Time, new immigrants “at Old Mill and across the nation are experiencing fewer teachable moments like … most teachers espouse in their classrooms. Why? No time. Instead, hurried students are being put through a regiment of word drills, grammar exercises and rote memorization designed to arm them with basic facts and test-taking skills. This approach of teaching to the test – repetition without full comprehension – is designed to help students score well on federally mandated multiple-choice tests.” This is an issue of social justice: language development for academic achievement is denied. It’s not that the students aren’t able to learning. They are denied an opportunity to learn in the first place.

As educators work with language learners, the dimension of language in the social justice equation is of particular importance. Many language learners are placed in systems that ignore their language needs and instead, blame the kids for their socio-economic status or lack of parental involvement, and other excuses. The problem is not only inherent to the United States. A recent post I was reading from Australia nailed the issue in their article Dodgy Data and Language Misdiagnosis.

### 2NC/1NR – STEM Competitiveness Module

#### Charter schools key to STEM – that solves competitiveness

Rees 13 — Nina Rees is the President and Chief Executive Officer of the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. Rees holds a Bachelor of Science in psychology from Virginia Tech and a Master of Arts in international transactions from George Mason University. Prior to her tenure at KU, she served as the first Deputy Under Secretary for Innovation and Improvement at the U.S. Department of Education. In this capacity, she oversaw the administration of 28 grant programs, supporting 1,300 projects, and was responsible for spearheading innovative federal programs and policies such as school choice, charter schools, and alternative routes to teacher certification and school leadership. Before moving to the Education Department, Rees served as Deputy Assistant for Domestic Policy to the Vice President at the White House, 11-18-2013 ("Charter Schools Lead the Way on STEM", National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, Accessed Online at http://blog.publiccharters.org/2013/11/charter-schools-lead-stem/, Accessed on 7-13-2017, SV)

Over the next decade, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates the United States will create 9.2 million jobs in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). In order to fill these jobs, experts agree that we must adequately train our students in STEM fields. This is a critical step toward securing our economic competitiveness. It’s encouraging to see some of our nation’s best high schools embracing STEM education. Take a look at the U.S. News 2013 list of “best high schools in America” and you will find a number of schools with a strong focus on STEM workforce preparation – and many of these schools are charter schools. On a recent survey, one-fifth of all American charter schools reported that they have a specific STEM or math/science focus, and this number is growing. Among them are the Magnolia Science Academy, a high school in California, and the Denver School of Science and Technology in Colorado. Both are models of STEM-focused education, and both are public charter schools. At Magnolia Science Academy all students take a computer class every day and technology is integrated into core classes. Students learn how to design websites and effectively use the internet and curriculum that is aligned with National Educational Technology Standards. The school also sets a high bar in mathematics. In 2006, Magnolia student Zarathustra Brady became one of six U.S. students on the gold-medal winning national team at the International Mathematical Olympiad. Denver School of Science and Technology (DSST), a cluster of six public charter schools, focuses on bringing STEM education to low-income and minority students. Despite many incoming students performing below grade level, the school’s high standards foster a culture of achievement. Students take algebra-based physics in 9th grade and are expected to complete college-level coursework in science and engineering by the time they graduate. Thanks to its robust curriculum, the schools boast a 100 percent college acceptance rate. These examples are inspirational, but I believe we can do even more. Neither schools nor businesses can tackle this issue alone, but together we are poised for success. The National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, which represents 2.3 million students in more than 6,000 schools, is working with charter schools across the country to connect them with STEM resources and ensure they are working with their local business communities to craft school curriculums that will prepare students for careers in STEM fields. The charter model is unique because it provides schools with the freedom and flexibility to align teaching to our evolving workforce needs. We’re grateful to chambers of commerce for playing such a critical leadership role in advancing STEM education and look forward to building strong alliances with business partners from coast-to-coast to better serve our nation’s students and their communities.

#### Competiveness prevents great power war

Colby and Lettow 14 (Elbridge and Paul, Robert M. Gates fellow @ Center for a New American Security + senior director for strategic planning on the U.S. National Security Council staff from 2007 to 2009, 7/3, “Have We Hit Peak America?,” <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/07/03/have_we_hit_peak_america>)

In other words, a greater number of Americans are worried about diminishing U.S. influence today than in the face of feared Soviet technological superiority in the late 1950s, the Vietnam quagmire of the late 1960s, the 1973 oil embargo, the apparent resurgence of Soviet power around the 1979 invasion of Afghanistan, and the economic concerns that plagued the late 1980s—the five waves of so-called declinist anxiety that political scientist Samuel Huntington famously identified. Many analysts have attributed Americans’ current anxiety to the aftershock of waging two long wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. But the polls actually reflect something deeper and more potent—a legitimate, increasingly tactile uncertainty in the minds of the American people created by changes in the world and in America’s competitive position, which they feel far more immediately than do the participants in Washington policy debates. Average Americans do not experience the world through the lens of great-power rivalry or U.S. leadership abroad, but rather through that of an increasingly competitive globalized labor market, stagnating income growth among the middle class, and deep and unresolved worries about their children’s future. A recent cnn poll, for instance, found that Americans think by a 2-to-1 margin that their children’s lives will be worse than their own. They are questioning the promise of growth and expanding opportunity—the very substance of the American dream. This anxiety is real and justified, and it lies behind much of the public’s support for withdrawing from the world, for retrenchment. Yet American leadership and engagement remain essential. The United States cannot hide from the world. Rather, it must compete. And if it competes well, it can restore not only its economic health, but also its strength for the long haul. That resilience will preserve Americans’ ability to determine their fate and the nation’s ability to lead in the way its interests require. Unfortunately, absent from current discussions about U.S. foreign policy has been a hardheaded assessment of what it will actually take to rejuvenate and compete. Policymakers and experts have not yet taken a clear-eyed look at the data and objectively analyzed the fundamental shifts under way globally and what they mean for America’s competitive position. Nor have they debated the steps necessary to sustain U.S. power over the long term. THE WORLD’S ECONOMIC CENTER OF GRAVITY The larger a country’s GDP, the greater its pull on the world’s economic center of gravity. So when the Industrial Revolution spurred massive growth in the United States, the center moved west, eventually out over the Atlantic Ocean. Today, it is moving back toward Asia. Many foreign-policy experts seem to believe that retaining American primacy is largely a matter of will—of how America chooses to exert its power abroad. Even President Obama, more often accused of being a prophet of decline than a booster of America’s future, recently asserted that the United States “has rarely been stronger relative to the rest of the world.” The question, he continued, is “not whether America will lead, but how we will lead.” But will is unavailing without strength. If the United States wants the international system to continue to reflect its interests and values—a system, for example, in which the global commons are protected, trade is broad-based and extensive, and armed conflicts among great nations are curtailed—it needs to sustain not just resolve, but relative power. That, in turn, will require acknowledging the uncomfortable truth that global power and wealth are shifting at an unprecedented pace, with profound implications. Moreover, many of the challenges America faces are exacerbated by vulnerabilities that are largely self-created, chief among them fiscal policy. Much more quickly and comprehensively than is understood, those vulnerabilities are reducing America’s freedom of action and its ability to influence others. Preserving America’s international position will require it to restore its economic vitality and make policy choices now that pay dividends for decades to come. America has to prioritize and to act. Fortunately, the United States still enjoys greater freedom to determine its future than any other major power, in part because many of its problems are within its ability to address. But this process of renewal must begin with analyzing America’s competitive position and understanding the gravity of the situation Americans face. FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 200 YEARS, MOST GROWTH IS OCCURRING IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD, and the speed with which that shift—a function of globalization—has occurred is hard to fathom. Whereas in 1990 just 14 percent of cross-border flows of goods, services, and finances originated in emerging economies, today nearly 40 percent do. As recently as 2000, the gdp of China was one-tenth that of the United States; just 14 years later, the two economies are equal (at least in terms of purchasing power parity). This shift reorders what was, in some sense, a historical anomaly: the transatlantic dominance of the past 150 years. As illustrated by the map below, it wasn’t until the Industrial Revolution took hold in the 19th century that the world’s “economic center of gravity” decisively moved toward Europe and the United States, which have since been the primary engines of growth. Today, however, the economic center of gravity is headed back toward Asia, and it is doing so with unique historical speed. This trend will persist even though emerging economies are hitting roadblocks to growth, such as pervasive corruption in India and demographic challenges and serious distortions in the banking system in China. For instance, according to the asset-management firm BlackRock and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (oecd), consumption in emerging markets has already eclipsed that in the United States, and spending by the middle classes in Asia-Pacific nations is on track to exceed middle-class spending in North America by a factor of nearly six by 2030. U.S. wealth is not shrinking in absolute terms—and it continues to benefit from economic globalization—but the United States and its allies are losing might compared with potential rivals. Although Europe and Japan have been responsible for much of the developed world’s lost relative economic power, the U.S. economy has also slowed from its traditional rates of expansion over the past several decades. Worsening productivity growth has played a particularly large role in the U.S. slowdown, dropping to around 0.5 percent annually, which the Financial Times has referred to as a “productivity crisis.” A range of factors are responsible, including a decline in the skill level of the American workforce and a drop in resources allocated to research and development. U.S. REVENUE VS. SPENDING By 2043, federal spending on entitlements and net interest payments will exceed federal revenues, meaning funds for any discretionary programs will be borrowed. Overall, the U.S. economy has become less competitive. The McKinsey Global Institute, for instance, has measured the relative attractiveness of the United States across a range of metrics, such as national spending on research and development and foreign direct investment as a percentage of gdp. It found that U.S. business attractiveness relative to that of competitors fell across 14 of 20 key metrics from 2000 to 2010—and improved in none. And according to the Harvard Business Review, U.S. exports’ global market share dropped across the board from 1999 to 2009 and suffered particularly sharp falls in cutting-edge fields such as aerospace. This shift in economic growth toward the developing world is going to have strategic consequences. Military power ultimately derives from wealth. It is often noted that the United States spends more on defense than the next 10 countries combined. But growth in military spending correlates with gdp growth, so as other economies grow, those countries will likely spend more on defense, reducing the relative military power of the United States. Already, trends in global defense spending show a rapid and marked shift from the United States and its allies toward emerging economies, especially China. In 2011, the United States and its partners accounted for approximately 80 percent of the military spending by the 15 countries with the largest defense budgets. But, according to a McKinsey study, that share could fall significantly over the next eight years—perhaps to as low as 55 percent. The resulting deterioration in American military superiority has already begun, as the countries benefiting most rapidly from globalization are using their newfound wealth to build military capacity, especially in high-tech weaponry. As Robert Work and Shawn Brimley of the Center for a New American Security wrote this year: “[T]he dominance enjoyed by the United States in the late 1990s/early 2000s in the areas of high-end sensors, guided weaponry, battle networking, space and cyberspace systems, and stealth technology has started to erode. Moreover, this erosion is now occurring at an accelerated rate.” (Work has since been confirmed as deputy secretary of defense.)

### 2NC/1NR – Economic Decline Causes War

#### Decline causes WMD lashout—no checks

Harold James 14, Professor of history at Princeton University’s Woodrow Wilson School who specializes in European economic history, 7/2/14, “Debate: Is 2014, like 1914, a prelude to world war?,” <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/read-and-vote-is-2014-like-1914-a-prelude-to-world-war/article19325504/>

As we get closer to the centenary of Gavrilo Princip’s act of terrorism in Sarajevo, there is an ever more vivid fear: it could happen again. The approach of the hundredth anniversary of 1914 has put a spotlight on the fragility of the world’s political and economic security systems. At the beginning of 2013, Luxembourg’s Prime Minister Jean-Claude Juncker was widely ridiculed for evoking the shades of 1913. By now he is looking like a prophet. By 2014, as the security situation in the South China Sea deteriorated, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe cast China as the equivalent to Kaiser Wilhelm’s Germany; and the fighting in Ukraine and in Iraq is a sharp reminder of the dangers of escalation. Lessons of 1914 are about more than simply the dangers of national and sectarian animosities. The main story of today as then is the precariousness of financial globalization, and the consequences that political leaders draw from it. In the influential view of Norman Angell in his 1910 book The Great Illusion, the interdependency of the increasingly complex global economy made war impossible. But a quite opposite conclusion was possible and equally plausible – and proved to be the case. Given the extent of fragility, a clever twist to the control levers might make war easily winnable by the economic hegemon. In the wake of an epochal financial crisis that almost brought a complete global collapse, in 1907, several countries started to think of finance as primarily an instrument of raw power, one that could and should be turned to national advantage. The 1907 panic emanated from the United States but affected the rest of the world and demonstrated the fragility of the whole international financial order. The aftermath of the 1907 crash drove the then hegemonic power – Great Britain - to reflect on how it could use its financial power. Between 1905 and 1908, the British Admiralty evolved the broad outlines of a plan for financial and economic warfare that would wreck the financial system of its major European rival, Germany, and destroy its fighting capacity. Britain used its extensive networks to gather information about opponents. London banks financed most of the world’s trade. Lloyds provided insurance for the shipping not just of Britain, but of the world. Financial networks provided the information that allowed the British government to find the sensitive strategic vulnerabilities of the opposing alliance. What pre-1914 Britain did anticipated the private-public partnership that today links technology giants such as Google, Apple or Verizon to U.S. intelligence gathering. Since last year, the Edward Snowden leaks about the NSA have shed a light on the way that global networks are used as a source of intelligence and power. For Britain’s rivals, the financial panic of 1907 showed the necessity of mobilizing financial powers themselves. The United States realized that it needed a central bank analogous to the Bank of England. American financiers thought that New York needed to develop its own commercial trading system that could handle bills of exchange in the same way as the London market. Some of the dynamics of the pre-1914 financial world are now re-emerging. Then an economically declining power, Britain, wanted to use finance as a weapon against its larger and faster growing competitors, Germany and the United States. Now America is in turn obsessed by being overtaken by China – according to some calculations, set to become the world’s largest economy in 2014. In the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis, financial institutions appear both as dangerous weapons of mass destruction, but also as potential instruments for the application of national power. In managing the 2008 crisis, the dependence of foreign banks on U.S. dollar funding constituted a major weakness, and required the provision of large swap lines by the Federal Reserve. The United States provided that support to some countries, but not others, on the basis of an explicitly political logic, as Eswar Prasad demonstrates in his new book on the “Dollar Trap.” Geo-politics is intruding into banking practice elsewhere. Before the Ukraine crisis, Russian banks were trying to acquire assets in Central and Eastern Europe. European and U.S. banks are playing a much reduced role in Asian trade finance. Chinese banks are being pushed to expand their role in global commerce. After the financial crisis, China started to build up the renminbi as a major international currency. Russia and China have just proposed to create a new credit rating agency to avoid what they regard as the political bias of the existing (American-based) agencies. The next stage in this logic is to think about how financial power can be directed to national advantage in the case of a diplomatic tussle. Sanctions are a routine (and not terribly successful) part of the pressure applied to rogue states such as Iran and North Korea. But financial pressure can be much more powerfully applied to countries that are deeply embedded in the world economy. The test is in the Western imposition of sanctions after the Russian annexation of Crimea. President Vladimir Putin’s calculation in response is that the European Union and the United States cannot possibly be serious about the financial war. It would turn into a boomerang: Russia would be less affected than the more developed and complex financial markets of Europe and America. The threat of systemic disruption generates a new sort of uncertainty, one that mirrors the decisive feature of the crisis of the summer of 1914. At that time, no one could really know whether clashes would escalate or not. That feature contrasts remarkably with almost the entirety of the Cold War, especially since the 1960s, when the strategic doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction left no doubt that any superpower conflict would inevitably escalate. The idea of network disruption relies on the ability to achieve advantage by surprise, and to win at no or low cost. But it is inevitably a gamble, and raises prospect that others might, but also might not be able to, mount the same sort of operation. Just as in 1914, there is an enhanced temptation to roll the dice, even though the game may be fatal.

#### makes the US uncooperative and desperate – leads to hegemonic wars

**Goldstein 7** - Professor of Global Politics and International Relations @ University of Pennsylvania, Avery Goldstein, “Power transitions, institutions, and China's rise in East Asia: Theoretical expectations and evidence,” [Journal of Strategic Studies](http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~db=all~content=t713636064), Volume[30](http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~db=all~content=t713636064~tab=issueslist~branches=30#v30), Issue [4 & 5](http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~db=all~content=g780703608)August 2007, pages 639 – 682

Two closely related, though distinct, theoretical arguments focus explicitly on the consequences for international politics of a shift in power between a dominant state and a rising power. In War and Change in World Politics, Robert **Gilpin suggested that**peace prevails when a dominant state’s capabilities enable it to ‘govern’ an international order that it has shaped. Over time, however, **as economic and technological diffusion proceeds** during eras of peace and development, **other states are empowered.**Moreover, the burdens of international governance drain and distract the reigning hegemon, and **challengers**eventually **emerge who seek to rewrite the rules of governance. As the power advantage of the** erstwhile **hegemon ebbs, it may become desperate enough to resort to** theultima ratio of international politics, **force, to forestall the**increasingly urgent**demands of a rising challenger**. Or **as the power of the challenger rises, it may be tempted to press its case with**threats to use**force. It is the rise and fall of the great powers that creates**the circumstances under which major wars, what Gilpin labels **‘hegemonic wars’,**break out.13 Gilpin’s argument logically encourages pessimism about the implications of a rising China. It leads to the expectation that international trade, investment, and technology transfer will result in a steady **diffusion of American economic power, benefit**ing the **rapidly developing states** of the world, including China. As **the US**simultaneously scurries to put out the many brushfires that threaten its far-flung global interests (i.e., the classic problem of overextension), it **will be unable to devote sufficient resources to maintain or restore its** former **advantage** over emerging competitors like China. **While the erosion of the** once clear **American advantage plays itself out, the US will find it ever more difficult to preserve the order** in Asia **that it created** during its era of preponderance**. The expectation is an increase in the likelihood for the use of force – either by a** Chinese **challenger** able to field a stronger military in support of its demands for greater influence over international arrangements in Asia**, or by a besieged American hegemon desperate to head off further decline**. **Among the trends that alarm** those who would look at Asia through the lens of Gilpin’s theory **are China’s expanding share of world trade and wealth**(much of it resulting from the gains made possible by the international economic order a dominant US established); **its acquisition of technology in key sectors** that have both civilian and military applications (e.g., information, communications, and electronics linked with to forestall, and the challenger becomes increasingly determined to realize the transition to a new international orderwhose contours it will define. the ‘revolution in military affairs’); and an expanding military burden for the US (as it copes with the challenges of its global war on terrorism and especially its struggle in Iraq) that limits the resources it can devote to preserving its interests in East Asia.14 Although similar to Gilpin’s work insofar as it emphasizes the importance of shifts in the capabilities of a dominant state and a rising challenger, the power-transition theory A. F. K. Organski and Jacek Kugler present in The War Ledger focuses more closely on the allegedly dangerous phenomenon of ‘crossover’– the point at which a dissatisfied challenger is about to overtake the established leading state.15 In such cases, **when the power gap narrows, the dominant state becomes increasingly desperate.** Though suggesting why a rising China may ultimately present grave dangers for international peace when its capabilities make it a peer competitor of America, Organski and Kugler’s **power-transition theory**is less clear about the dangers while a potential challenger still lags far behind and faces a difficult struggle to catch up. This clarification is important in thinking about the theory’s relevance to interpreting China’s rise because a broad consensus prevails among analysts that Chinese military capabilities are at a minimum two decades from putting it in a league with the US in Asia.16 Their theory, then, **points with alarm to trends in China’s growing wealth and power relative to the United States**, but **especially** looks ahead to what it sees as **the period of maximum danger – that time when a dissatisfied China could be in a position to overtake the US on dimensions believed crucial for assessing power. Reports** beginning in the mid-1990s that offered extrapolations **suggest**ing **China’s growth would give it the world’s largest**gross domestic product (**GDP** aggregate, not per capita) **sometime in the first** few**decades of the twentieth century** fed these sorts of concerns about a potentially dangerous challenge to American leadership in Asia.17 The huge gap between Chinese and American military capabilities (especially in terms of technological sophistication) has so far discouraged prediction of comparably disquieting trends on this dimension, but inklings of similar concerns may be reflected in occasionally alarmist reports about purchases of advanced Russian air and naval equipment, as well as concern that Chinese espionage may have undermined the American advantage in nuclear and missile technology, and speculation about the potential military purposes of China’s manned space program.18 Moreover, **because a dominant state may react to the prospect of a crossover and believe that it is wiser to embrace the logic of preventive war and act early to delay a transition while the task is more manageable**, Organski and Kugler’s **power-transition theory** also **provides grounds for concern about the period prior to the possible crossover.**19 pg. 647-650

### 2NC/1NR – Regulation Bad for Innovation

#### Regulation destroys innovation – intrusion undermines development.

Allen 17 — Jeanne Allen is founder of the Center for Education Reform, an organization that aims to expand educational opportunities that lead to improved economic outcomes for all Americans, especially youth. Jeanne earned an M.S.Ed Degree in Education Entrepreneurship from the University of Pennsylvania, 4-13-2017 ("The overregulation of public charter schools", Arizona Charter School Association, Accessed Online at https://azcharters.org/the-overregulation-of-public-charter-schools/, Accessed on 7-11-2017)

Unfortunately, there are some clouds on the horizon. A prime example of “regulatory reload” has made an appearance in this year’s session of the Arizona legislature. A remarkably successful charter community, comprised of 547 schools and serving some 180,000 students, about 30 percent of the state’s public schools total, will be seriously impacted by an ill-advised measure that opens the door for regulatory intrusion.

The measure would require an annual report accounting for every penny that a school spends, and authorizes the auditor general to “request” any additional information he may wish to see, a “request” with which the school “shall comply.”

In one move, the bill’s eight sentences of text would give the state government the ability to second guess every decision that a charter school operator may make about apportioning its resources to provide a quality education. One of the most important reasons for charter school success in Arizona and all across America is the ability to innovate, make decisions and provide quality education free of the regulatory burdens common in traditional public schools.

My greatest concern is that proposals like these are part of a pattern that’s developing in many places – a tendency for charters to begin to morph into the sort of system that they set out to disrupt. Academics call it isomorphism, a process by which once innovative organizations become more bureaucratic, risk averse and ordinary.

The record of the charter schools in Arizona over the past several years is extraordinary. Their students have outperformed the state average at virtually every grade level and subject, and have earned top scores in the nation in the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

Ordinarily, policy makers would regard a record like that as something well worth preserving and encouraging. Instead, in this bill, legislators appear to be preparing to ~~cripple~~ [destroy] Arizona’s charter schools. Cooler heads need to prevail, and soon.

#### The plan is regulation not oversight – that kills innovation

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 overregulation:

Studies of accountability in public schools, while generally positive, have also shown that schools may shift their efforts away from low-stakes subjects and skills to focus on tested material. These or other unintended consequences may follow new testing or reporting requirements for choice programs, perhaps undermining the rationale for alternative school options in the first place.

The worst performance of a choice system by far has been found recently in Louisiana, where students in the state-monitored voucher program woefully underperform those remaining in public schools. If one explanation for these results is that some of the state’s top private schools opted against participating in the voucher program, that may suggest that strict testing and admissions requirements may dissuade high-quality private schools from participating in a voucher program.

Correspondingly, surveys of private schools participating or considering participation in voucher programs indicate that admissions rules and additional paperwork (though not so much testing) are the primary barriers to participation. This suggests that private schools may be discouraged from joining public choice plans without ample control over who they admit and what they teach.

### 1NC/2NC – Uniqueness CP

#### The United States federal government should create charter-specific authorizers, single point of contact teams, and advanced management systems dedicated toward charter schools

#### That overcomes squo overregulation problems

Lindquist 17 — Benjamin J. Lindquist is the program director for the Character and K12 Education Programs at the Kern Family Foundation. Lindquist graduated Magna Cum Laude with a Bachelor’s Degree in English from St. John's University in Central Minnesota. He earned his Master’s Degree in Business Administration (MBA) from the Leeds School of Business at the University of Colorado Boulder (CU), 3-22-2017 ("The Achilles Heel of charter growth—overregulation", Thomas B. Fordham Institute, Accessed Online at https://edexcellence.net/articles/the-achilles-heel-of-charter-growth%E2%80%94overregulation, Accessed on 7-11-2017, SV)

Solutions to Overregulation

The problem of overregulation is real, but it can be remedied. Ideas include:

Charter-Specific Authorizers. Some states have created authorizers that specialize in overseeing charters and have discouraged traditional education departments and districts from authorizing. Examples include the DC Public Charter School Board and the Arizona State Board for Charter Schools. This moves charters under a separate system of oversight for state and federal reporting, a system that can support a variety of distinctive options.

Single Point of Contact. State departments and districts seeking to oversee their charters efficiently and well can create specialized teams as a single point of contact for schools, empower those teams to manage all aspects of reporting, and provide them with the authority and resources to implement better reporting systems.

Advanced Management Systems. Powerful knowledge management systems, such as Epicenter and Illuminate, span many different functions once performed by multiple reporting systems. These systems minimize the need for manual entry and support more agile information retrieval, analysis, and reporting. They have the capacity to support authorization in ways that are less burdensome to schools.

Any solution starts with recognizing that charter schools can only reinvent public education if they operate outside of the traditional system. The best people to build great charter schools, district charter portfolios, and statewide charter sectors are visionary educators and reform-minded entrepreneurs passionate about enabling charters to fulfill their distinct missions. Now that the charter movement has come through twenty-five years of development, there are many such seasoned professionals with the real-world knowledge and field experiences to redesign reporting systems from the ground up. If done properly, these systems could free up precious resources to support higher levels of performance instead of removing the operating autonomy and flexibility so fundamental to charter success.

### A2: Charters Bad

#### Charter schools have a larger impact – it isn’t necessarily negative

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)

These results tell us whether a student attending a randomly selected charter school will perform better, on average, than a similar student attending a traditional public school. But only comparing averages likely misses a lot of nuance. There are good and bad charters, just as there are good and bad traditional public schools. But do charters vary more in terms of their ability to promote student achievement than comparable traditional public schools? Our data allow us to answer this question empirically, something few, if any, prior studies have done.

We find that charters vary more in their impact on student performance on state tests than traditional public schools. In other words, even though the average charter has a zero or negative impact on test scores, there are more charters with very large positive or very large negative test-score impacts than there are traditional public schools with such extreme outcomes. We also find that the negative impacts of charters are concentrated in non-urban areas (Figure 2), which is consistent with a lottery-based national study finding that charter middle schools deliver better results in urban areas.

The greater variability in the quality of charters is consistent with the idea that they are laboratories for innovation and experimentation, some of which succeed and some of which fail. We investigated further whether certain types of charters are likely to succeed or fail by separating charter schools into categories based on their mission statements. Figure 2 shows that schools with missions emphasizing academic rigor had positive effects on math scores, whereas those with a progressive (e.g., focused on the “whole child”) or more general mission statement had negative impacts. Schools focused on the arts also had negative impacts, perhaps because their focus is on an area other than core academic subjects.

#### Bad Charters close

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)

Part of the deal struck by charter operators is that in return for the freedom to innovate they will be held accountable for results. Thus far, the system of accountability in place in Arizona has not produced a charter sector that produces better outcomes, on average, than the traditional sector. But we do find that the charter sector is better at weeding out poorly performing schools than the traditional sector. Figure 3 shows that the charter elementary and middle schools that closed were significantly less effective in math, reading, and science than traditional and charter schools that remained open. The same was not true for traditional public schools that closed, which barely differed from traditional schools that remained open.

#### The study

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)

Charter schools are more popular in Arizona than in any other state. In the 2012-13 school year, 13.3 percent of Arizona students attended charter schools, almost three times the national average of 4.6 percent. That same year, Arizona’s 530 charter schools accounted for nearly a quarter of all public schools in the state. But student-level data on Arizona’s schools have not been made widely available, so the state’s charters have not been subject to the kinds of impact evaluations that have been completed in states such as Florida and North Carolina and cities such as Boston and New York.

We provide the first recent, comprehensive look at Arizona’s charter schools in a new paper released today, which will be published in a forthcoming issue of the peer-reviewed journal Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. Our analysis is based on statewide, student-level longitudinal data obtained from the Arizona Department of Education (AZDOE) that contains information on test scores, school enrollment, and student characteristics for the 2005-06 through 2011-12 school years.

Many prominent studies of charter schools take advantage of admission lotteries to compare students who were equally interested in attending a charter, but only some of whom were given the opportunity. That method is the best way to measure the impact of those schools, but these studies have a potentially important shortcoming: they can only examine charters that are so popular that they have more applicants than available seats. Our study examines a wide range of charter schools in Arizona using methods that have been shown to best replicate lottery-based results.

We focus our analysis on charter middle schools, because we are able to compare charter and traditional public school students who had similar entering test scores and demographic characteristics and even attended the same elementary school. We also examine high schools, taking into account students’ academic performance at the end of middle school. It is not possible to use this methodology to examine elementary schools because testing begins in third grade, so for those schools we compare test-score growth in traditional public schools and charter schools while taking into account student characteristics such as race, age, and special education status.

### A2: Charter Schools Not Key to ELL

#### Data proves our argument – charter schools add weeks of learning for English-language learners.

Gordon 15 – Ariel Gordon, BA in Philosophy, Politics, and Economics, and Spanish Language and Literature from the University of Michigan, researched public policy as a Ronald Reagan Fellow at the Goldwater Institute, Policy Research Assistant at Libre, 2015 (“School Choice, Charter Schools Help Give English Language Learners the Tools for Success,” September 2nd, *The LIBRE Initiative,* Available Online At <http://thelibreinitiative.com/blog-libre/school-choice-charter-schools-help-give-english-language-learners-tools-success>, Accessed 7-12-2017)

It's that time of year again. During "Back to School" season, many children in the U.S. are nervous about doing well in new classes, meeting new teachers, and seeing old friends again. However, a small but significant subset of students has an additional worry to add to the list – whether or not they will be able to speak English well enough to understand their coursework and to succeed in the classroom. English-learning students and their parents know that English proficiency is crucial for success in both the classroom and the future job market, and it is important that our children are able to access the kind of schools that adequately prepare them for the challenges ahead by efficiently teaching this necessary skill

As of the 2012-2013 school year, there were almost 4.4 million public school students that participated in programs for English Language Learners (ELL students). The programs to help ELL students, named ESL (English as a Second Language) programs, exist in all types of schools across America to help non-native speakers improve their listening comprehension, speaking proficiency, reading abilities, and writing skills in English, as well as to help students maintain grade level status, and to eventually help them graduate with English proficiency. ESL programs aim to assist students whose parents want them to learn English but are not English speakers themselves. A new report from Pew Research Center notes that over 87% of U.S. Hispanics agree that Hispanic immigrants need to learn to speak English in order to be able to succeed in the U.S. This increased desire to learn English is reflected in the numbers - as of 2013, over 33.2 million (68%) of Hispanics in the U.S. are reported to have attained English proficiency, up from 20.7 million (59%) in 2000.

When a household does not speak English at home, it often falls to the child's school to teach them this necessary skill. Unfortunately, many of the states with the largest ELL student population also have some of the weakest public school systems. Nevada, Arizona, and California all have large amounts of ELL students, and a recent study places all three in the 10 worst states for public education. In the same study, Arizona, Nevada, and California also all ranked in the 5 worst states for pupil-to-teacher ratios, which can have a larger-than-average impact on ELL students. Students learning a second language need greater attention and personalized instruction in order to succeed, and many of our state's public school systems are failing to provide for their needs.

However, in many states, school choice programs are allowing ELL students access to schools that have a strong record of success. Of particular note are the school choice programs implemented in Arizona and Nevada in order to provide an alternative to their suffering public schools. Charter schools, for example, are stepping up and are doing a better job of educating English language learners. Nationally, charter schools have been shown to provide an average of 43 additional days of learning to ELL students. In certain states, like Texas, ELL students in charter schools receive 50 more days of learning in reading, and 22 additional days in math as compared with their peers enrolled in traditional public schools. If an ELL student wants to further customize their education beyond what a charter school can offer, states like Arizona, Nevada, and Florida have Education Savings Accounts, in which qualifying students and parents can have a chance to choose whatever education plan is best for them, instead of being limited based upon their zip code.

#### Even Massachusetts is getting better – charters are accepting more English-language learners.

Schoenberg 15 – Shira Schoenberg, politics reporter for The Republican, named number 1 of the best state reporters by The Washington Post, 2015 (“Charter schools enrolling more English language learners, students with disabilities, state says,” October 20th, *Mass Live,* Available Online At <http://www.masslive.com/politics/index.ssf/2015/10/charter_schools_enrolling_more.html>, Accessed 7-21-2017)

The data found that enrollment in charter schools by English language learners and students with disabilities has increased since 2010. For example, just 5.5 percent of new charter school enrollees in 2011 were learning English, compared to nearly 16 percent of new enrollees in 2015. The percentage of charter school students learning English is now higher than the statewide average - although this partially reflects the fact that charter schools are located in urban areas with many immigrants.

The percentage of charter school students with disabilities (14 percent) in 2015 still lagged behind the statewide average of around 16 percent. But the percentage of charter school enrollees with disabilities had grown from 12 percent in 2011.

The growing number of charter school students with disabilities or who are learning English comes after a 2010 law required charter schools to create recruitment and retention plans for attracting special needs students and English language learners. The law also gave charter schools access, through an independent third party, to lists of district students, which the schools could use for marketing.

### A2: No STEM Schools Now

#### More STEM schools opening now

Schaffhauser 16 — Dian Schaffhauser, freelance writer based in Nevada City, 09-01-2016 ("Charter STEM Schools Growing in Nevada", The Journal, Accessed Online at https://thejournal.com/articles/2016/09/01/charter-stem-schools-growing-in-nevada.aspx, Accessed on 7-13-2017, SV)

A Nevada STEM school system has just expanded by opening additional locations in the Las Vegas area. Coral Academy of Science Las Vegas (CASLV) is a free public charter school that emphasizes science, technology and math. Coral Academy's students take college-prep courses with an emphasis on advanced placement classes and compete in numerous engineering and science fairs, robotics tournaments and math and science contests, regionally and nationally.

The initial Las Vegas site, opened in 2007–2008, replicated the original school, which began in 2000 with 67 students in a Reno location and eventually grew to 1,200 students at three schools. The Las Vegas school grew to three campuses and now has been expanded with the addition of two new facilities.

The new campuses are serving K–5 and can accommodate up to a thousand additional students, bringing Las Vegas enrollment up to about 2,700 students. Clark County School District, which serves Southern Nevada, is one of the largest districts in the country with 320,000 students at 357 schools. The Coral Academy schools aren't included in that count.

In 2010 President Obama's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology recommended that the federal government promote the development of 1,000 new STEM-focused schools over the next decade, especially in areas that could serve high-poverty neighborhoods. At that time, a council report noted, the country had about 100 such schools. As of last year a study by the National Consortium of Secondary STEM Schools had identified 949 STEM-focused high schools alone.

### A2: Charters Not Key to STEM

#### Competitiveness is linear – if we win that charters are largely responsible for improving STEM, their collapse undermines US competitiveness enough to cause a war.

#### Charters are best – they can innovate to fill STEM.

EdChoice 14 — EdChoice is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit, nonpartisan organization with the goal of advancing the education system. Founded by Milton and Rose Friedman, 6-20-2014 ("Friday Freakout: Is Overregulation Inevitable?", EdChoice, Accessed Online at https://www.edchoice.org/blog/friday-freakout-is-overregulation-inevitable/, Accessed on 7-11-2017, SV)

Admittedly, we are not experts on charter schools. But, again, we disagree with Bill that “charters expand at the expense of public schools.” Charters expand because they’re filling a need and, clearly, meeting parents’ and children’s needs. Education funding should not be controlled by any one school but rather by every single parent. As Milton Friedman said, fund students, not schools.

The money charter schools receive is used to educate children, the same as traditional public schools, albeit differently. Giving educators that freedom is to be celebrated. Of course, some charter schools struggle to help students attain, but the same can be said for some traditional public schools. At least charter schools face greater pressure to close via their authorizers and/or parents’ decisions to stay or go.

There are many charters helping disadvantaged students make bigger strides with more limited public funds:

Aspire Public Schools

72 percent are low-income

100 percent of graduates matriculated to college

IDEA Public Schools

83 percent are low-income

100 percent of graduates matriculated to college

Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP)

86 percent of students are low-income

83 percent of graduates matriculated to college

In a new Friedman Foundation report coming in early July, the author gathered not only the above performance data, but also the strategies top-performing charter schools and charter management organizations utilize to adjust for economies of scale, avoid inefficiencies, and maintain their autonomy. We encourage folks with the same concerns as Bill to check out The Chartered Course.

Ultimately, we aim high in hopes we can get as close as possible to an education system that empowers students, parents, and educators before assuming any desired one-size-fits-all outcome (see No Child Left Behind as an example). In other words, we want to be by the puppy’s side as it wades into the water and learns to swim before yanking it out and strapping a life jacket, leg floaties, and an oxygen tank on its back.

The assumption that education can’t and won’t evolve past the predictable cycles of the present lacks vision. It lacks creativity. Most important, it lacks a basic faith in humanity’s ability to make life better. We choose to be of the camp that sees innovations changing our society every day, and trusting that parents, teachers, principals, and entrepreneurs can do the same for the educational system serving our nation’s youth.

#### Charters are key to STEM – innovation and minority access.

Mathewson 17 — Tara García Mathewson is an award-winning multimedia journalist who spent the first part of her career covering local government and large school districts in suburban Chicago. Now she focuses on education policy and social issues as a freelancer from her home base in Boston, 2-9-2017 ("The next generation of charter school innovation and impact", Education Dive, Accessed Online at http://www.educationdive.com/news/the-next-generation-of-charter-school-innovation-and-impact/435774/, Accessed on 7-13-2017, SV)

Today, technology is integral to the success of many of the nation’s high-performing charters, whether because it creates a home base for student learning or because it helps teachers and administrators track outcomes and achieve steady improvement.

Richard Whitmire, veteran journalist and author, has spent years researching the nation’s best charter schools and analyzing the source of their success. His latest book, “The Founders: Inside the Revolution to Invent (and Reinvent) America’s Best Charter Schools,” he follows the path toward Charters 3.0, which he says follows the early “No Excuses” charter movement and the growth of rapidly scalable charter management organizations. The 3.0 version of top-performing charter schools is all about personalized, student-centered learning.

At STEM Preparatory Schools in South Los Angeles, that means giving a predominantly black and Latino student body a window into the world of science, technology, engineering and math through an inquiry-based education. CEO Emilio Pack says every single class starts with a compelling problem and teachers give students the space to investigate, struggle, collaborate and build resiliency to solve challenging problems like scientists do.

For their culminating project in a senior engineering class, for example, five girls have developed a bracelet that allows users to contact help if they are in danger of sexual assault.

“Women who are underrepresented in STEM will get very involved in creating STEM solutions if there’s a social problem attached to it,” Pack said at a recent conference for journalists hosted by the Education Writers Association.

Between 95% and 100% of seniors will be accepted to college this year, and Pack said 70% of STEM Prep students have declared STEM majors.

STEM Preparatory schools were designed as California was phasing out legacy exams and introducing Common Core-aligned standardized tests. Pack said he and his team knew new tests were coming, but they designed the school focusing more on the skills students would need to be successful beyond graduation rather than the ones they’d need to master formal assessments.

In the end, Pack said the critical-thinking and problem-solving focus of the Common Core exams give his students an advantage. STEM Prep students have exceeded the performance by the average Los Angeles student since the tests debuted.

### A2: Charters Not Key to STEM – Magnet Solves

#### Charter schools key – magnet schools mostly attract rich families.

Gardner 15 – Walt Gardner, visiting lecturer in the UCLA graduate school of education, writes the Reality Check blog, 2015 (“Comparing Charter and Magnet Schools,” October 2nd, *Education Week,* Available Online At <http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/walt_gardners_reality_check/2015/10/comparing_charter_and_magnet_schools.html>, Accessed 7-20-2017)

Still to be determined, however, is the question of family income. Magnet students tend to come from higher-income families than charter students. Because test scores almost always reflect socioeconomic factors, the district needs to clarify the issue. Nevertheless, I believe that all stakeholders would be better served by comparing magnets with charters rather than with traditional public schools.

### A2: Yettick

#### Yettick flows Neg – helps minorities in STEM

Yettick 17 — 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, 7-13-2017 ("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)

That said, there was also a bright spot: Three groups of students (females, Hispanics, and blacks) who are underrepresented in many STEM fields performed better in STEM than non-STEM high schools, after accounting for prior student achievement. For females, the results were somewhat mixed. Females at STEM schools earned higher scores in biology and math than their counterparts in non-STEM schools. But so did males. Also, the gender gap within STEM schools was larger than the gender gap within non-STEM schools, with males outperforming females in both school types.

For minority groups that are underrepresented in STEM fields, the results were more positive.

"STEM schools boost the likelihood that blacks take Math A, Biology and Chemistry by 5.4, 6.2 and 16.4 percentage points relative to whites," the authors write. "Similarly, Hispanics in STEMs receive an additional benefit relative to whites of around 7 percentage points in the probability of taking Math A and 9 and 13 percentage points for the probabilities of taking Biology and Chemistry, respectively. The black-white and Hispanic-white gaps are also smaller for Math B [test scores]."

The authors concluded by suggesting that, in the future, researchers peek inside the black box of STEM high schools to see what, if anything, STEM schools do differently, especially when it comes to females, Hispanics, and blacks.

"While the literature might suggest that STEMs are characterized by a 'chilly environment,' where minorities and females can feel unwelcomed, our results suggest that, in contrast, these schools are doing something right for them," they write.

### A2: STEM Not Key to Competitiveness

#### STEM key to competitiveness – it is decreasing now

Gordon 14 — Bart Gordon served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1985-2011 including as Chairman of the Committee on Science & Technology from 2007-2011. He is currently a partner at the global law firm K&L Gates LLP, 4-19-2014 ("STEM Education: Key to America’s Global Competitiveness", USA Science and Engineering Festival: The Blog, Accessed Online at http://scienceblogs.com/usasciencefestival/2014/04/19/stem-education-key-to-americas-global-competitiveness/, Accessed on 7-13-2017, SV)

Our nation has a long and proud history as a global leader in the development of technological breakthroughs and the development of revolutionary products that change and save lives around the world. In recent years, however, fewer young Americans are entering fields of science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) and as a result, our global competitiveness is in jeopardy. For the past six years, the majority of patents issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office have been awarded to international owners, and fewer American students are pursuing advanced science degrees and the World Economic Forum ranks the United States 52nd in quality of math and science education. We can and must do better.

At the same time, STEM occupations are poised to grow more quickly in the future than the economy as a whole. More than half of our nation’s economic growth since World War II can be attributed to development and adoption of new technologies and this area holds the path toward sustainable economic growth and prosperity for the next 50 years. A report from the Georgetown University Center on Education and the workforce projected 2.4 million job openings in STEM fields by 2018. Only by developing a generation of workers prepared for those opportunities can America secure its continued global competitiveness.

### A2: Competitiveness Resilient

#### No resiliency—US competitiveness is weaker than its ever been

Dichristopher 16 — (Tom Dichristopher, 9-15-2016, "US competitiveness is at its worst in generations, Harvard’s Michael Porter says," CNBC, http://www.cnbc.com/2016/09/15/us-competitiveness-is-at-its-worst-in-generations-harvards-michael-porter-says.html, Accessed 7-14-2017, JWS)

The United States is falling short on a number of critical measures of competitiveness, with small businesses bearing the most pain due to the shortfalls, a new study by Harvard Business School finds. The end result is the country is failing to promote prosperity among all Americans, according to Harvard's fifth-annual U.S. Competitiveness Project report. Professor Michael Porter, co-chair of the Competitiveness Project, said Thursday the weakness extends beyond the current economic recovery from the financial crisis. According to the study, America's performance peaked in the late 1990s. "We're stalled in America. Our performance, economic performance, on many metrics is worse than we've seen in many generations. I mean not five years. I mean 10, 15, 20, 30 years," he told CNBC's "Squawk Box." The study, which draws on surveys of Harvard Business School alumni and the general public, finds the United States retains key strengths in areas like higher education, entrepreneurship and capital markets. But those advantages have been offset by weaknesses in the corporate tax code, early and secondary education, infrastructure, the political system and health care. Those problems have gone unsolved because Washington has failed to have an honest conversation about addressing them, and the country lacks a cohesive economic strategy, particularly at the federal level, the study concludes. According to Porter, that may not change. He said the project gave up on assessing Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump's potential impact on competitiveness because their plans are not clear enough. "Their policies are so fragmented, so changing that we really can't understand what the strategy is," he said. The study also found fault with companies for failing to improve the business environment in the regions where they operate. It said they must contribute through skills development, supporting public education and partnering on economic development programs. The combined failure of the political system and business class has had a greater negative impact on small business, Porter said. That is because large businesses can inoculate themselves from the weaknesses in American competitiveness by virtue of their size, Porter explained. "If we have a bad tax policy, they have a global tax structure that works around it. If they can't find the right skills for their industry in America, they set up a facility in Latvia," he said. "The real pain is hitting small business." Pessimism is deepening, the study found. Fifty percent of business leaders surveyed said they thought the situation would worsen in the next three years, while 30 percent expect improvement and 20 percent forecast no change.

## Politics

### 1NC – Link

#### The plan moves away from choice and local control of education—causes GOP backlash

Strauss 12 — (Valerie Strauss, 8-28-2012, "What GOP platform says on education," https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/post/what-gop-platform-says-on-education/2012/08/28/4b993bce-f15a-11e1-892d-bc92fee603a7\_blog.html?utm\_term=.26b04434f2c2, Accessed 7-9-2017, JWS)

Here’s what the 2012 Republican Party platform calls for regarding education: Education: A Chance for Every Child Parents are responsible for the education of their children. We do not believe in a one size fits all approach to education and support providing broad education choices to parents and children at the State and local level. Maintaining American preeminence requires a world-class system of education, with high standards, in which all students can reach their potential. Today’s education reform movement calls for accountability at every stage of schooling. It affirms higher expectations for all students and rejects the crippling bigotry of low expectations. It recognizes the wisdom of State and local control of our schools, and it wisely sees consumer rights in education – choice – as the most important driving force for renewing our schools. Education is much more than schooling. It is the whole range of activities by which families and communities transmit to a younger generation, not just knowledge and skills, but ethical and behavioral norms and traditions. It is the handing over of a personal and cultural identity. That is why education choice has expanded so vigorously. It is also why American education has, for the last several decades, been the focus of constant controversy, as centralizing forces outside the family and community have sought to remake education in order to remake America. They have not succeeded, but they have done immense damage Attaining Academic Excellence for All Since 1965 the federal government has spent $2 trillion on elementary and secondary education with no substantial improvement in academic achievement or high school graduation rates (which currently are 59 percent for African-American students and 63 percent for Hispanics). The U.S. spends an average of more than $10,000 per pupil per year in public schools, for a total of more than $550 billion. That represents more than 4 percent of GDP devoted to K-12 education in 2010. Of that amount, federal spending was more than $47 billion. Clearly, if money were the solution, our schools would be problem-free. More money alone does not necessarily equal better performance. After years of trial and error, we know what does work, what has actually made a difference in student advancement, and what is powering education reform at the local level all across America: accountability on the part of administrators, parents and teachers; higher academic standards; programs that support the development of character and financial literacy; periodic rigorous assessments on the fundamentals, especially math, science, reading, history, and geography; renewed focus on the Constitution and the writings of the Founding Fathers, and an accurate account of American history that celebrates the birth of this great nation; transparency, so parents and the public can discover which schools best serve their pupils; flexibility and freedom to innovate, so schools can adapt to the special needs of their students and hold teachers and administrators responsible for student performance. We support the innovations in education reform occurring at the State level based upon proven results. Republican Governors have led in the effort to reform our country’s underperforming education system, and we applaud these advancements. We advocate the policies and methods that have proven effective: building on the basics, especially STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering, and math) and phonics; ending social promotions; merit pay for good teachers; classroom discipline; parental involvement; and strong leadership by principals, superintendents, and locally elected school boards. Because technology has become an essential tool of learning, proper implementation of technology is a key factor in providing every child equal access and opportunity. Consumer Choice in Education The Republican Party is the party of fresh and innovative ideas in education. We support options for learning, including home schooling and local innovations like single-sex classes, full-day school hours, and year-round schools. School choice – whether through charter schools, open enrollment requests, college lab schools, virtual schools, career and technical education programs, vouchers, or tax credits – is important for all children, especially for families with children trapped in failing schools. Getting those youngsters into decent learning environments and helping them to realize their full potential is the greatest civil rights challenge of our time. We support the promotion of local career and technical educational programs and entrepreneurial programs that have been supported by leaders in industry and will retrain and retool the American workforce, which is the best in the world. A young person’s ability to achieve in school must be based on his or her God-given talent and motivation, not an address, zip code, or economic status. In sum, on the one hand enormous amounts of money are being spent for K-12 public education with overall results that do not justify that spending. On the other hand, the common experience of families, teachers, and administrators forms the basis of what does work in education. We believe the gap between those two realities can be successfully bridged, and Congressional Republicans are pointing a new way forward with major reform legislation. We support its concept of block grants and the repeal of numerous federal regulations which interfere with State and local control of public schools.

### 2NC – Extensions

#### Integration into charter schools is politically contentious

Mcdermott and Kaczynski 17- Nathan Mcdermott and Andrew Kaczynski, Cnn 17, 1-19-2017, ("DeVos in 2015: Suburban Republicans oppose school choice out of fear 'poor minority kids' will invade schools " CNN 7-21-2017, http://www.cnn.com/2017/01/19/politics/kfile-devos-2015-suburban-republicans/index.html

Donald Trump's education secretary nominee, Betsy DeVos, once criticized members of her own party for opposing school choice reforms, saying in a 2015 speech that many suburban Republicans do so out of fear that poor, minority students would enroll in their neighborhood schools.

DeVos made the comments at the South by Southwest education conference while speaking about the partisan gridlock that prevents the kind of education reforms she envisions.

At her contentious confirmation hearing Tuesday evening, DeVos faced tough questioning from Democrats about her views on charter schools and voucher programs, guns in schools, and accountability for for-profit schools.

In her 2015 speech, she introduced her comments by saying she was going to get "politically incorrect" in discussing the opposition.

"Many Republicans in the suburbs likes the idea of education choice as a concept, right up until it means that poor kids from the inner cities might invade their schools," DeVos said, in a video of the speech reviewed by CNN's KFile. "That's when you'll hear the sentiment 'well, it's not really a great idea to have poor minority kids come to our good suburban schools' though they'll never actually say those words aloud."

DeVos expanded on her point by telling a story about a Michigan Republican legislator who opposed public school choice because his suburban district bordered the city of Detroit, which is urban and primarily black.

She also criticized Democrats for opposing school choice, though said the reason for their opposition was because of their loyalty to teachers unions.

DeVos did praise some politicians on both sides for their support of school choice and voucher programs, specifically naming Republicans John Boehner and Jeb Bush, as well as Democrats Cory Booker and Andrew Cuomo, for their support on the issue.

#### Democrats hate the plan

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)

Political parties, and certainly today’s Democratic Party, consist of coalitions of voting blocs with varied, if converging, interests. Since the beginning of the 2016 presidential campaigns, high-profile voices from several key Democratic constituencies have spoken out against charter schools, in some cases unexpectedly. Consider the diversity of perspectives represented:

The Movement for Black Lives released a platform that called for a moratorium on charter schools, arguing that the expansion of charter schools, along with budget cuts and standardized tests, undermines black students’ learning and educational environments. Around the same time, the NAACP ratified a resolution calling for a moratorium on charter school expansion until charters satisfy certain performance and accountability criteria.

Hillary Clinton, regarded as a moderate and mainstream Democrat, caught the charter school community by surprise with her claim that charters “don’t take the hardest-to-teach kids, or, if they do, they don’t keep them.” With that statement, Clinton seemed to depart from her supportive earlier stances on charter schools.

Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders, progressive stalwarts, vocally opposed a ballot measure to increase the cap on the number of charter schools in Massachusetts. That measure failed by a wide margin, revealing an unexpectedly partisan divide in a deeply Democratic state.

HBO’s John Oliver, less overtly political than the others but with considerable cultural and policy impact, aired a caustic segment about charter schools on his show, “Last Week Tonight.” That segment generated millions of page views and strong reactions from the education policy world.

While these voices might speak to different constituencies in the Democratic Party, one voice heard by all belongs to Donald Trump. Trump and DeVos, divisive figures enormously unpopular among Democrats, could become the public faces of charter schools and school choice. This brings risk. As Shavar Jeffries, president of Democrats for Education Reform, told Richard Whitmire, “I can’t think of anything more potentially harmful to the charter school movement, or anything more antithetical to its progressive roots, than having Donald Trump as its national champion.” This problem could worsen with time, too, if a Trump administration regards school choice as a panacea and fails to address the policy specifics that can determine the success or failure of school choice policies.

## State CP

### 1NC

#### Text: The 50 states and all relevant territories should ensure that diversity considerations are part of charter school approval process and exercise stronger oversight of existing charter schools

#### The counterplan weighs the admission of charters as to integrate the schools and ensures greater state control of charters to ensure goals are being met

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 7-10-2017, JWS)

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.” 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.

### 2NC Solvency

#### The counterplan mandates racial balancing provisions that are able to resolve segregation

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 112- Accessed on 7-13-2017, SV)

B. State and Local Policies that Encourage Integration

In addition to the suggestions for improving legislation pertaining to the factors outlined in section III.B, state and local legislation should emphasize the importance of integrated education for children today, and the responsibility of charter schools to serve as creative models furthering integrated learning. While states have considerable independence when forming education policies, charter school policies should be more uniform to ensure that charter schools as a whole serve as a meaningful option for all students and as a vehicle that supports and celebrates integration and diversity.

i. Authorization Standards and Obligations

Agencies that authorize new charter contracts or renew those of existing schools yield considerable power in defining the purpose and services of the charter schools they oversee. As discussed in Part III, both state statutes and authorizing bodies should mandate that all charters provide services such as transportation, free and reduced lunch programs, language and disability services, and outreach efforts to ensure the charter school is a viable option for any interested family. Additionally, state laws that confine charter enrollment to a single district could extend the opportunity to students across district lines while allowing preferences for local students. Schools could maintain diversity by employing a racialbalancing provision—similar to that in Connecticut—that ensures inter-district enrollment does not have a disparate impact on lowincome and minority students living in the charter school’s public neighborhood district.

Such statutory changes and mandates will be ineffective without consistent oversight of their implementation by the school’s authorizing agency. Each authorizer, however, has monetary incentives to accept and renew contracts with charter operators. States should therefore appoint or create a singular body (such as the state’s Board of Education) that has the final say in approving charter applicants.157 If the lower authorizing body approves an application with less than adequate plans for racial and socioeconomic integration and outreach, the state agency could reject the application or require revisions before approval. The higher authority could additionally impose further oversight by mandating data reporting and instituting sanctions for schools that fail to make progress toward diminishing racial isolation. Regardless of the additional statutory protections states put in place for charter schools, oversight will remain key to ensuring schools operate in accordance with their approved application and make progress toward their stated goals concerning achievement and diversity.

### A2: States Fail

#### States are best – they can promote integration better than the federal government.

Kahlenberg 17 – Richard Kahlenberg, senior fellow at The Century Foundation, 2017 (“The New Champions of School Integration,” April 6th, *The Atlantic,* Available Online At <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2017/04/the-new-champions-of-school-integration/522141/>, Accessed 7-30-2017)

In recent years, the federal courts have been an impediment, such as when the Supreme Court struck down voluntary racial-integration plans in Louisville, Kentucky, and Seattle in 2007. But socioeconomic-integration plans are perfectly legal. And state courts have an important role to play interpreting state constitutions to foster school integration.

The best example is the Connecticut Supreme Court, which in the 1996 case of Sheff v. O’Neill ruled that segregation between Hartford schools and the surrounding suburbs violated the state constitution, whether or not the segregation was intentional. James Ryan, the dean of Harvard’s Education School, has been writing for decades about the idea of replicating Sheff-type state-level decisions in places where courts have found a constitutional right to a decent education. Given research suggesting that socioeconomic school integration is an even more powerful lever for boosting achievement than funding, he has suggested that state finance litigation be extended to integration. Now, at the conference, he wondered: Could the time be opportune, given that “courts have found their voice” in promoting democratic values in the age of Trump, resisting, for example, the ban on immigration from majority-Muslim nations? Might the courts be newly open to lawsuits that seek to encourage efforts to ensure that children of different backgrounds have the opportunity to learn together and from one another?

It may be the worst of times for school integration at the federal level, but could this be the best time for progressive school boards and state courts, newly energized by the national political scene, to embrace an education reform that will strengthen American democracy?

## Neolib link

### 1NC Link

#### Neolib link – the plan’s reform props up an irredeemable system – only destroying neoliberalism solves

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 54-55, SV)

In this chapter I have argued that the charter school movement largely retains the rhetoric of educational equity and social justice; however, charter schools have a much closer institutional resemblance to private corporations that enter markets and grow by creating and exploiting opportunities. Two of those most salient growth opportunities are racial hypersegregation and urban decline resulting from deindustrialization. In exploiting such markets for growth, charter schools have threatened the future viability of public education by forcing traditional public school districts battling the effects of racial segregation and urban decline into market competition. Such perpetual crises are created and maintained by the state through public policy. Contrast the state’s role in financing and promoting charter growth and public education privatization with the previous era of desegregation funding and busing programs and you will see two very different approaches to redistribution. From the Brown decision until the Reagan Justice Department’s dismantling of desegregation programs, the state created a significant equity-driven redistribution program that, although imperfect and inadequate, recognized institutional racism and systemic abuse inflicted on majority-black urban school districts. With the advent of charter schools and their quasi-public financing structures and high-interest bonds, the state is similarly engaged in a program of public fund redistribution, only this time, the funds are redistributed upward to those who hold charter school debts or the properties those debts finance or both. Harvey posits that this redistributive reversal is characteristic of the neoliberal state’s drive toward accumulation by dispossession in which the ruling class recaptures physical, institutional, and conceptual space from lower class gains won under regimes of social democracy. The neoliberal state “does this in the first instance through pursuit of privatization schemes and cut-backs in those state expenditures that support the social wage. Even when privatization appears as beneficial to the lower classes, the long-term effects can be negative.”105 The conversion of pubic assets (whether funds or physical space) to private assets either through higher bond debt or facilities poses an existential threat to traditional public schools in segregated and declining urban spaces. Even if this trend could be reversed—and again, evidence points decisively towards intensification rather than reversal—charter schools and education privatization has already captured the institutional bureaucracies and conceptual space of public education. By this, I mean that charter schools and neoliberal education reform has bipartisan support at every level of bureaucracy. Conceptually, education reform resembles Margaret Thatcher’s neoliberal TINA thesis: There Is No Alternative at the level of public policy. Many charter school advocates undoubtedly have good intentions, and many parents who choose charter schools, especially from within circumstances where no real meaningful choices exist, are by no means enemies of public education. However, privatizing education will invariably occlude nonmarket justifications of public education. Indeed, this largely seems to have already occurred. The notion that the state should invest in public education out of a commitment to furthering human dignity and the common good is anachronistic and drowned out by the chants of “college and career readiness.” Robust concepts of equity have lost out to thin slivers of opportunity. If a reversal, or more crucially, a new path is to be cleared for urban education policy, the paradigmatic neoliberal state must cease to exist. Urban education policy, the anchor for all education policy, inevitably reflects the state’s approach to urbanization writ large. Before commencing the long march through the institutions to effect change, it is necessary to understand the ideology that governs those institutions and shapes and reshapes those spaces. It is to urban neoliberalization that I turn in Chapter Two.