# States CP

#### The fifty states and relevant sub-national territories should (INSERT MANDATES OF PLAN)

#### The counterplan solves better than the plan. States alone promote innovation and accountability---the perm’s overlapping mandates fail.

Chopin, Labor & Employment Law Department Associate, 13

[Lindsey H., Loyola Law Review, “Untangling Public School Governance: A Proposal To End Meaningless Federal Reform And Streamline Control In State Education Agencies”, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/loyolr59&type=Image&id=421>, p. 442-447, 7/10/17, KW]

the modern failure of increased federal intervention should make us wary of complete federal control

overlapping governance by multiple bodies creates a confusing and unaccountable system

With a cooperative of state and local control, led by strong state institutional centers, this proposal has the potential to create a balanced system in which real reform can occur  
All funds raised for education should be deposited into the state agency. The state will then adequately and equitably disburse these funds to ensure that poorer districts are not short-changed

Centering education governance in the states will create a balance that local and federal governance has yet to find. States are small enough to respond to local needs, yet large enough to have the resources to respond to those needs.

(The Federalism DA cards say a lot of the same, talk about the upside potential of state plan to aff and how this plan fixes the problems found in the Fed DA)

**IMPACT: ACHEIVEMENT GAPS (ONLY FOR FOLLOWING CARD)**

#### The counterplan alone promotes SEA leadership—which promotes state innovation---the plan and perm tradeoff by shifting SEA resources towards compliance with federal regulations, and undercutting SEA trend-setting

---the impact is achievement gaps

Weiss and McGuinn 16 - \*consultant to organizations on education programs, technologies, and policy, and former chief of staff to U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan, \*\*PhD, Professor of Political Science and Education at Drew University and Senior Research Specialist, Consortium for Policy Research in Education (Joanne and Patrick, “The Evolving Role of the State Education Agency in the Era of ESSA: Past, Present, and Uncertain Future,” http://www.aspendrl.org/portal/browse/DocumentDetail?documentId=2958&download&admin=2958%7C1917288972)

\*\*\*SEA = State Education Agencies

states have considerably more flexibility and authority in K-12 education than they had under the previous federal education law under ESSA(Every Student Succeeds Act) compared to No Child left behind Act

Leaders at the helm of state education agencies (SEAs) therefore find themselves in a moment of both great change and great opportunity, as many agencies move away from a predominant focus on compliance with federal regulations and programmatically dictated uses of funds, and toward a broader focus on supporting districts and schools.

ESSA presents fewer federal mandates, which opens the door to state creativity and innovation.

SEAs will be able to reorganize and prioritize functions to adapt to new demands being placed on them.

The Federal Government could not adapt as easily to increasing problems for they had to target a broader, more general pool of schools.

If we are to close the country’s longstanding racial and socioeconomic achievement gaps and address concerns about the nation’s overall educational performance, states and SEAs [State Education Agencies] will increasingly need to lead the effort

(Talk about how states CP allows for more experimentation in policies, increased and more profound action against racial and socioeconomic achievement gaps)(Works especially well with school to prison or arguments discussing racial segregation)

#### State action solves the aff – spurs decentralized innovation and a race to the top – the plan’s top-down action crushes federalism

Evers, research fellow at the Hoover Institution, 14

(Williamson, “How the Common Core Suppresses Competitive Federalism”, http://educationnext.org/common-core-suppresses-competitive-federalism/)

(Using Common Core as an example)

The insight of competitive federalism is that fifty-one state school boards are better than a single federal Executive-branch office

Political Scientist Thomas Dye: intergovernmental competition” was seen by the Founders as an “auxiliary precaution” against the “monopoly abuse of power by a single centralized government.

Competitive federalism encourages innovation, allows movement between jurisdictions that enhances liberty, and permits a better match between policies and voter preferences

Common Core’s national uniformity runs counter to competitive federalism

Unless Common Core is stopped, its officials will dismantle what remains of state and local decision-making

Competitive federalism allows experimentation by alternative jurisdictions. One state can try one policy, while another state tries something else. This is why it is called the “laboratory of democracy.” This feature of federalism is what brought Massachusetts, Indiana, California and several other states to have the outstanding curriculum-content standards that they had before the Common Core

(Talk about how some economies require better educations than others, ex. California in the age of machine learning)

#### Federal policies are watered down because too many divergent view points—dooms implementation

Chopin, Labor & Employment Law Department Associate, 13

[Lindsey H., Loyola Law Review, “Untangling Public School Governance: A Proposal To End Meaningless Federal Reform And Streamline Control In State Education Agencies”, <http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?collection=journals&handle=hein.journals/loyolr59&type=Image&id=421>, p. 442-447, 7/10/17, KW]

ambitious federal policies are often difficult to implement because there is a large gap between the theory of the policy and the actual ability to put the theory into practice.

the further a policy stretches from standard procedure, the more likely it is to fail or have perverse side effects; thus, these types of reforms, although attractive, will likely have a high failure rate. 201 When failure occurs, the policy must be reformed, which creates a vicious cycle of policy after policy

because legislation must pass through a Congress composed of members with vastly different viewpoints and agendas, policies must be flexible enough to please representatives of all fifty states

this type of agreement is not easily reached, and the policies suffer as a result. 203 With every concession of flexibility comes a chance for failure, and the result is a set of regulations with no substance or enforcement potential. 204 Even if the initial policies or goals were sound, the policies will likely never make any real, widespread change

(Talk about recent inability to pass legislature in Congress ex. GOP Health Care bill)

**AT: PERM (READ IF THEY RUN PERMUTATION ARGUMENT AGAINST CP)**

**1 – Permutation doesn’t solve – it still includes federal mismanagement with state action – doesn’t solve any of our case turns.**

**2 – Permutation requires state spending – means delays due to political gridlock, billions wasted, and a much weaker precedent for broader federalism.**

**3 – Independent state action is key.**

**Roth, 10** – civil engineer and transportation economist. He is currently a research fellow at the Independent Institute. During his 20 years with the World Bank, he was involved with transportation projects on five continents (Gabriel, June, “Federal Highway Funding,” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/highway-funding)

Today, the interstate highway system is long complete and **federal financing has become** an **increasingly inefficient** way to modernize America's highways. **Federal spending is often misallocated to low-value activities, and the regulations that go hand-in-hand with federal aid stifle innovation and boost highway costs. The federal government pursues misguided goals by use of its fiscal powers and regulatory controls**. **State governments can tackle transportation without federal intervention.**

**4 – Our efficiency turn is \*amplified\* by including federal action with state action.**

**Edwards, 11** – Director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute and the editor of www.downsizinggovernment.org (Chris, November 16, 2011, “Federal Infrastructure Investment,” http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment)

Problems with Federal Infrastructure Investment **There are calls today for more federal spending on infrastructure, but advocates seem to overlook the downsides of past federal efforts**. **Federal infrastructure projects have often suffered from large cost overruns**. **Cost overruns can happen on both public and private infrastructure projects, but the problem is exacerbated when multiple levels of government are involved in a project because there is less accountability.**

**(END CARD HERE)**

**The permutation doesn’t include a federal mandate – vote negative – severance should be a voting issue because it eliminates all neg ground. Our counterplan isn’t plan-plus, which should be the litmus test for why this perm is abusive.**