# Strategy notes and stuff to know about Title I

#### FYI – most funding under title I through 3 of 4 grants

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

Districts are eligible to receive Title I funding based primarily on school district Census poverty rates (Riddle, 2011). Title I funds are allocated through four components, basic grants, concentration grants, targeted assistance grants and the Education Finance Incentive Grants. The first three components (77% of Title I) allocate funds based on the percent of students in poverty in each district and the state average per-pupil expenditures on education. Districts receive more Title I funds as the percent of students in poverty increases and the state average per-pupil expenditures increases. Education Finance Incentive Grants (23% of Title I) provide additional funding based on the state’s funding level as a percent of the state’s per capita income spent on K-12 education and a measure of the degree to which the state distributes funding equitably across districts (Baker, Taylor, Levin, Chambers & Blankenship, 2013).There are a few 1ac versions ready to go in this doc:

**Portability:**  During the writing of ESSA, there was a debate about whether or not to include a provision to make Title I funds portable, that is tie them to individual students not to schools or school districts. This would allow Title I funds to follow students to private or charter schools. There is a big debate about this on both sides – but don’t let that scare you, there’s a bunch of people who think that this free market approach would be fabulous!

**Meta formula changes**: One of the big criticisms of current title I funding is lack of transparency and too much complexity resulting in misallocation of funding. The plan would revamp the formulas to streamline and increase transparency. This regulation would help equalize funding

**Close the comparability loophole:** ESSA left in place a comparability rule and subsequent loophole that allows states to use accounting tricks to demonstrate that they are in compliance with a requirement that school districts treat Title I and non-Title I schools comparably. The comparability loophole allows districts to count numbers of teacher rather than resources allocated. This ensures that districts, who vary their pay based on experience and quality, can be in compliance while still undermining quality education in Title I schools by placing cheaper, less experienced teachers in Title I schools.

Most of the advantages could be mixed and matched – so if the internal links/advantages seems confusing/overlapping that’s why! You could use any of the other lab’s aff adv about achievement as adv too.

**There are some pieces for additional advantages** – rural economies; more robust racism adv; federalism adv (for portability).

#### Extension and backup for all versions – you can mix and match things throughout - be a bit careful, we’ve noted a few things might not be consistent between increase formula reforms and portability.

# 1ACs

## Portability 1ac

### Portability Inherency

#### Squo ESSA reauthorization does not include portability of Title I funds, undermining school and state flexibility

Corona, government relations director, and Burke, director of foundation for educational chocie 16 (Brittany Corona State Programs and Government Relations Director, Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice; Lindsey Burke Director, Center for Education Policy and Will Skillman Fellow in Education, http://www.heritage.org/education/commentary/new-way-fund-education “A new way to fund Education” 7-3-2017//GDI/CH)

The tenants of federalism and the reality of federal education financing mean there are very few things Washington can or should do to advance school choice. However, as long as the federal government continues to spend roughly $15 billion annually on Title I programs, which constitute the largest portion of the approximately $24 billion ESSA, states should have the freedom to use those funds how they see fit for their communities. That should include allowing states to make those dollars portable, meaning they follow low-income children to any educational environment of choice—public, charter, private, or otherwise. Today, convoluted Title I formulas coupled with policies in some states that assign students to public schools based on their parents’ ZIP Codes do not make Title I a vehicle conducive to achieving its primary purpose: “…provid[ing] a good education for every boy and girl—no matter where he lives,” as was President Lyndon B. Johnson’s intention when establishing the initiative in 1965. By reforming Title I to give states the option to make dollars portable, policymakers would create much-needed flexibility for education providers and families and increase the likelihood of achieving the initiative’s goal. During the summer of 2015, an amendment to the House version of ESSA (H.R. 5) would have allowed for complete portability of Title I funds, including the ability of students in states that opted-in to have their funds follow them to private schools of choice. But the original amendment including portability to private schools was tabled, and a subsequent watered-down version, which did not include private schools, was considered. Even that weaker option, which would have allowed portability only to public schools and public charter schools, failed to make the final bill. ESSA, as signed into law, allows for no Title 1 portability whatsoever.

### Quality education Advantage [Portability]

#### Educational disparities rising—impacting children’s well-being and brain development

**Boser,** Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress, **and Baffour,** research associate, K-12 Education Policy, Center for American Progress, **2017**

(Ulrich and Perpetual, “Isolated and Segregated”, Center for American Progress, May 31, 2017, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2017/05/31/433014/isolated-and-segregated/>, accessed 7/5/17, GDI-JG)

Educational disparities between lower- and higher-income students have noticeably widened in recent years. In fact, income-based disparities among students are now larger than racial disparities,26 and low-income children are 15 percent less likely to graduate from high school than their high-income peers.27∂ The causes of this gap are many and well-documented. Many low-income students encounter a host of disadvantages outside of school that are likely to affect their educational achievement.28 For instance, low-income students are less likely to benefit from parents with postsecondary degrees. Studies have shown that the mother’s education level strongly predicts the achievement of the child, and among low-income families, the mother’s education level usually does not exceed a high school diploma.29∂ Children living in low-income neighborhoods also have increased exposure to hardship in their communities. These communities tend to lack access to meaningful job opportunities and face chronic unemployment. As a consequence, members are more likely to be distressed by mental health challenges, substance abuse, crime, and high levels of incarceration. Furthermore, residents of these communities are also excessively exposed to pollutants and environmental hazards. The trauma associated with all of these conditions poses serious negative consequences for a child’s well-being and brain development.30∂ But while family and community factors are strong predictors of student achievement, school-level factors matter as well. In fact, in 1966, James Coleman, an American sociologist and researcher, released a report that studied more than 650,000 students nationwide and found that the level of student poverty in a school is the single most determinative school-level factor in a student’s academic achievement.31∂ Since the Coleman report, study after study has shown that low-income children who attend high-poverty schools fare worse than low-income children who attend low-poverty schools.

#### And, Low income schools reflect more teacher attrition and lower teacher quality undermining academic achievement

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

In contrast, teacher experience gaps exist both across schools in the same state and across schools in the same district. The coefficient for elementary schools of -0.079 in the first row of Panel C, Column 4 (of Table 4) suggests that, comparing schools in the same district, each 10% increase in the percent of FRL students is associated with a 0.79 percentage point decrease in the proportion of teachers with three or more years of experience. Elementary schools with 75% FRL students have, on average, 79.8% of teachers with three or more years of experience, whereas lower-poverty elementary schools with 25% FRL have 83.8% of teachers with three or more years of experience on average, a gap of about 4.0 percentage points. As demonstrated by the coefficients for middle and high schools in Column 4 of Panel C, experience gaps in middle and high schools are even greater. Based on the predicted values, the within-district experience gaps for middle and high schools are 6.5 and 6.1 percentage points, respectively (based on comparisons between schools with 25% FRL and 75% FRL in the same district). Teacher experience gaps are even greater for students of color (see appendix Table A2). These findings comport with other statewide analyses of teacher attrition (e.g., Hanushek et al., 2004; Goldhaber et al., 2015) – low-income students and students of color disproportionately attend schools with the least experienced teachers within school districts.

#### This gap matters for multiple reasons:

#### Scenario 1- economic growth

#### This hinders long term economic growth and competitiveness because educational inequality makes it impossible to meet future high-skilled job demand—fixing the gap is key to economic competitiveness

Parmley and Smith, Smith is a Senior Fellow with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2016

[Kelli and Marshall, “Memo: Improving and equalizing high school and college graduation rates for all students,” Brookings Institute, December 15, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2016/12/15/memo-improving-and-equalizing-high-school-and-college-graduation-rates-for-all-students/>, GDI - TM]

Economists estimate that by 2020 more than two-thirds of jobs in the United States will require some form of postsecondary education or training. However, at the current rate of higher education completion, the nation will fall nearly 20 million degrees short of meeting that need. According to The Pell Institute, in 2014 only 35 percent of 25-34 year olds had a bachelor’s degree or higher, placing the United States around the middle of 43 developed nations. Achieving economic competitiveness demands a national response to increase the number of people earning four-year degrees or credentials. Moreover, the degree attainment rate masks pernicious inequities. According to the Pell Institute, more than half of all 24-year-olds with bachelor’s degrees are from families in the top 25 percent of the income bracket, while individuals from the bottom quarter accounted for only 10 percent of four-year degrees. Moreover, according to the Digest of Educational Statistics, Asians (57 percent) and whites (40 percent) are roughly twice as likely to hold a bachelor’s degree as African Americans (27 percent) and Hispanics (20 percent). Despite recent improvements in college-going rates, the overall degree completion rates, combined with disparities in educational attainment for low-income and underrepresented populations, will impede our nation’s efforts to develop a flourishing, inclusive economy. The “leaky student pipeline” metaphor, which characterizes the transition points in our educational system where students are lost, provides a powerful framing for identifying how to increase graduation rates. At each transition, some students fall by the wayside, especially black and Hispanic students and those from low-income families. While every transition point is important from a policy and practice perspective, improving student success at three critical junctures would have the greatest impact: (1) high school graduation, (2) pre-college remediation, and (3) college graduation. The U.S. has made progress over the last 15 years in improving on-time high school completion. A recent GradNation report describes how high school graduation rates began to rise in 2002, after flat-lining for 30 years, and have climbed sharply since 2006. The national graduation rate reached 82.3 percent in 2014—a gain of more than 10 percentage points since 2002. Gains by black and Hispanic students have been the key drivers with both of these student subgroups exceeding the national rate of improvement between 2013 and 2014 (0.9 points), and with yearly gains averaging more than 1.3 percentage points since 2011. Even with these gains, however, there is much to do to reach GradNation’s goal of having 90 percent of students graduate on time by 2020. The opportunity gap remains one ongoing challenge. The overall increase in high school graduation rates notwithstanding, substantial racial and economic variation persist. For example, while 88 percent of white students graduate, only 73 percent of African American and 75 percent of Hispanic Americans leave school with a diploma. That means one-quarter of African and Hispanic American students have little chance of obtaining a reasonably well paying job and are effectively shut out of college.[1]

#### School Choice facilitates better investments that grow the economy by restructuring education

Keating, Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council, Chief Economist, 15 (Raymond “School Choice and Economic Growth: Market Forces and Education” EdChoice 02-26-15 https://www.edchoice.org/research/school-choice-and-economic-growth/ 7-14-2017 GDI-JIJD)

It’s clear that investments in human capital—including education—matter to economic growth. The link between education and growth has long been a talking point for elected officials—and they have it right. However, given the poor performance of the U.S. economy for at least the past six years—average real GDP growth of 1.0 percent, and for the past 13 years, average real GDP growth of 1.8 percent, compared with average real growth of 3.7 percent from 1950 to 2000—the imperative to improve economic growth has not been more important, arguably, than since the Great Depression. ¶ Unfortunately, too much talk about boosting education to boost the economy comes back to the simplistic and costly proposal of throwing more taxpayer dollars at an education system long bloated by taxpayer dollars, with little to show for such massive expenditures— except a staffing surge. These dollars invested in public education that do not boost student achievement are dollars that could have been spent, for example, on scientific breakthroughs, on modernizing factories and other business facilities, or on other goods and services actually chosen by consumers. ¶ The structure of primary and secondary education in the United States—that is, government-run and regulated— runs counter to the market system of competition and freedom that has provided the foundation for building successful, competitive businesses and industries focused on serving consumers, and creating the most powerful economy on the planet. Therefore, no one should be shocked that enormous resources are spent on this education system, while that same system fails to achieve corresponding results. After all, this effectively is a government monopoly, and why would anyone expect innovation, quality, efficiency, and a focus on the consumer from a monopoly? Moreover, government monopolies, given their waste and failures, serve as serious drags on economic growth.¶ To achieve true excellence in education that will in turn help to accelerate economic growth, government control and regulation must give way to true choice and competition whereby entrepreneurs and educators work to better serve their customers, i.e., students and families. ¶ Greg Forster summed it up this way: “Worst of all, the monopoly pushes out educational entrepreneurs who can reinvent schools from the ground up. Only a thriving marketplace that allows entrepreneurs to get the support they need by serving their clients better can produce sustainable innovation. In any field of human endeavor, whether education or medicine or politics or art or religion or manufacturing or anything else, entrepreneurs who want to strike out in new directions and do things radically differently need a client base. There need to be people who will benefit from the new direction and support it. And that client base must be robust on three dimensions: size, strength, and suffrage. There must be enough supporters, they must have enough ability to provide support, and they must have enough freedom to decide for themselves what to support.”117 ¶ More money, along with a host of other efforts, such as curriculum changes and reforms in teacher compensation policies, will mean little in terms of education outcomes and the economy, given that the government-controlled system will remain in effect. Substantive change that dramatically alters educational performance and positively impacts the economy requires universal school choice. Interestingly, more support for school choice, including universal school choice, exists than most people probably think. ¶ Consider that, according to the Education Next 2013 survey of American adults on the question of a universal voucher initiative that “gives all students an opportunity to go to private schools with government funding,” 44 percent were in favor, with 37 percent opposed.118 ¶ However, a 2013 Friedman Foundation for Educational Choice survey provided definitions of what is actually meant by various forms of school choice, and the poll results among American adults are quite encouraging. For example: ¶ • A “tax-credit scholarship system” was favored by 66 percent of adults, with 24 percent opposed. School Choice and Economic Growth: A Research Synthesis on How Market Forces Can Fuel Educational Attainment 36 edchoice.org (Definition: “A ‘tax credit’ allows an individual or business to reduce the final amount of a tax owed to government. Some states give tax credits to individuals and businesses if they contribute money to nonprofit organizations that distribute private school scholarships. A ‘tax-credit scholarship system’ allows parents the option of sending their child to the school of their choice, whether that school is public or private, including both religious and non- religious schools.”) ¶ • Education savings accounts were favored by 64 percent of adults, with 25 percent opposed. (Definition: “An education savings account—often called an ESA—allows parents to withdraw their child from a public district or charter school, and receive a payment into a government-authorized savings account with restricted, but multiple uses. Parents can then use these funds to pay for private school tuition, online education programs, private tutoring or saving for future college expenses.”) ¶ • On school vouchers, when asked if they favor or oppose without any definition, 43 percent were in favor, with 28 percent opposed. But when vouchers were defined, those in favor jumped to 60 percent and 32 percent were opposed. (Definition: “A school voucher system allows parents the option of sending their child to the school of their choice, whether that school is public or private, including both religious and non-religious schools. If this policy were adopted, tax dollars currently allocated to a school district would be allocated to parents in the form of a ‘school voucher’ to pay partial or full tuition for their child’s school.”) ¶ • Finally, universal school vouchers gained large support, whereas means-tested vouchers did not. When noted that “Some people believe that school vouchers should only be available to families based on financial need,” 58 percent disagreed and 37 percent agreed. Meanwhile, when noted that “Some people believe that school vouchers should be available to all families, regardless of incomes and special needs,” 58 percent agreed, and 37 percent disagreed. ¶ When choice and competition in education are truly expanded in a substantive, substantial way, the benefits will flow forth in terms of improving educational attainment and quality, thereby boosting U.S. productivity, innovation, entrepreneurship, and economic growth.

#### US economic growth good – solves laundry list of impacts

Noell, Professor of Economic and Business at Westmont College and Ph.D. in Economic from Lousiana State University and Smith, Professor of Economic and Business at Gordon College and Ph.D. in Economic from Stanford University, 13

(Edd S. and Stephen L.S., “Want A Better World? Let's Work On Boosting Economic Growth,” *Forbes*, April 23, 2014, http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/04/23/want-a-better-world-lets-work-on-boosting-economic-growth/, GDI – TM)

If we as a society want to live in a better world, we must start taking economic growth seriously. It’s easy for economists to understand why growth is so important—but too often, economists fail to explain why it matters. With increased economic growth, the lives of millions of people around the world—in countries both rich and poor—can be transformed. Both authors of this column have witnessed growth’s power in person. One grew up in 1960s Hong Kong. While today Hong Kong is a wealthy financial capital, in the early 1960s it was engulfed in poverty. His earliest memories include images of the flood of over one million refugees into his city from Mao’s China. But by the time he reached high school much had changed. Children born in shanty towns now lived in apartments with electricity and running water. Each morning, crossing Victoria Harbor with its glittering view of Hong Kong’s burgeoning skyline, he could see the trade, construction, and growth that provided jobs, increased wealth, and lifted families out of poverty. Since then, in our frequent professional travel to Asia, we have both seen first-hand the fantastic poverty reduction triggered by growth in Korea, China, and much of Southeast Asia. The immense power of economic growth is easy to see in dramatic surges like Hong Kong’s, but the transformative power of growth is not limited to poor countries. In wealthy countries like the United States growth and the prosperity that it brings allow us, as a society, to afford to do many good things. It is quite remarkable that someone such as the climate activist Bill McKibbin argues that growth is “the one big habit we finally must break.” When he looks at growth, he sees a malevolent force driving our desires to consume ever more fossil fuels. We could not disagree more. With greater growth our economy can afford to buy green products, offset our carbon footprint, and conserve and replenish the renewable natural resources we consume. Growth means, literally, the increase in the production of goods and services in an economy. Since production of goods and services requires that workers and firms’ owners be paid, the value of production is basically the same as the value of households’ income. So growth measures the increases in a country’s ability to take care of itself. With growth, families are better able to purchase goods and services. A cynic may only think of the purchase of another 80” TV, but economists understand that the “goods” a society gets from growth go far beyond the ones you can pick up at Best Buy. With greater growth we could invest even more in basic research to help find cures for diseases like Alzheimer’s and Parkinson’s. Greater growth would allow us to avert the coming intergenerational fight over how to pay for trillions of dollars of entitlement promises we have made to the needy among us, and to our parents and grandparents in the form of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. These are profoundly moral concerns. In short, the supporters of growth—who usually make their case in economic terms, about tax and spending policies—are on to something. They understand growth’s potential to ease economic problems. Right now the United States is growing at about two percent per year—but to get the U.S. unemployment rate down to a healthy level (under six percent) within four years will take approximately four percent growth per year. That is not just a number on a press release—it’s the dignity of a paycheck and the security of an income for millions of families across America. So if you care about long-term human wellbeing—in rich and poor countries alike—you must care about economic growth. Before we as a society can consider how to achieve such growth, we must recognize that getting growth right matters. Not every instance of economic growth in every country is beneficial. But time and again, hard data documents its positive impact on the things that ultimately matter: education, environmental care, physical health, political freedom, and healthy culture. Failure to realize the transformative power of growth would be a failure of our moral imaginations. We would risk leaving a world for our children in which diseases persist, rivers remain polluted, and the elderly and sick receive inadequate care. Growth must not be sold short. Growth is not just morally defensible; it is a moral imperative for achieving lasting human flourishing.

#### Scenario 2 – Democratic Decision making

#### Educational equality essential to U.S. democracy—persistent and long standing inequalities undermine participation and democratic decision-making

Chen, PhD candidate at Saint Louis University, publishing in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal, 2015

[Amy Yun-Ping, “Educational Inequality: An Impediment to True Democracy in the United States,” Sociology Study, Vol.5 No.5, May, <http://www.davidpublisher.org/Public/uploads/Contribute/55f62bc2bf7b8.pdf> accessed GDI -TM]

The fundamental concept of democracy aims to offer equal access to all members of society and to ensure that they are empowered to make a good life for themselves and establish the public good for the country. Quality education is a method to eliminate poverty and encourage the engine of shared prosperity for generations of Americans. When education improves the preparation and productivity of young members of the community, it increases the wealth of the country and leads many people to their American dreams. Nevertheless, the persistent and long-standing educational inequalities are an obstacle for the United States becoming a nation with true democracy and equal liberty. Thus, democracy becomes a superficial aspect and a beautiful bubble, and it is not realized in practice. The Collapse of Political Responsibility Hochschild and Scovronick (2003) stated, “Education also powerfully affects people’s involvement with politics and their community, thereby creating another link between the nested structure of inequalities in schooling and the American dream” (Hochschild and Scovronick 2003: 24). Well-educated members of the community largely understand their obligation as participants in a democratic society, and they likely know current political facts and participate in political activities. The virtue of education in a democracy is that it tends to prepare children for citizenship and to foster in them the knowledge necessary for them to function in a civic society. But today in the United States, only some Americans fully exercise their political rights, and these are often citizens with high incomes, high socioeconomic statuses, and high levels of formal education. According to the American Political Science Association Taskforce (2005): In 1990, nearly nine out of 10 individuals in families with incomes over $75,000 reported voting in presidential elections, while only half of those in families with incomes under $15,000 reported voting. Fifty-six percent (56%) of those with incomes of at least $75,000 reported participating in political campaign activities, compared with a mere 6% among Americans with incomes under $15,000. (American Political Science Association Taskforce 2005: 80-81) The evidence indicates that there is a significant correlation between income status and the practice of citizenship. Americans with higher socioeconomic status usually enjoy not only higher educational achievement and salaries, but also have greater resources and skills to engage in politics and organizations. Education provides opportunities for Americans to acquire knowledge of democracy and to recognize their duty as members of a democratic society. Nevertheless, educational inequalities can lead to disparities in resources and skills between privileged and unprivileged people. The situation demolishes the goal of promoting democracy. The voices of U.S. citizens are heard unequally, and collective decisions respond much more to the privileged than to people of average means. The gap of inequality will increase. Instead of making progress, U.S. politics will continue to involve exclusion and unfairness, which strongly distorts the primary framework of democracy.

#### And, Democracies less violent, more protective of human rights and less prone to war

**Diamond,** Senior Fellow, Hoover Institution, and Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies, Stanford University, **2016**

(Larry, “Democracy in Decline: How Washington Can Reverse the Tide”, Foreign Affairs, Jul/Aug 2016, Volume 95, Issue 4, pages 151-159, accessed via ProQuest, GDI-JG)

Although democracy promotion may have fallen out of favor with the U.S. public, such efforts very much remain in the national interest. Democracies are less violent toward their citizens and more protective of human rights. They do not go to war with one another. They are more likely to develop market economies, and those economies are more likely to be stable and prosperous. Their citizens enjoy higher life expectancies and lower levels of infant and maternal mortality than people living under other forms of government. Democracies also make good allies. As Michael McFaul, the former U.S. ambassador to Russia, has written, "Not every democracy in the world was or is a close ally of the United States, but no democracy in the world has been or is an American enemy. And all of America's most enduring allies have been and remain democracies."∂ Authoritarian regimes, by contrast, are inherently unstable, since they face a central dilemma. If an autocracy is successful-if it produces a wealthy and educated population-that population will construct a civil society that will sooner or later demand political change. But if an autocracy is unsuccessful-if it fails to generate economic growth and raise living standards-it is liable to collapse.

### Portability good – Choice Advantage

#### Uniquely, school choice like Title I portability promote integration – statistics prove

Gibbons, Public affairs manager, Step up Students, 2014 (Patrick, “The myth of school vouchers and racism” Chapel Hill News, 5/14/14. (<https://www.stepupforstudents.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/14-4-15-patrick-myth-of-vouchers.pdf>) Accessed 7/11/17, GDI – JPA)

Many have tried to link vouchers and school choice to racism,¶ but it can’t be done without a tortured reading of the law and¶ civil rights history.¶ So it was a surprise to see attorneys Elizabeth Haddix and¶ Mark Dorosin of the UNC Center for Civil Rights, do just that in¶ “The Ugly Truth About Vouchers,” (CHN, http://bit.ly/1iiQSQT).¶ The authors begin by claiming private schools “are permitted¶ to discriminate against students on the basis of race,” which is¶ simply not true. As determined by the U.S. Supreme Court in¶ Runyon v. McCrary (1976), no private school in the U.S. is¶ permitted to discriminate based on race, color or national origin.¶ Next, Haddix and Doroson argue there are “historical links¶ between racism and private schools.” Indeed, many private¶ schools grew in enrollment during desegregation, as white¶ students fled public schools. But to link racism and private¶ schools is to miss the more important historical precursor:¶ American public schools were themselves rooted in racism.¶ African-Americans waited 235 years after the founding of the¶ first public high school to get their first public high school. It¶ would be another 84 years before the U.S. Supreme Court ruled¶ on Brown v. Board (1954) and nearly 20 more years before real¶ integration efforts were made.¶ Don’t forget, public school districts and elected officials¶ fought racial integration every step of the way. Some districts¶ zoned African-Americans completely outside their boundaries.¶ Others shut down altogether to avoid integration. Many urban¶ areas faced “white flight” as white families segregated¶ themselves into whiter public school enclaves.¶ After whitewashing this history, the authors point to four¶ rural, North Carolina counties where black students make up 79¶ to 86 percent of public school enrollment while private schools¶ there are between 95 and 99 percent white. The point they¶ seem intent on missing is that the new voucher plan likely would¶ send many black students to largely white private schools – and¶ thus reduce segregation. How is that racist?¶ Finally, the authors directly link North Carolina’s recent¶ voucher legislation with racist policies occurring 40 to 60 years¶ prior. They write, “Private entities that profit from privatizing¶ our tax dollars have not been made to answer for the racist¶ history of their legislation.”¶ It is a head-scratching statement given the lingering racial¶ segregation in North Carolina along public school district lines.¶ Though the North Carolina student population is 52 percent¶ white and 26 percent black, districts range from 0.03 percent to¶ 95 percent black and 3 percent to 94 percent white. Take¶ neighboring Orange and Durham counties. Orange County is 64¶ percent white and 16 percent black. Durham County is 19¶ percent white and 51 percent black.¶ The authors’ statements are even more disappointing when¶ you realize the great work the UNC Center for Civil Rights has¶ done in highlighting the inequalities facing low-income and¶ minority students. Last year, the center’s report, “The State of¶ Exclusion,” blasted public school zoning policies. The report¶ found “failing schools” were the closest school to 48 percent of¶ all black students in the state, while high-poverty schools were¶ the closest to 68 percent. These rates were double the¶ statewide average for all students.¶ Given the existing racial and income disparities, the most¶ likely beneficiaries of North Carolina’s voucher program – put on¶ hold by a court injunction – are minority students. This is exactly¶ what we saw in Florida after the state passed the Tax Credit¶ Scholarship Program. Today, 70 percent of scholarship students¶ attending private schools are black or Hispanic. Half of the¶ students come from single-parent households, while the¶ average scholarship student lives in a family with a household¶ income just 9 percent above poverty.¶ Isn’t this exactly the student population Haddix, Dorosin and¶ the UNC Center for Civil Rights wish to help in North Carolina?

#### Educational inequality and segregation promotes racial exclusion

**James,** Professor of Law, University of Miami School of Law, **2015**

(Osamuida, “Soapbox: Racial segregation in schools, no matter how unintended, should be illegal”, Miami Herald, February 19, 2015, http://www.miamiherald.com/news/local/community/miami-dade/coral-gables/article10679735.html, accessed 7/11/17, GDI-JG)

A popular magazine recently asked its readers whether racial segregation is still legal, even if it is not deliberate. The answer depends on what we mean to oppose when we oppose racial segregation. If we mean to merely prevent formal and intentional acts of discrimination, then the answer is yes — unintended racial segregation is legal. If we mean to actually end racial exclusion, marginalization, and isolation in pursuit of substantive equality, then the answer is no — racial segregation, no matter how unintended, should be illegal.∂ Failure to commit to substantive racial equality continues to forestall attempts to achieve racial integration in our communities and schools. In Miami, for example, “unintended” residential racial isolation today is actually the product of intentional local, state, and federal policies that broadened access to safe, stable communities for some, while simultaneously denying home ownership, quality education, and public services to others. One need only examine neighborhood maps of Miami during the early 1930s that used racial composition to designate — for investment purposes — areas like Coral Gables as “best,” and certain parts of Coconut Grove as “hazardous,” to get a sense of this intentional government discrimination.∂ Although this sort of blatant racism has long been outlawed, enduring racial and economic segregation in our city is a direct byproduct of intentional decisions to deny access to mortgages and other forms of community investment and development on the basis of race. Moreover, our still-segregated communities have resulted in segregated learning environments.∂ Current debates about controlled choice in the city of Coral Gables implicate this very issue. When asked whether their government has any obligation to counteract school segregation, many parents might respond ‘no’ if it means that they cannot attend their neighborhood school. After all, they might argue, school segregation is an historical artifact no longer in operation.∂ As members, however, of a broader community still impacted today by the intentional racial discrimination of yesterday, we have a duty to consider factors other than convenience, comfort, and our own ideal schooling arrangements when evaluating controlled choice.∂ We have a duty to also consider the value of school integration in helping us achieve our goal of substantive equality. We have a duty to weigh that value just as heavily as we weigh benefits of attending school close to home, and to reject the false dichotomy that the formality of “intent” creates. We have a moral imperative to actively embrace a commitment to racial inclusion in our schools and neighborhoods, and to reject school assignment plans that result, intentionally or unintentionally, in racial exclusion and segregation instead.

#### Racism kills – disproportionate impact on health of racial and ethnic minorities

**Miller, 2016**

(Jake “Health Disparities - Talk explores the unhealthy truth about racism” Harvard Medical School October 20, 2016 <https://hms.harvard.edu/news/health-disparities-0> accessed GDI - TM)

Racism makes people sick. In the United States, blacks, Latinos, native Americans and other minority groups have greater risks of diseases like tuberculosis and coronary heart disease than whites, as numerous studies by sociologists, public health researchers, epidemiologists and physicians have found. Once they are sick, researchers say, minorities tend to receive lower quality health care than whites. As a result, minorities can expect to die at a younger age than whites. At the latest 2016 HLC Diversity Dialogue, featured speaker David Williams, the Florence Sprague Norman and Laura Smart Norman Professor of Public Health at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, discussed the historic and current state of health disparities in the U.S. and explored some possible solutions. One key reason for the lack of health equity is the health risks that are associated with the lower social and economic status of minorities, said Williams, who is also professor of African and African American studies and of sociology at Harvard University and director of the Lung Cancer Disparities Center at the Harvard Chan School. Blacks and Latinos in the U.S. experience lower income and wealth and have reduced access to high quality health care and nutritious food, Williams said, so it’s not surprising that they experience higher rates of mortality than people in this country who are better off economically. But it’s not just about economics. “The deeply embedded racism in our culture has consequences for health,” Williams said, citing growing bodies of research that show the perils of prejudice. When researchers correct for factors such as education and income—comparing white high school dropouts with black high school dropouts, for example—there are still significant differences in the health risks and outcomes between races. Ongoing research is shedding light onto why that happens and how policy changes and medical training can help solve the problem. Williams noted that numerous studies have shown that people who experience discrimination are more likely to have elevated stress hormones, increased inflammation, high blood pressure, cognitive impairments and poor sleep.

#### School choice helps every student –whether they choose to exercise choice or not

**Bedrick,** education policy analyst at the Cato Institute, **2016** (Jason “Public or Private, What Students Need Is Educational Choice” CATO Institute, 8/5/16 (<https://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/public-or-private-what-students-need-educational-choice>) Accessed 7/8/17, GDI – JPA)

Public or Private, What Students Need Is Educational Choice¶ When parents are looking for a school for their children, their primary concern isn’t whether the school is run by the government or a private entity. They want to know that the school provides a high-quality education in line with their values that meets the unique needs of their children.¶ The real question isn’t “public vs. private” but what sort of education system delivers what parents want and kids need. Assigning children to district schools based on the location of the home that their parents can afford might work for some families, especially those who can afford to live in expensive areas with better schools. But district-based schooling leaves low-income families behind. Instead, our education system should directly empower families to choose the schools that work best for them.¶ Whether they exercise choice or not, all students benefit from having more choices.¶ Students have diverse educational needs. They have varying aptitudes and interests and learn better in different environments. No school can be all things to all students. No school can meet all the unique needs of all the children who just happen to live nearby. Even the highest-performing schools aren’t necessarily the right fit for some students. Empowering families with educational choice through vouchers, tax-credit scholarships, or education savings accounts enables them to select the education providers that are the best match for their kids.¶ District schools are subject to political control, which produces winners and losers. At best, district schools will reflect the values and preferences of the majority of citizens in a given area. Other times they even reflect the values and preferences of a mere plurality or a politically powerful minority. The zero-sum nature of political control forces citizens into conflict with each other. By contrast, a system of educational choice avoids social strife and fosters social harmony by allowing parents with differing views of education each to have their preferences met without forcing their views on their unwilling neighbors.¶ Perhaps most importantly, research shows that educational choice works. The near-consensus of random-assignment studies — the gold standard of social science research — finds that educational choice programs improve students’ academic performance and increases their likelihood of graduating high school and enrolling in college.¶ Not only do participating students benefit, but so do those who remain in their assigned schools. More than 30 studies find that choice programs produce modest but statistically significant positive effects in district schools as a result of the increased choice and competition.¶ Whether they exercise choice or not, all students benefit from having more choices.

### Portability Solvency

#### Option –

#### Plan: The United States federal government should amend Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and subsequent reauthorizations of the Title I provision to allow for Title I portability.

#### Portability in Title I funds streamlines formulas allowing fairer distribution of resources – weighting systems can prevent transfer overload

Snow, Foundation for Excellence in Education, policy analyst in education choice, 17 (Mckenzie Snow “It’s time to free states to improve the focus and fit of their Title I funds” Fordham Institute 1-24-2017 https://edexcellence.net/articles/its-time-to-free-states-to-improve-the-focus-and-fit-of-their-title-i-funds 7-12-2017 GDI-JIJD)

Title I is currently focused on funding a system of schools, not disadvantaged students. A portability option would allow states to instead fund eligible children—putting students first in a very real way. Furthermore, arguing against any voluntary change to the status quo assumes that current Title I funding distribution is fair. Unfortunately, this is not the case.¶ We’ve been hearing a lot about Michigan’s education system recently. Under the current Title I funding distribution system, Detroit City School District receives about $4,100 per child. The School District of the City of Inkster—less than thirty minutes away from downtown Detroit and with essentially the same poverty rate—receives about $1,350 per child or one-third of Detroit’s per pupil allocation. (See Marguerite Roza and Robin Lake here.) Because of the Title I distribution required by four competing federal formulas—each of which has different allocation patterns, prioritizes different states and localities, and is meant to create different incentives—the per pupil allocation between different states and districts seems erratic.In addition to considering the integrity of Title I’s current funding distribution, it is important to take a sober look at the likely rate of student transfers in a portable system. The transfer rates in states with public and private school choice programs are gradual, and Title I-eligible students – and, therefore, Title I dollars—would not likely depart any school or district overnight.¶ To limit the impact of transitioning to portability on dependent schools, states could include weights for concentrations of poverty, allotting more Title I dollars to students in attendance areas with poverty rates above a certain threshold. States also could have the option to include hold harmless provisions based on poverty concentration that limit the amount of federal dollars a school or district could lose each year. However, such hold harmless provisions could complicate and curb the extent to which funds truly follow the child in a state’s portable Title I program.¶ Clearly, the current Title I funding distribution system isn’t perfectly fair or impressively impactful. Allowing states to design and implement transparent, student-centered Title I distribution systems that better reflect their unique education landscapes does more than shift money around. Portability empowers states to target resources so that Title I funding can have a meaningful impact on their neediest students. Simply put, Title I portability would provide states the freedom to try to serve their low-income students with existing federal dollars better—if they want.

#### Per pupil funding and litany of regulations make Title I ineffective at closing achievement gaps – only portability would solve

Koteskey, Education Policy Analyst, 15 (Tyler, "Title I funding portability is key to ESEA reform"; the hill; 7/9/15 thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/education/247300-title-i-funding-portability-is-key-to-esea-reform, 7/3/17, GDI AC)

The current Title I program is broken. A meta-analysis of 17 federal studies on its effectiveness indicated only a modest overall impact, while another by Harvard University concluded the program had failed in its original mission of closing achievements gaps between disadvantaged and wealthy students. Examining what schools have to go through to get Title I funding, it is easy to see why. The program’s litany of regulations forces the administrative staff of states and districts to spend resources proving compliance with requirements on how they spend their grants to avoid losing eligibility. This wastes time and money that could be used to allocate the funding in ways that best serves their schools’ individual needs. The “supplement not supplant” and “comparability” provisions, discussed at length in the Reason Foundation’s Title I reform analysis, restricts states’ abilities to combine these dollars with pre-existing state funding for low-income students to create comprehensive programs. And because Title I allocates grants to schools rather than individual students, it actually promotes per-student funding inequalities between schools, especially at larger schools with high numbers but low-percentages of low-income kids. Scott’s Title I portability amendment has the potential to change all of this. Tying Title I funds to eligible students relieves administrative burdens by removing the need to justify expenditures. It also ensures that every school gets the same amount of per-student grants for every low-income child they educate. By making these funds portable, wherever these students enroll, low-income pupils will be able to expand their educational options. They will benefit from administrators with new incentives to attract and retain them to get access to the dollars they bring. Portable Title I funding could even be combined with expanding state voucher, tax-credit scholarship programs, and education savings accounts, with proven positive effects on achievement for disadvantaged students to give even more families access to better options.

#### Title 1 portability provides private school autonomy—allowing resources to follow students

**Burke,** Will Skillman Fellow in Education Policy in the Institute for Family, Community, and Opportunity at The Heritage Foundation, **2015**

(Lindsey M., “From Piecemeal to Portable: Transforming Title I into a Student-Centered Support System”, Heritage Foundation, September 28, 2015, <http://www.heritage.org/education/report/piecemeal-portable-transforming-title-i-student-centered-support-system>, accessed 7/4/17, GDI-JG)

∂ The Elementary and Secondary Education Act includes important protections for private schools. Specifically, section 9506 of the ESEA states that nothing in the law shall be construed to (a) “affect any private school that does not receive funds or services under” ESEA; (b) “affect a home school”; or (c) “permit, allow, encourage, or authorize any Federal control over any aspect of any private, religious, or home school.” Private schools that participate in Title I’s equitable services provision specifically are not subject to ESEA’s Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) requirement nor to the law’s Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) mandate.∂ ∂ Stakeholders in the private school community occasionally raise objections to Title I portability out of concern over the possibility of federal regulations following dollars to participating private schools. To mitigate those concerns, any portability proposal should include strong protections for private school autonomy.∂ ∂ Private School Participation. Existing private school participation in the Title I program is already significant. More than 20 percent of private schools currently participate in Title I programs. Notably, the proportion of religious private schools that participate in Title I is much higher. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, nearly half of all Catholic schools (47.8 percent) participate in Title I programs, along with 13 percent of schools designated as “other religious.” Taken together, nearly one-quarter (24.9 percent) of religiously affiliated schools already participate in Title I. Fewer non-religious schools (8 percent) participate in Title I.[28]∂ ∂ ∂ ∂ Strong Protections for Private Schools. Any proposal to allow states to have their Title I dollars follow children to private schools of choice must be coupled with strong protections for private schools. Title I portability proposals should incorporate language similar to that included in the law authorizing the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, which provides scholarships to children from low-income families living in the nation’s capital to attend a private school of choice. Many private schools do not want to be considered “recipients of federal financial assistance” out of concern that such a designation would make them subject to the onerous federal regulations and enforcement actions (such as those that fall under Title IX) of the federal civil rights agencies, including the U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR). The Institute for Justice crafted language for the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program that specified that children, not schools, received scholarship proceeds and thus schools were not to be considered recipients of federal funds. Subsections 308(d) and (e) of the D.C. School Choice Incentive Act of 2003 (Title III in Division C of Public Law 108-199) state:∂ ∂ This language was necessary because of the unfortunate United States Supreme Court decision in Grove City College v. Bell in 1984, which held that colleges that accepted students participating in the federal Pell Grant program were recipients of federal funds and therefore subject to federal oversight. This led Grove City and Hillsdale Colleges to withdraw from the Pell Grant program.∂ ∂ Title I portability would allow money to follow the student rather than being a payment to a school. Adding those federal dollars to a state-awarded scholarship should not impact school operations, mission, or culture, as such funds would be provided directly to the participating student. Including language used in the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program authorizing statute would provide a framework for additional protections within a portability option.[30]

## Meta Reform 1ac

### Meta reform Inherency

#### Title I formula complexity distorts funding allocation in absence of full funding

Schanzenbach et al., director of The Hamilton Project and a Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution, 16 (Diane, Davis Boddy, Megan Mumford, Greg Nantz, “Fourteen Economic Facts on Education and Economic Opportunity” 3/16, <http://www.hamiltonproject.org/assets/files/education_facts.pdf>, 7-6-17, GDI-JIJD)

Title I of ESEA is the primary source of federal funding for schools with high concentrations of poverty. The purpose of Title I, particularly its schoolwide program, is to allocate more money to schools with concentrations of poverty. As discussed in Fact 8, low-income students are more likely to struggle in school and require additional support. However, the negative trend in figure 7 shows that states with higher shares of low-income students receive less Title I funding per eligible student. Because Title I is the primary mechanism for the federal government to distribute school funds across states, this negative relationship is counterintuitive and suggests that the funds may not be targeted appropriately in the status quo. The negative relationship between share of students eligible and funding per eligible student is due in large part to the interaction between Title I’s chronic underfunding and the complex Title I formulas that distort allocations in the absence of full funding. For example, to fully fund the Basic Grants portion of Title I in 2015 would have required $50 billion in allocations; Congress instead appropriated only $6.5 billion. A new Hamilton Project policy proposal by Nora Gordon, “Increasing Targeting, Flexibility, and Transparency in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to Help Disadvantaged Students” (2016) discusses the causes of this dilemma and offers potential policy solutions. Gordon explains that a small state minimum leads to states such as Vermont receiving a disproportionate level of Title I funding. Additionally, a provision known as hold harmless, which allows districts to continue to receive allocations based on allocations received in previous years, prevents Title I funding from adapting quickly to structural changes in poverty levels across states and districts.

### Meta Reform 1ac – inequality Adv

#### Complexity of formulas disadvantage small state, mid sized cities, areas with concentrated poverty – create tradeoffs because Title I underfunded now undermining education quality

Camera and Cook, education reporter at U.S. News & World Report, 16 (Lauren and Lindsey, "Title I: Rich Schools Districts Get Millions Meant for Poor Kids" US News, June 1 2016, https://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016-06-01/title-i-rich-school-districts-get-millions-in-federal-money-meant-for-poor-kids, Accessed July 4th 2017, GDI AC

Title I, the largest federal K-12 program, was how Johnson planned to do that. And since children from poor families often enter schools with a host of more-costly educational needs – from less exposure to reading and math to social, emotional and nutritional problems – it's important the limited federal dollars are funneled to those who need them most, he reasoned. How is it then that a school district like Nottoway, with a child poverty rate of 30 percent, receives so much less in federal support than Fairfax, one of the wealthiest districts in the country? The answer lies in a complicated and outdated formula that's used to distribute the Title I money – a formula that's resulted in a series of significant funding discrepancies that can shortchange school districts with high concentrations of poverty, and benefit larger districts and big urban areas instead of poorer, rural districts and small cities. "The places that are less poor are getting more money per poor kid," says Nora Gordon, an associate professor at the McCourt School of Public Policy at Georgetown University who recently conducted an analysis of the Title I program for The Hamilton Project. "This is what happens when you have four different formulas that are very opaque and interact in different ways. You can have a lot of things in the law that seem like a good idea, but the net result is not a progressive one." In fact, the net result often means that in addition to the formula overlooking poor rural school districts, like Nottoway, it also shortchanges smaller high-poverty urban districts, like Flint, Michigan, which similarly faces challenges that affluent districts often don't, such as dated facilities and teacher shortages. Discrepancies are also visible in the amount of Title I money districts receive per poor child. Virginia’s Mecklenburg County, for example, with a child poverty rate of 30 percent, receives $1,000 per poor student through Title I – the same amount as poor students in York County, where the child poverty rate is less than 6 percent. For more information about your school district, use our interactive table. To be sure, when policymakers crafted the current formula in 2001 as part of the No Child Left Behind Act, they did so intending to correct a formula that was directing even fewer dollars to concentrations of poor students than it does today – one that allowed Claiborne Parish in Louisiana, with a child poverty rate of 36 percent, to infamously use its Title I funds to build not one, but two Olympic-sized swimming pools for students. But the formula has proven a sort of intractable beast – one that politicians and policymakers have had little success altering, despite its glaring shortcomings. "In the context of deeply inadequate funding overall, formula changes are always seen as a zero sum game," says Michael Dannenberg, director of strategic initiatives for policy at Education Reform Now. "More money for one district or state is coming at the expense of needy children in someone else's district or state." "Politically it's very hard," he says. "It's not impossible, but it's very hard." Dannenberg would know. He first tried – and failed – to change the formula while working for former Sen. Clairborne Pell of Rhode Island. Years later, as a senior policy adviser for Sen. Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts, Dannenberg was part of the push to update the formula as part of No Child Left Behind. That version is still used today. "To be clear, the wealthiest school districts are getting more per Title I child than high poverty school districts," he says. "But the effort to improve targeting of Title I funding [to concentrations of poor students] was realized in part as a result of the No Child Left Behind Act. We had a degree of success, but not nearly as much as one would hope." Still, the changes weren't insignificant. For example, from 2002, when the law went into effect, through 2010, data show that roughly $6 billion in Title I funding was directed to high-poverty school districts that otherwise wouldn't have been under the old formula, according to data from the Education Department. "That's a lot of bake sales," says Dannenberg. A Formulaic Failure? The formula, which is really four separate formulas rolled into one, is intended to send more money to poor districts. But it leaves much to be desired, many education policy experts say, and one of its biggest criticisms is that it spreads dollars too thin. According to the Center for American Progress, a left-leaning think-tank based in Washington, 67 percent of schools get Title I funding despite the fact that only half have relatively high concentrations of poverty. In Virginia alone, 134 districts get a slice of the Title I pie despite only 79 having higher than average levels of concentrated poverty. That's because districts can tap the federal purse even if they serve only a handful of low-income students. Falls Church City Public Schools, for example, another manicured Virginia district just outside of Washington, receives money for its 76 poor children even though the child-poverty rate there is less than 3 percent. "Title I was never meant to be general education aid," says Liz King, senior policy analyst and director of education policy at The Conference on Civil and Human Rights. "It was meant to be targeted to serve students in concentrations of poverty." The formula, however, places more weight on the number of poor students in a district than on the concentration of poor children in a district – one of the biggest reasons places like Fairfax, at 195,000 students big, gets as much money as it does. In addition, the formula directs extra funding to states with small populations – an attempt to channel more money to rural states, like New Mexico, that often depend on federal support for things like attracting and retaining teachers to remote schools. But wealthy states like Delaware and Connecticut have small populations because they are geographically small, and therefore qualify for the additional funds despite not needing them. Because of this fluke of the law, these small states with lower child poverty rates receive more Title I funds per poor child than poor states. Find them in the top left quadrant of the scatterplot. Meanwhile, many high poverty, rural states that don’t benefit from this rule or the prioritization of large districts. They appear in the bottom right quadrant of the scatterplot because they have a high child poverty rate, but receive less money per poor child. Another oft-cited critique of the formula is that it rewards states and districts for investing more of their own dollars in education. While the goal is to incentivize states to spend more themselves, it tends to compound existing inequalities since wealthier states and districts tend to invest more heavily in education anyway. Mississippi best illustrates this dilemma. Especially in the state's Delta region, where poverty rates soar up to 60 percent, local revenue rarely breaks $1 million, and in some cases schools use their Title I money for bare necessities, like paying the electric and water bills. "We don't want to allow states to roll back their spending," says Gordon. "But the reason why Mississippi is getting so little money per poor pupil is because they are spending very little money."

#### Specifically, racial composition of schools correlates with resources – increasing disparities in education opportunities and outcomes

Reardon, Stanford University Graduate School of Education professor, et al, 17 (Sean F., Demetra, Stanford Center for Education Policy Analysis research associate, Ken, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia with expertise in Educational Theory, Educational Policy, Econometrics, "The Geography of Racial/Ethnic Test Score Gaps", January 2017, http://cepa.stanford.edu/wp16-10, 7-8-17, GDI-EC)

While the top two boxes at the right of Figure 1 describe potential out-of-school influences on racial achievement gaps, the bottom two describe potential school-related influences. These are divided into within- and between-school factors. The key to both is that achievement gaps may be caused, in part, by racial differences in school experiences and opportunities. These differences in experiences and opportunities may result from students attending different schools (between-school segregation) or they may occur even among students attending the same school. Between-school segregation is a necessary (though not sufficient) condition for between-school differences in educational experiences and opportunities to contribute to achievement gaps; if black, Hispanic, and white students are equally represented in each school, then each group will experience the same average level of (and the same variation in) school quality. In the presence of segregation, however, if school racial composition is correlated with school resources (which affect the ability to attract and retain skilled teachers; teacher/student ratios; the quality of instructional materials, equipment, and facilities; the availability of support staff; and less tangible factors like school climate), then black and Hispanic students will, on average, experience fewer opportunities for learning than their white peers. Although the effects of school segregation are difficult to estimate, the best available research suggests that school segregation tends to widen racial educational disparities in achievement and educational attainment, as well as adult income (Ashenfelter, Collins and Yoon 2005; Card and Rothstein 2007; Guryan 2004; Johnson 2011; Reardon 2016).

#### And, education reproduces inequality in the Squo – replicates economic marginalization

\*\*don’t use with portability version of the aff

**Chen,** PhD candidate at Saint Louis University, publishing in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal, **2015**

(Amy Yun-Ping, “Educational Inequality: An Impediment to True Democracy in the United States,” Sociology Study, Vol.5 No.5, May 2015, <http://www.davidpublisher.org/Public/uploads/Contribute/55f62bc2bf7b8.pdf>, accessed 7/10/17, GDI-JG)

Education is an investment that tends to increase opportunity for each individual’s success and promote the common good of a country. Schooling also enables children to develop the cognizance of citizenship and decision-making skills, leading to the creation of a better society and boosting the nation’s economy. However, today U.S. education plays a key role in the reproduction of inequality (Anyon 1981; MacLeod 2009). Students’ performance is tied with multiple factors, such as school environment, teacher quality, class size, and educational support, all of which are affected by a school’s socioeconomic status. In regard to educational access and school performance, socioeconomic capital matters in a number of ways. For instance, parents with higher socioeconomic status prefer the placement of their children into higher ability groups and social environments, which in turn increases more focus on raising the students’ school engagement and enhancing their academic advantages (Lareau and Horvat 1999; Lee and Bowen 2006). Also, economic capital gives these parents more options because they have money available to offer their children with access to a variety of activities that are common in the high society and with educational assistance and private tutoring that are not receivable through public schools (Lareau 2000; Lareau 2003; Lareau and Horvat 1999; Lee and Bowen 2006). In other words, financial resources provide children with access to cultural capital and the ability to prepare for future competition.∂ In contrast, many children from impoverished families suffer numerous injustices (Lareau 2003; MacLeod 2009; Nieto and Bode 2008; Putnam 2015). They have a more difficult time attaining a high level of academic achievement because educational resources are inadequate. The schools in poor areas often receive less funding, so the schools have fewer resources available to improve academic achievement and provide quality education (Carter and Welner 2013; MacLeod 2009; Ravitch 2010; Ravitch 2013). Moreover, poor children and parents have fewer choices regarding the selection of a better community or school district. Therefore, the children from impoverished areas end up being victims under this arduous condition. The gaps between the performance of students from “good school districts” and those from “poor school districts” continue to accumulate. The goal of equal educational opportunity has never been achieved, and a nation with democracy has never been established.∂ In addition, the advocacy of individual choice in education leads to establishment of charter school systems, which creates difficult-to-overcome barriers and complex failures in democratic education (Ravitch 2010; Ravitch 2013). The ideas of individual choice and charter schools are a process toward educational inequalities. Charter schools are marketized and privatized public entities. The core concept behind the creation of charter schools is that they are associated with business interest groups. Many recent studies have indicated that charter schools worsen educational inequality and increase the gap among different socioeconomic populations because the under-the-table selection process and the lottery system of admission ruin fairness (Bartlett et al. 2002; Lipman 2003; Ravitch 2013). For example, many charter schools operate independently and autonomously, and they use a lottery process to decide enrollment by random selection. This leaves many children behind and deprives them of educational chances. Lottery winners receive tickets to the path of success; in contrast, lottery losers are doomed to settle for the problematic public education. Children’s futures should not be determined on the basis of a simple gamble. Moreover, the growing competition for public funding between charter schools and public schools negatively affects poor districts with financial deficits (Bartlett et al. 2002; Ravitch 2010; Ravitch 2013). Businesses that become involved in public education generally tend to invest in potentially profitable areas, which are the high-income and majority-White districts. Also, many private education providers are unwilling to address the concerns of and to offer help to nurture low-income communities; instead, they believe it is faster and more profitable to put more effort and investment into wealthier communities and reach efficiency. This strongly skews unfairness against marginalized communities and discriminates based on race and class toward huge disparities in resources and the quality of education.

#### And inequality kills people through structural violence

**Bezruchka**, Senior Lecturer in Global Health at the University of Washington, **14**

(Stephen, 2014, New Press, “Inequality Kills,” <https://depts.washington.edu/eqhlth/pages/BezruchkaInequalityKillsBkPubInfo14.pdf>, GDI – TM)

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

#### Educational equality essential to U.S. democracy—persistent and long standing inequalities undermine participation and democratic decision-making

Chen, PhD candidate at Saint Louis University, publishing in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal, 2015

[Amy Yun-Ping, “Educational Inequality: An Impediment to True Democracy in the United States,” Sociology Study, Vol.5 No.5, May, <http://www.davidpublisher.org/Public/uploads/Contribute/55f62bc2bf7b8.pdf> accessed GDI -TM]

The fundamental concept of democracy aims to offer equal access to all members of society and to ensure that they are empowered to make a good life for themselves and establish the public good for the country. Quality education is a method to eliminate poverty and encourage the engine of shared prosperity for generations of Americans. When education improves the preparation and productivity of young members of the community, it increases the wealth of the country and leads many people to their American dreams. Nevertheless, the persistent and long-standing educational inequalities are an obstacle for the United States becoming a nation with true democracy and equal liberty. Thus, democracy becomes a superficial aspect and a beautiful bubble, and it is not realized in practice. The Collapse of Political Responsibility Hochschild and Scovronick (2003) stated, “Education also powerfully affects people’s involvement with politics and their community, thereby creating another link between the nested structure of inequalities in schooling and the American dream” (Hochschild and Scovronick 2003: 24). Well-educated members of the community largely understand their obligation as participants in a democratic society, and they likely know current political facts and participate in political activities. The virtue of education in a democracy is that it tends to prepare children for citizenship and to foster in them the knowledge necessary for them to function in a civic society. But today in the United States, only some Americans fully exercise their political rights, and these are often citizens with high incomes, high socioeconomic statuses, and high levels of formal education. According to the American Political Science Association Taskforce (2005): In 1990, nearly nine out of 10 individuals in families with incomes over $75,000 reported voting in presidential elections, while only half of those in families with incomes under $15,000 reported voting. Fifty-six percent (56%) of those with incomes of at least $75,000 reported participating in political campaign activities, compared with a mere 6% among Americans with incomes under $15,000. (American Political Science Association Taskforce 2005: 80-81) The evidence indicates that there is a significant correlation between income status and the practice of citizenship. Americans with higher socioeconomic status usually enjoy not only higher educational achievement and salaries, but also have greater resources and skills to engage in politics and organizations. Education provides opportunities for Americans to acquire knowledge of democracy and to recognize their duty as members of a democratic society. Nevertheless, educational inequalities can lead to disparities in resources and skills between privileged and unprivileged people. The situation demolishes the goal of promoting democracy. The voices of U.S. citizens are heard unequally, and collective decisions respond much more to the privileged than to people of average means. The gap of inequality will increase. Instead of making progress, U.S. politics will continue to involve exclusion and unfairness, which strongly distorts the primary framework of democracy.

#### And, Democracies less violent, more protective of human rights and less prone to war

**Diamond,** Senior Fellow, Hoover Institution, and Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies, Stanford University, **2016**

(Larry, “Democracy in Decline: How Washington Can Reverse the Tide”, Foreign Affairs, Jul/Aug 2016, Volume 95, Issue 4, pages 151-159, accessed via ProQuest, GDI-JG)

Although democracy promotion may have fallen out of favor with the U.S. public, such efforts very much remain in the national interest. Democracies are less violent toward their citizens and more protective of human rights. They do not go to war with one another. They are more likely to develop market economies, and those economies are more likely to be stable and prosperous. Their citizens enjoy higher life expectancies and lower levels of infant and maternal mortality than people living under other forms of government. Democracies also make good allies. As Michael McFaul, the former U.S. ambassador to Russia, has written, "Not every democracy in the world was or is a close ally of the United States, but no democracy in the world has been or is an American enemy. And all of America's most enduring allies have been and remain democracies."∂ Authoritarian regimes, by contrast, are inherently unstable, since they face a central dilemma. If an autocracy is successful-if it produces a wealthy and educated population-that population will construct a civil society that will sooner or later demand political change. But if an autocracy is unsuccessful-if it fails to generate economic growth and raise living standards-it is liable to collapse.

### Meta formula reforms 1ac – solvency

#### Option 1

#### Plan: The United States federal government should simplify Title I Basic Grants and Targeted Grants and eliminate Concentration Grants and Education Grants.

#### Option 2:

#### Plan The United States federal government should substantially increase its funding and/or regulation of elementary and secondary education through reform of Title I grant formulas.

#### Formula reforms solve – multiple reforms improve resource allocation, enhance forecasting future allocation

Gordon, non-resident Senior Fellow at the Brookings, 2016 (Nora, “Increasing Targeting, Flexibility, and Transparency in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to Help Disadvantaged Students”, Brookings, March 2016, <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Full-Paper.pdf>, gdi-JM)

Current law delivers (and ESSA would continue to deliver) Title I, Part A via the four formulas described in table 1, and is often criticized as lacking in transparency and progressivity (e.g., Miller 2009). I propose that we greatly simplify two of these formulas (Basic Grants and Targeted Grants) and eliminate the remaining two (Concentration Grants and Education Finance Incentive Grants). The resulting allocation of funds would better target funds to districts with greater shares of children in poverty. It would have the additional benefit of providing a more transparent framework for forecasting future allocations, and exposing the distributional effects of any proposed formula changes in subsequent reauthorizations. Specifically, formula reform should have the following components. 1. Retain Basic Grants. Introduce language to ensure that Basic Grants consume no more than half the total appropriation for Title I, Part A (they currently allocate 45 percent). Change eligibility requirements so only school districts with at least 5 percent of children in poverty are eligible, as opposed to the current formula that permits districts with at least 2 percent of children in poverty or ten poor children to collect funds. The national child poverty rate in 2014 was 22 percent, and the median school district had 19 percent of children eligible for Title I, so this change is quite modest. 2. Eliminate Concentration Grants. The existing Concentration Grants formula is exactly the same as the formula for Basic Grants, with just one difference: the eligibility requirements. Concentration Grants are awarded to all districts with at least 6,500 eligible children or at least 15 percent children eligible; two-thirds of all districts are eligible for these grants. I propose eliminating this formula from the law and directing the 9 percent of Title I, Part A funds to LEAs allocated via Concentration Grants in 2015 to the modified Targeted Grants formula below. 3. Eliminate Education Finance Incentive Grants. Education Finance Incentive Grants have the most complicated formula of the four Title I grants. These grants are a well- intentioned attempt to reward states for having a greater ratio of per-pupil spending to per-capita income (effort), and lower variance in per-pupil spending across districts (equity), but they have several critical flaws. First, even if Congress could get states to spend more and try to equalize fully, this could inadvertently penalize efficient spending, or encourage school finance regimes that result in a “race to the bottom.” Second, effort and equity are functions of budget decisions at the state and local levels; as difficult as it would be to incentivize state legislatures with this opaque formula, motivating the local school boards or voters who must approve tax changes is unrealistic. Finally, though political decisions affect equity and effort, so do other factors that cannot be readily manipulated by education policy (e.g., longstanding patterns of economic residential segregation within a state), so the formula bestows some rewards arbitrarily. Similar to my proposal for Concentration Grants, I propose to remove the Education Finance Incentive Grants funding mechanism from the law and redirect its budget share (nearly a quarter of Title I, Part A funds to LEAs in 2015) to Targeted Grants. 4. Use freed-up funds to expand Targeted Grants, using poverty rates , rather than counts, to allocate those funds. The current law calculates weights per eligible student based on poverty rates, then again using poverty counts, and chooses whichever calculation is most beneficial to each district. This procedure is referred to as “number weighting.” In practice, with a fixed appropriation to distribute, this directs funds toward districts with a large number, but not share, of poor kids and away from smaller, high poverty– share districts. In July 2011 Representative Glenn Thompson (R-PA) sought to address this with his All Children are Equal (ACE) Act. ESSA flags number weighting in particular for study by the Institute of Education Sciences. I propose to eliminate number weighting in Targeted Grants and apply weights to all districts based on poverty rates. (Basic Grants do not use weights so they would be unaffected.) 5. Remove state-level spending per pupil from all remaining formulas. Language in Section 1303 of ESSA specifies that eligible children are to be multiplied by “40 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure in the State, except that the amount determined under this subparagraph shall not be less than 32 percent, or more than 48 percent, of the average per-pupil expenditure in the United States.” The defense for this method is that teachers cost more in states with higher costs of living, and that the spending per pupil is a proxy for aggregate state-level differences in teacher salaries. In practice, states with greater spending per pupil (and therefore higher Title I allocations, all else equal) have less poverty; the correlation between state spending per pupil and the share of children eligible in the state is -0.19. I propose to replace the language above with language to multiply weighted eligible children by “6 percent of the national average per-pupil current expenditure in the United States.” Though 6 percent may seem a major cut from the 40 percent (of state spending) in current law, note that Congress now funds Basic Grants at about 14 percent of what full funding would require. At current levels, using approximately this factor would fully fund the proposed program (using all proposed reforms), entailing no ratable reductions for at least for one year. 6. Eliminate the small state minimum. This is the most politically visible aspect of the formula changes and would generate major reductions in allocations for Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, North Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming, bringing their allocations per eligible child in line with the rest of the country (see figures 1 and 2). 7. Phase in the changes above over a four-year period using hold harmless, then eliminate hold harmless going forward. Hold districts harmless at 80 percent (regardless of counts or rates of eligible children in the district) of FY2015 allocation levels in year one, at 50 percent in year two, and at 20 percent in year three. By year four, district allocations will be calculated using the formula, with no role for previous funding levels. (One option here would be to allow federal or state waivers for districts who present evidence of short- term demographic shocks and who expect enrollments to return.) During the transition, hold district- but not state- level funding harmless.

The net impact of this set of formula reforms yields major distributional improvements: first, per-eligible-pupil Title I funds will increase more rapidly with poverty rates than they do under the current regime (see figure 2). Second, the variance in per-eligible-pupil allocations conditional on poverty rates would be much reduced—that is, similar places would be treated equally under the law. And finally, the allocation of funds will be more transparent and predictable. Though most individual school districts not affected by the small state minimum would experience relatively limited changes in their allocation per eligible individual, the changes should be phased in via the hold harmless schedule outlined above over the four-year period of ESSA to allow districts time to plan and fulfill short-run contractual obligations. That is, the new formulas would go into use immediately, but hold harmless would slow their implementation. Figure 3 shows the state- level allocation of funds under the proposed formula. (These simulated allocations assume constant demographics and appropriations, and are based on no hold harmless; this would summarize allocations four years from implementation of the proposal, once changes were fully phased in.)

#### **Current Title I funding is too complicated, the plan allows for proper Title I funding that supports students and teachers.**

Boser & Brown, 15, Vice President of Education Policy at American Progress [Ulrich & Catherine; 7-7-2015, American Progress "5 Key Principles to Guide Consideration of any ESEA Title I Formula Change," Center for American Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/07/07/116696/5-key-principles-to-guide-consideration-of-any-esea-title-i-formula-change/> ; RJC]

Last year, the federal government spent more than $14 billion to help educate low-income students as part of Title I, Part A, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, or ESEA. For schools, particularly low-income schools, these federal investments make a huge difference. If Title I was used to only fund teachers, for instance, it would support the jobs of more than 200,000 educators.

But while federal education dollars bring many benefits for students, they are distributed in a way that is deeply unfair both between and within states. This unfairness stems from the following flaws in the allocation formula.

It is overly complex and opaque. Title I today is allocated based on four separate formulas with conflicting incentives. State and local legislators and education officials have almost no way to know how much their allocation will change from year to year due to changes in district or state policy, population, or distribution of students living in poverty. This lack of transparency severally limits the formula from serving as an incentive for policy change or from enabling states and districts to plan for the future.

It sends more money to wealthier states. Wealthier states have historically invested more heavily in education, and those investments are favored by the current Title I formula. This results in a system that compounds existing inequities by giving more to the haves than to the have nots. Furthermore, the formula’s emphasis on the number of children who live in poverty means that more affluent districts that serve only a handful of such children receive Title I dollars. This dilutes the pool, leaving fewer resources for those places with more concentrated poverty.

It shows clear bias against rural states and mid-sized cities. As a result of this distortion, the so-called small state minimum, which gives more money to smaller states for no other reason than their small population, “states with small populations and low concentrations of poor children receive radically larger grants on a per-poor-child basis than states with larger populations, including those with substantial rural poverty.” What’s more, the formula prioritizes larger districts. Detroit, for instance, gets much more per student than Flint, Michigan, and Los Angeles gets more than Sacramento, California, due to the formula’s heavy weighting of large communities over mid-sized and rural communities.

To be clear, there is no perfect school funding formula. By definition, formulas distribute limited pots of money among diverse schools and districts, and most districts, if not all, could benefit from more resources. Formula decisions, in other words, force difficult trade-offs. Should the formula spread the funding to more students or leverage it most heavily among the neediest? Should it reward states and communities for investing in education, or should it compensate for the fact that they have not made such investments, which has real and often dire consequences for the students living in those communities? Should the formula fund communities with large concentrations of poor students or fund poor students in more socioeconomically diverse communities? These are difficult questions without easy answers.

The goal for every member of Congress—when considering modifying the Title I formula—should be to maximize public utility or the public good and to find the trade-off point where the greatest number of students receive the maximum boost to their life prospects.

## Comparability Loophole 1AC

#### The SQuo leaves effort and comparability standards unchanged by ESSA – means comparability requirement judged based on spending per student not number of teachers per student

**Knight,** Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. <http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/_Files/docs/papers/CERPS_Working_Paper_2016_2.pdf> accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

The federal government ensures Title I funding reaches the intended students through three requirements: (a) maintenance of effort; (b) comparability; and (c) supplement, not supplant.4 Maintenance of effort implies that no states or districts can decrease total or per-pupil funding by more than 10% from the prior year. ESSA makes no major changes to the maintenance of effort requirement.

Comparability requires districts to staff Title I schools with equal or more instructional staff per pupil compared to non-Title I schools. However, because more experienced teachers typically sort into more advantaged schools within districts (Clotfelter, Ladd, Vigdor & Wheeler, 2006; Goldhaber, Lavery & Theobald, 2015) and more experienced teachers earn higher salaries, comparability in pupil-staff ratios may not imply comparability in spending on instructional staff members (Haxton et al., 2012). Over the past decade, DOE representatives have argued that comparability should be judged based on spending on teachers per student, rather than simply the number of teachers or staff members per student (Government Accountability Office, 2011; Hanna, Marchitello & Brown, 2015; Heuer & Stullich, 2011; National School Board Association, 2013). While the DOE has used the enactment of ESSA to push for equalized spending on teacher salaries between Title I and non-Title I schools, ESSA makes no changes to the statutory language of the comparability requirement and the DOE has not suggested changes to the methods in which districts meet the comparability requirement.

#### First, comparability loopholes incentivizes teacher funding shenanigans that undermine teacher quality in Title I schools

**Knight,** Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. <http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/_Files/docs/papers/CERPS_Working_Paper_2016_2.pdf> accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

Over the past four decades, policymakers in the Department to Education (DOE) have enacted various regulations to encourage school districts to allocate funding equitably across schools. Local school districts that meet certain eligibility requirements for receiving Title I funding are required to identify the “Title I schools” that will receive federal funds. Based on those classifications, the DOE currently requires districts to staff Title I schools with at least as many instructional personnel per student as non-Title I schools (the “Comparability Rule”). This policy is meant to ensure that districts will allocate federal funding equitably across schools.

However, in most cases, the highest-poverty schools within each district have higher teacher attrition rates and, as a result, the least experienced teaching staff (Goldhaber, Lavery & Theobald, 2015). Because districts typically use standardized salary schedules that offer higher compensation to more experienced teachers, districts that use equal staffing ratios across schools actually allocate less teacher salary funding per student to the highest-poverty schools. The “comparability loophole” refers to the lack of any requirement that districts spend equal dollars per student across Title I and non-Title I schools (Hanna, Marchitello, & Brown, 2015; McClure, 2008; Roza, 2008; Roza, Miller & Hill, 2008). A controversial policy that the DOE has pushed for, both historically and during the current rulemaking process required to implement ESSA, would mandate districts to equalize spending on teacher salaries between Title I and non-Title I schools.

#### And teacher quality key - helps disadvantaged students the most and help accumulates over time - studies prove

Goldhaber, University of Washington, Bothell Center for Education Data & Research Director, 16 (Dan, "In Schools, Teacher Quality Matters Most", Education Next, Spring 2016, educationnext.org/in-schools-teacher-quality-matters-most-coleman/, 7-10-17, GDI-EC)

Beyond the headline finding about the impact of schooling overall, the report contains a fair amount of nuance on which school characteristics do (and, importantly, which do not) predict student achievement. The primary analytical technique used involved assessing the proportion of the variation in student achievement explained by different factors. Across grades and different student subgroups, the Coleman study found that most of the variation in student achievement is within rather than between schools, but a larger share of the variation is found between schools in earlier grades and among more disadvantaged subgroups. Regarding teacher quality specifically, one of the key conclusions is that the quality of teachers shows a stronger relationship [than school facilities and curricula] to pupil achievement. Furthermore, it is progressively greater at higher grades, indicating a cumulative impact of the qualities of teachers in a school on the pupil’s achievements. Again, teacher quality seems more important to minority achievement than to that of the majority.

The finding that “teacher quality is one of the few school characteristics that significantly affects student performance” is quite consistent with more-recent research. Also in line with current studies is the report’s finding that “for any groups whether minority or not, the effect of good teachers is greatest upon the children who suffer most educational disadvantage in their background, and that a given investment in upgrading teacher quality will have most effect on achievement in underprivileged areas.” Recent studies, for instance, find that higher funding levels, smaller classes, and more-qualified teachers all have larger effects on disadvantaged students than on other students.

#### And, this phenomenon impacts racial minority students disproportionately

Resmovits, Senior Education Reporter, The Huffington Post, 2k14 (Joy, “American Schools Are STILL Racist, Government Report Finds”accessed 7/04/17 published 3/21/14 www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/03/21/schools-discrimination\_n\_5002954.html GDI-XRL)

Black students are suspended or expelled at triple the rate of their white peers, according to the U.S. Education Department’s 2011-2012 Civil Rights Data Collection, a survey conducted every two years. Five percent of white students were suspended annually, compared with 16 percent of black students, according to the report. Black girls were suspended at a rate of 12 percent — far greater than girls of other ethnicities and most categories of boys.

At the same time, minority students have less access to experienced teachers. Most minority students and English language learners are stuck in schools with the most new teachers. Seven percent of black students attend schools where as many as 20 percent of teachers fail to meet license and certification requirements. And one in four school districts pay teachers in less-diverse high schools $5,000 more than teachers in schools with higher black and Latino student enrollment.

Such discrimination lowers academic performance for minority students and puts them at greater risk of dropping out of school, according to previous research. The new research also shows the shortcomings of decades of legal and political moves to ensure equal rights to education. The Supreme Court’s landmark 1954 Brown v. Board of Education ruling banned school segregation and affirmed the right to quality education for all children. The 1964 Civil Rights Act guaranteed equal access to education.

#### Additionally, minority students have less access to experienced teachers and the coursework necessary to be prepared for college

Cook, Data Editor for U.S. News, 2015

[Lindsey, “U.S. Education: Still Separate and Unequal,” U.S. News, January 28, <https://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/data-mine/2015/01/28/us-education-still-separate-and-unequal>, GDI –TM]

Separate and Unequal More than 2 million black students attend schools where 90 percent of the student body is made up of minority students. Dozens of school districts have current desegregation orders. Minority students represent 57 percent of the population in “dropout factories” — schools where the senior class has 60 percent or fewer students who entered as freshmen — but only 30 percent of the population in all schools. On average, schools serving more minority populations have less-experienced, lower-paid teachers who are less likely to be certified. A report from the Center for American Progress found that a 10 percentage point increase in students of color at a school is associated with a decrease in per-pupil spending of $75. Disparities in course offerings mean students of color have fewer opportunities to challenge themselves with more difficult courses — the type of courses needed to prepare for a four-year college degree or for a high-paying career in STEM. In seventh and eighth grades, blacks make up 16 percent of students, but account for 10 percent of students taking Algebra 1 and 9 percent of students passing the course. While nearly one in five white students took Calculus in high school, one in 15 black students did. Fewer black students have access to a full range of high school math and science courses — algebra I, geometry, algebra II, calculus, biology, chemistry and physics. They are under-represented in gifted and talented programs. Black students take fewer Advanced Placement classes than white students and score lower on AP tests. While black students disproportionately attend schools with higher minority populations, the teachers, principals and administrators who interact with the students are a different story. When the U.S. Department of Education collected data in the 2007-2008 school year, 80 percent of principals in public schools were white. Meanwhile, only 6.2 percent of high school public school teachers across all subject areas are black — the highest percentage is for health and physical education, where 9.2 percent of teachers are black.

#### Rejecting modern-day segregation in education perpetuate by the SQuo is a moral imperative—we have a duty to embrace a commitment to racial inclusion

James, a Professor of Law at the University of Miami School of Law where she writes about opportunity and inequality in America’s public schools, 2015

[Osamudia, “Soapbox: Racial segregation in schools, no matter how unintended, should be illegal,” The Miami Herald, February 19, <http://www.miamiherald.com/news/local/community/miami-dade/coral-gables/article10679735.html>, GDI –TM ]

Failure to commit to substantive racial equality continues to forestall attempts to achieve racial integration in our communities and schools. In Miami, for example, “unintended” residential racial isolation today is actually the product of intentional local, state, and federal policies that broadened access to safe, stable communities for some, while simultaneously denying home ownership, quality education, and public services to others. One need only examine neighborhood maps of Miami during the early 1930s that used racial composition to designate — for investment purposes — areas like Coral Gables as “best,” and certain parts of Coconut Grove as “hazardous,” to get a sense of this intentional government discrimination. Although this sort of blatant racism has long been outlawed, enduring racial and economic segregation in our city is a direct byproduct of intentional decisions to deny access to mortgages and other forms of community investment and development on the basis of race. Moreover, our still-segregated communities have resulted in segregated learning environments. Current debates about controlled choice in the city of Coral Gables implicate this very issue. When asked whether their government has any obligation to counteract school segregation, many parents might respond ‘no’ if it means that they cannot attend their neighborhood school. After all, they might argue, school segregation is an historical artifact no longer in operation. As members, however, of a broader community still impacted today by the intentional racial discrimination of yesterday, we have a duty to consider factors other than convenience, comfort, and our own ideal schooling arrangements when evaluating controlled choice. We have a duty to also consider the value of school integration in helping us achieve our goal of substantive equality. We have a duty to weigh that value just as heavily as we weigh benefits of attending school close to home, and to reject the false dichotomy that the formality of “intent” creates. We have a moral imperative to actively embrace a commitment to racial inclusion in our schools and neighborhoods, and to reject school assignment plans that result, intentionally or unintentionally, in racial exclusion and segregation instead.

#### Teacher quality also impact graduation rates - increasing the graduation rate boosts the economy- data shows

Amos, Alliance for Excellent Education Vice President of Communications, 16 (Jason, "THE GRADUATION EFFECT: Increasing National High School Graduation Rate Key to Job Creation and Economic Growth, New Alliance Analysis Finds", Alliance for Excellent Education, 1-12-16, all4ed.org/articles/the-graduation-effect-increasing-national-high-school-graduation-rate-key-to-job-creation-and-economic-growth-new-alliance-analysis-finds/, 7-14-17, GDI-EC)

New data from the Alliance for Excellent Education demonstrates how graduating more students from high school creates new jobs, increases consumer spending, boosts tax revenues, and increases the gross domestic product. This “Graduation Effect” data is available for the United States as a whole, all fifty states and the District of Columbia, and more than 200 metro areas nationwide at impact.all4ed.org.

“The two areas of rising rates getting major attention are the Federal Reserve and the high school graduation rates,” said Bob Wise, president of the Alliance and former governor of West Virginia. “For the short-term impact on the nation’s economy, the Federal Reserve’s raising of interest rates has generated a lot of attention, but over the long term, rising graduation rates are much more important for the nation’s economy.”

The national high school graduation rate is at an all-time high, but one in five students still fails to earn a diploma on time. Increasing the national high school graduation rate to 90 percent would likely have the following positive effects on the national economy:

Create 65,150 new jobs

Boost gross domestic product by $11.5 billion annually

Increase annual earnings by $7.2 billion

Increase annual spending by $5.3 billion

Increase federal tax revenue by $1.1 billion

#### And, Improving education key to competitiveness and economic prosperity

**Jennings,** founder and former CEO, Center on Education Policy, Washington, D.C., and former General Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives' Committee on Education and Labor, **2015**

(Jack, “ESEA at 50”, Kappan Magazine, April 2015, Volume 96, Number 7, accessed 7/6/17, GDI-JG)

A worldwide job market exists today in which U.S. students will have to compete for jobs with Korean students, among many others, once they leave school. We ignore at our peril the economic and technological changes that have led to higher educational demands.∂ As Marshall S. Smith, a former professor and high- ranking official in the Carter and Clinton adminis- trations, has noted:∂ . . . the challenges of a global economy, a complex and changing international environment, and the tech- nology and communication revolutions have dra- matically increased our collective national need to ensure our future prosperity. As a nation, we are ever more dependent on the quality of our human capital to carry us into a productive and safe future. Our schools are better than many think, but we must ask them to change and become smarter (2011, p. 233).

#### US economic growth good – solves laundry list of impacts

Noell, Professor of Economic and Business at Westmont College and Ph.D. in Economic from Lousiana State University and Smith, Professor of Economic and Business at Gordon College and Ph.D. in Economic from Stanford University, 13

(Edd S. and Stephen L.S., “Want A Better World? Let's Work On Boosting Economic Growth,” *Forbes*, April 23, 2014, http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/04/23/want-a-better-world-lets-work-on-boosting-economic-growth/, GDI – TM)

If we as a society want to live in a better world, we must start taking economic growth seriously. It’s easy for economists to understand why growth is so important—but too often, economists fail to explain why it matters. With increased economic growth, the lives of millions of people around the world—in countries both rich and poor—can be transformed. Both authors of this column have witnessed growth’s power in person. One grew up in 1960s Hong Kong. While today Hong Kong is a wealthy financial capital, in the early 1960s it was engulfed in poverty. His earliest memories include images of the flood of over one million refugees into his city from Mao’s China. But by the time he reached high school much had changed. Children born in shanty towns now lived in apartments with electricity and running water. Each morning, crossing Victoria Harbor with its glittering view of Hong Kong’s burgeoning skyline, he could see the trade, construction, and growth that provided jobs, increased wealth, and lifted families out of poverty. Since then, in our frequent professional travel to Asia, we have both seen first-hand the fantastic poverty reduction triggered by growth in Korea, China, and much of Southeast Asia. The immense power of economic growth is easy to see in dramatic surges like Hong Kong’s, but the transformative power of growth is not limited to poor countries. In wealthy countries like the United States growth and the prosperity that it brings allow us, as a society, to afford to do many good things. It is quite remarkable that someone such as the climate activist Bill McKibbin argues that growth is “the one big habit we finally must break.” When he looks at growth, he sees a malevolent force driving our desires to consume ever more fossil fuels. We could not disagree more. With greater growth our economy can afford to buy green products, offset our carbon footprint, and conserve and replenish the renewable natural resources we consume. Growth means, literally, the increase in the production of goods and services in an economy. Since production of goods and services requires that workers and firms’ owners be paid, the value of production is basically the same as the value of households’ income. So growth measures the increases in a country’s ability to take care of itself. With growth, families are better able to purchase goods and services. A cynic may only think of the purchase of another 80” TV, but economists understand that the “goods” a society gets from growth go far beyond the ones you can pick up at Best Buy. With greater growth we could invest even more in basic research to help find cures for diseases like Alzheimer’s and Parkinson’s. Greater growth would allow us to avert the coming intergenerational fight over how to pay for trillions of dollars of entitlement promises we have made to the needy among us, and to our parents and grandparents in the form of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. These are profoundly moral concerns. In short, the supporters of growth—who usually make their case in economic terms, about tax and spending policies—are on to something. They understand growth’s potential to ease economic problems. Right now the United States is growing at about two percent per year—but to get the U.S. unemployment rate down to a healthy level (under six percent) within four years will take approximately four percent growth per year. That is not just a number on a press release—it’s the dignity of a paycheck and the security of an income for millions of families across America. So if you care about long-term human wellbeing—in rich and poor countries alike—you must care about economic growth. Before we as a society can consider how to achieve such growth, we must recognize that getting growth right matters. Not every instance of economic growth in every country is beneficial. But time and again, hard data documents its positive impact on the things that ultimately matter: education, environmental care, physical health, political freedom, and healthy culture. Failure to realize the transformative power of growth would be a failure of our moral imaginations. We would risk leaving a world for our children in which diseases persist, rivers remain polluted, and the elderly and sick receive inadequate care. Growth must not be sold short. Growth is not just morally defensible; it is a moral imperative for achieving lasting human flourishing.

### Comparability Solvency

#### Option 1

#### Plan: The United States federal government should increases its regulation of elementary and secondary education by closing the comparability loophole by requiring that districts fund their Title I schools at the same level as or higher than their other schools based on actual spending

#### Option 2

#### Plan: The United States federal government should increases its regulation of elementary and secondary education through the closure of comparability loophole in Title I.

#### Option 3

#### Plan: The United States federal government should close the comparability loophole in Title I compliance.

#### We solve -

#### Comparability loophole perpetuates unequal funding structures – closing the loophole increases funding for schools

Hanna, Center for American Progress Senior Policy Analyst et al. 15

(Robert Hanna, Max Marchitello, and Catherine Brown, “Comparable but Unequal: School Funding Disparities” Center For Amerian Progress, 3-11-15, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/03/11/107985/comparable-but-unequal/ 7-6-17, GDI-JIJD)

**Due to the loophole** in federal law**, more than 4.5 million low-income students attend inequitably funded Title I schools.** In most states, there are tens of thousands of students from low-income households who attend Title I schools that are not funded equitably relative to other schools in their district. See the appendix for state-by-state results.¶ These inequitably funded schools receive around $1,200 less per student than comparison schools in their districts. Overall,these schools receive around $668,900 less per year than comparison schools. In Fort Worth, Texas, for example, inequitably funded Title I schools receive around $2,600 less per student.In some districts, the disparities are even wider. In Santa Fe, New Mexico, inequitably funded Title I schools receive around $4,900 less than other schools. These disparities can add up to millions of dollars at the state level. If these gaps were closed, inequitably funded schools in Texas would receive another $1.6 billion annually, and in New Mexico, they would have an additional $65 million. See the appendix for state-by-state results.¶ If the federal loophole were closed, high-poverty schools would receive around $8.5 billion in new funds each year. This estimate is similar to findings reported in a previous study that used 2008-09 school finance data, also based on information collected by DOE. This amount is equivalent to around 1.5 percent of total state and local revenues, which were more than $500 billion in the 2011-12 school year. For inequitably funded Title I schools, these dollars could add real value. See appendix for state-by-state results.¶ As Congress works to reauthorize the No Child Left Behind Act, improving school funding has been a key focus. Sen. Lamar Alexander (R-TN), chairman of the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, and Rep. John Kline (R-MN), chairman of the House Education and Workforce Committee, both proposed changing the distribution of Title I funds. This would allow states the option of distributing funds solely on the basis of the number of low-income students, rather than continuing to use the four formulas that target the funds to concentrations of poor students. Moreover, both of their proposals fail to address the comparability loophole and would continue to allow districts to demonstrate comparability in ways that mask real inequities in school resources. Members of the House Education and the Workforce Committee recently approved Rep. Kline’s proposal.¶ What could $668,900 buy?¶ Comparability is about a broad range of resources. Title I schools should at least have the same amount of resources—to invest as school leaders see fit—as other schools. They may choose to hire more experienced, and thus more costly, teachers, or they may choose to invest in technology, a new curriculum, an after-school program, or teaching supplies. If shortchanged schools received an additional $668,000, they could do one of the following:¶ Purchase new MacBook Pro computers for more than 550 students¶ Construct six new libraries¶ Implement a new music education program that serves more than 3,500 students¶ Institute a new arts program covering more than 190 classrooms¶ Hire 12 new guidance counselors with an average salary of nearly $54,000¶ Give a $10,000 bonus to more than 60 teachers¶ This paper is not the first to point out this issue of comparability. The fiscal inequities perpetuated by the comparability loophole are well documented. In a DOE national study of school finance during the 2008-09 school year, the department looked at differences in spending between schools in the same districts and found that about 40 percent of Title I schools were underfunded relative to non-Title I schools. In 2012, the Center for American Progress issued its “Unequal Education” report, which analyzed the first wave of DOE per-school expenditure data that included actual teacher salaries. It found that children of color are routinely being shortchanged. CAP has long argued that the loophole is one of the most significant barriers to educational equity. Other groups such as The Education Trust and the New America Foundation have also analyzed the impact of the loophole and found that districts claiming comparability significantly underfund higher-poverty schools.

#### Closing the Comparability Loophole Solves Educational Inequality – stimulates state and local funding

Hanna, Center for American Progress Senior Policy Analyst et al. 15 (Robert Hanna, Max Marchitello, and Catherine Brown, “Comparable but Unequal: School Funding Disparities” Center For Amerian Progress, 3-11-15, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/03/11/107985/comparable-but-unequal/ 7-6-17, GDI-JIJD)

Students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds deserve the same opportunities at their peers from higher-income families. Notwithstanding the fact that comparability is the law of the land, the way districts comply with the provision undermines its true intent. Under the current fiscal policy, districts can spend less of their own state and local dollars on the schools with the highest needs, and most do spend millions of dollars less in these schools. Therefore, Congress should close the comparability loophole by requiring that districts fund their Title I schools at the same level as or higher than—based on actual spending—their other schools.

To truly address the problem of fiscal inequity, Congress must seize this opportunity to close the comparability loophole. An improved comparability provision could go a long way toward ensuring that all low-income students get their fair share of state and local funding.

#### Phased in shift to actual expenditures addresses education gaps and solves

Hanna, Center for American Progress Senior Policy Analyst et al. 15 (Robert Hanna, Max Marchitello, and Catherine Brown, “Comparable but Unequal: School Funding Disparities” Center For Amerian Progress, 3-11-15, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/03/11/107985/comparable-but-unequal/ 7-6-17, GDI-JIJD)

The comparability calculation must be based on actual expenditures, including actual teacher salaries.¶ Districts should be required to achieve comparability between Title I and non-Title I schools only by demonstrating that Title I schools receive state and local funding that is at least equal to the average of the district’s non-Title I schools.¶ Districts that serve only Title I schools must show that higher-poverty schools receive no less than the average total of state and local funds for lower-poverty schools.¶ Under current guidance from the U.S. Department of Education, districts can demonstrate comparability at the 90 percent level. In other words, districts can claim that they spend comparable amounts at Title I schools as long as those schools provide at least 90 percent of services offered in other schools. Districts can interpret that percentage as a ceiling not a floor. The department’s guidance should not allow for this amount of leeway.¶ Some have argued that the only way for districts to close the comparability gap is to force experienced teachers to transfer to high-poverty schools, which typically employ teachers with fewer years of experience and lower salaries. In fact, states and districts could provide a host of additional resources to the high-poverty schools and leave the staffing distribution as is. By purchasing the kind of enrichment activities listed in the “What could $668,900 buy?” text box above, districts would comply with the requirement.¶ In addition, districts could change their compensation systems to reward effectiveness instead of seniority or educational degree attainment. In this way, districts can pay highly effective teachers more, particularly those working in schools serving high concentrations of low-income students. With more highly effective teachers clustered in high-poverty schools, these districts could close the comparability gap through supporting highly effective teachers in these schools rather than forcing teachers to move to high-poverty schools.¶ At the same time, actually achieving comparability given that schools have been inequitably funded throughout history will not be easy. That is why Congress should require meaningful compliance with the comparability provision to be phased in gradually. Priority would first be given to the schools that have been most egregiously shortchanged. Full compliance would be required within five years. The following timetable would serve that end:¶ Year one: All districts must publicly report all expenditures by school level. These facts must be made available in an easy-to-read format that is available to the public. The report must also include the percentage of students eligible to receive free and reduced-price lunches. In each subsequent year, the district continues to report this data.¶ Year two: States and districts begin to fill in funding gaps. States would rank their Title I schools by per-pupil expenditures and ensure that the lowest-spending 25 percent of schools are funded to at least 100 percent of the average level of their districts’ comparison schools. These gaps could be closed through state or local actions or a combination of both.¶ Year three: States ensure that the lowest-spending 50 percent of Title I schools are funded to at least 100 percent of the average level of their districts’ comparison schools.¶ Year four: States ensure that the lowest-spending 75 percent of Title I schools are funded to at least 100 percent of the average level of their districts’ comparison schools.¶ Year five: States ensure that all Title I schools are funded at least to the level of the average of their districts’ comparison schools.¶ Under current law, districts already risk losing their Title I dollars if they fail to comply with comparability requirements. Congress should expand this provision to hold states accountable for the gaps outlined above as well. Here, the guiding principle is that states hold the ultimate responsibility for operating inequitable funding systems. Specifically, states should risk losing their full allocation of Title I dollars each year that they fail to keep on track with the above timeline. This arrangement would be a strong deterrent to states and districts that wish to continue their current approaches to funding their most disadvantaged schools. Nationally, this amounts to a reasonable trade-off. For example, we found that in the second year—the first year of narrowing comparability gaps—states and districts would be responsible for closing gaps by around $2.3 billion in exchange for receiving more than $14.6 billion in federal Title I funds.

## Environment Module [any verison]

#### Educational and income inequality increases environmental degradation and intensifies climate change

Holmberg, political economist, 17, (Susan Holmberg, “Inequality is Toxic: How Economic and Social Disparities Drive Climate Change”, rooseveltinstitute, May 8, 2017, <http://rooseveltinstitute.org/inequality-toxic-how-economic-and-social-disparities-drive-climate-change/>, July 14, 2017) GDI AC

The People’s Climate March in April reminds me how far we’ve come in understanding that climate change is deeply tied to another ominous 21st threat: economic and social inequality. Even in the U.S., one of the largest contributors of greenhouse gas emissions, we are beginning to recognize that there are and will be vast climate disparities. In inner cities, Native reservations, and rural farming communities, the poorest groups in America, many of color, are experiencing the worst effects of climate change but have the least ability to cope with and adapt to it.∂ At least on the left, many also recognize that, despite the massive job creation and other economic benefits that will come from moving to a clean fuel economy, there will be significant short-term costs. For example, fossil fuel workers will need a just, economically viable transition into new industries. There are also [strong ideas](https://www.thenation.com/article/heres-how-states-and-cities-can-fight-climate-change-and-inequality-in-the-trump-era/) being put forward to help low-income people with the rising energy prices that would result from a much-needed carbon tax.∂ Yet, as I write in my new report, “[Boiling Points](http://rooseveltinstitute.org/boiling-points/),” one key topic that is still overlooked is how environmental degradation and climate change are themselves the toxic byproducts of our inequality problem.∂ This may sound counterintuitive: But there is a spate of research showing a clear and positive relationship between environmental damage and economic and social inequality.∂ For example, economist James Boyce conducted a [study](https://www.umass.edu/economics/publications/2010-05.pdf) in the early 1990s with colleagues from the Political Economy Research Institute, which compared industrial air pollution across U.S. metro areas. The authors looked at the distribution of air pollution impacts across income levels and racial groups and found that, in cities where the gaps in pollution exposure between people of color and whites are larger, there tends to be much more pollution in general.∂ A second [study](http://econpapers.repec.org/article/eeeecolec/v_3a29_3ay_3a1999_3ai_3a1_3ap_3a127-140.htm) Boyce conducted, with another group of colleagues, looked at environmental quality across the 50 states and asked why it’s better in some states than others. It again turns out that these variations have much to do with differences in wealth and power. “Where income inequalities were greater, where educational inequalities were greater, where the fairness of fiscal policy in terms of both the tax system and access to services like Medicaid was better, you tended to find differences in environmental degradation.” More equal distributions of wealth and power were associated with better environmental outcomes.∂ Economist Jungho Baek and his coauthors also [find](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421513007404) that more equal income distribution in the U.S. results in better environmental quality in both the short and long run. Similarly UK geographer, Danny Dorling conducted a [study](http://www.dannydorling.org/wp-content/files/dannydorling_publication_id1828.pdf) of the world’s 25 richest countries, looking at behaviors like consumption of meat, water use, production of waste, flights, and overall effects on ecology. He found that “in all these affluent countries there are inequalities, and in those where inequalities are the greatest it is now becoming evident that people, on average, pollute much more.”∂ How do we make sense of these and other studies with similar results? Is inequality actually causing environmental damage? Or is this merely a correlation, whereby societies that have high inequality levels are also likely to pollute their environments more?∂ I argue that it’s both. First, we can imagine how the causes of inequality are also separately doing environmental harm. For example, take the rise of corporate short-termism since the 1970s. Many economists, including myself, argue that public companies that only prioritize next-quarter share prices—and pump up those share prices through stock buybacks—are an enormous driver of inequality. Corporate short-termism, by its very definition, is bad for the environment because the same shareholder incentives that skew companies away from investing in workers, capital, and innovation discourage them from investing in, for example, green retrofitting of existing buildings, sustainable production practices, and even compliance with environmental regulations.∂ Second, there are mechanisms by which inequality itself is an environmental toxin. For example, Boyce [argues](https://www.e-elgar.com/shop/the-political-economy-of-the-environment?___website=uk_warehouse)that, because wealth ultimately converts into political power, a society with high levels of wealth and income inequality leaves those at the bottom less able to resist the powerful interests that benefit from pollution. This increases environmental “bads” because the magnitude of environmental harm is a function of the magnitude of inequality. (These explanations just scratch the surface. See [the report](http://rooseveltinstitute.org/boiling-points/) to delve more into these ideas.)∂ What is the potential of these findings? Can we think of financial regulation, progressive tax policy, and entitlements as climate change policy? They will not directly pull carbon out of the atmosphere, which we need to do urgently, but these kinds of progressive economic policies may be a necessary foundation for a sustainable society. Recognizing that solving inequality is actionable climate policy builds on the foundation of climate justice exhibited at actions like the People’s Climate March, providing an incredibly strong framework for designing good policy and mobilizing an even stronger, multi-interest climate movement.

#### Without action short and long term, warming will surpass more than 8 degrees Fahrenheit—civilization would collapse.

Gillis, Winner Oakes Award for Distinguished Environmental Journalism, New York Times reporter 2015, [Justin Gillis, "Short Answers to Hard Questions About Climate Change", New York Times, 11-28-2015, <http://nyti.ms/1XnMRRr>]

1. How much is the planet heating up? 1.7 degrees is actually a significant amount. As of October 2015, the Earth had warmed by about 1.7 degrees Fahrenheit since 1880, when records begin at a global scale. That figure includes the surface of the ocean. The warming is greater over land, and greater still in the Arctic and parts of Antarctica. The number may sound low, but as an average over the surface of an entire planet, it is actually high, which explains why much of the world’s land ice is starting to melt and the oceans are rising at an accelerating pace. The heat accumulating in the Earth because of human emissions is roughly equal to the heat that would be released by 400,000 Hiroshima atomic bombs exploding across the planet every day. Scientists believe most and probably all of the warming since 1950 was caused by the human release of greenhouse gases. If emissions continue unchecked, they say the global warming could ultimately exceed 8 degrees Fahrenheit, which would transform the planet and undermine its capacity to support a large human population. 2. How much trouble are we in? For future generations, big trouble. The risks are much greater over the long run than over the next few decades, but the emissions that create those risks are happening now. Over the coming 25 or 30 years, scientists say, the climate is likely to resemble that of today, although gradually getting warmer. Rainfall will be heavier in many parts of the world, but the periods between rains will most likely grow hotter and therefore drier. The number of hurricanes and typhoons may actually fall, but the ones that do occur will draw energy from a hotter ocean surface, and therefore may be more intense, on average, than those of the past. Coastal flooding will grow more frequent and damaging. Longer term, if emissions continue to rise unchecked, the risks are profound. Scientists fear climate effects so severe that they might destabilize governments, produce waves of refugees, precipitate the sixth mass extinction of plants and animals in Earth’s history, and melt the polar ice caps, causing the seas to rise high enough to flood most of the world’s coastal cities. All of this could take hundreds or even thousands of years to play out, conceivably providing a cushion of time for civilization to adjust, but experts cannot rule out abrupt changes, such as a collapse of agriculture, that would throw society into chaos much sooner. Bolder efforts to limit emissions would reduce these risks, or at least slow the effects, but it is already too late to eliminate the risks entirely.

## Democracy Module [any version]

#### Educational equality essential to U.S. democracy—persistent and long standing inequalities undermine participation and democratic decision-making

Chen, PhD candidate at Saint Louis University, publishing in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal, 2015

[Amy Yun-Ping, “Educational Inequality: An Impediment to True Democracy in the United States,” Sociology Study, Vol.5 No.5, May, <http://www.davidpublisher.org/Public/uploads/Contribute/55f62bc2bf7b8.pdf> accessed GDI -TM]

The fundamental concept of democracy aims to offer equal access to all members of society and to ensure that they are empowered to make a good life for themselves and establish the public good for the country. Quality education is a method to eliminate poverty and encourage the engine of shared prosperity for generations of Americans. When education improves the preparation and productivity of young members of the community, it increases the wealth of the country and leads many people to their American dreams. Nevertheless, the persistent and long-standing educational inequalities are an obstacle for the United States becoming a nation with true democracy and equal liberty. Thus, democracy becomes a superficial aspect and a beautiful bubble, and it is not realized in practice. The Collapse of Political Responsibility Hochschild and Scovronick (2003) stated, “Education also powerfully affects people’s involvement with politics and their community, thereby creating another link between the nested structure of inequalities in schooling and the American dream” (Hochschild and Scovronick 2003: 24). Well-educated members of the community largely understand their obligation as participants in a democratic society, and they likely know current political facts and participate in political activities. The virtue of education in a democracy is that it tends to prepare children for citizenship and to foster in them the knowledge necessary for them to function in a civic society. But today in the United States, only some Americans fully exercise their political rights, and these are often citizens with high incomes, high socioeconomic statuses, and high levels of formal education. According to the American Political Science Association Taskforce (2005): In 1990, nearly nine out of 10 individuals in families with incomes over $75,000 reported voting in presidential elections, while only half of those in families with incomes under $15,000 reported voting. Fifty-six percent (56%) of those with incomes of at least $75,000 reported participating in political campaign activities, compared with a mere 6% among Americans with incomes under $15,000. (American Political Science Association Taskforce 2005: 80-81) The evidence indicates that there is a significant correlation between income status and the practice of citizenship. Americans with higher socioeconomic status usually enjoy not only higher educational achievement and salaries, but also have greater resources and skills to engage in politics and organizations. Education provides opportunities for Americans to acquire knowledge of democracy and to recognize their duty as members of a democratic society. Nevertheless, educational inequalities can lead to disparities in resources and skills between privileged and unprivileged people. The situation demolishes the goal of promoting democracy. The voices of U.S. citizens are heard unequally, and collective decisions respond much more to the privileged than to people of average means. The gap of inequality will increase. Instead of making progress, U.S. politics will continue to involve exclusion and unfairness, which strongly distorts the primary framework of democracy.

#### And, Democracies less violent, more protective of human rights and less prone to war

**Diamond,** Senior Fellow, Hoover Institution, and Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies, Stanford University, **2016**

(Larry, “Democracy in Decline: How Washington Can Reverse the Tide”, Foreign Affairs, Jul/Aug 2016, Volume 95, Issue 4, pages 151-159, accessed via ProQuest, GDI-JG)

Although democracy promotion may have fallen out of favor with the U.S. public, such efforts very much remain in the national interest. Democracies are less violent toward their citizens and more protective of human rights. They do not go to war with one another. They are more likely to develop market economies, and those economies are more likely to be stable and prosperous. Their citizens enjoy higher life expectancies and lower levels of infant and maternal mortality than people living under other forms of government. Democracies also make good allies. As Michael McFaul, the former U.S. ambassador to Russia, has written, "Not every democracy in the world was or is a close ally of the United States, but no democracy in the world has been or is an American enemy. And all of America's most enduring allies have been and remain democracies."∂ Authoritarian regimes, by contrast, are inherently unstable, since they face a central dilemma. If an autocracy is successful-if it produces a wealthy and educated population-that population will construct a civil society that will sooner or later demand political change. But if an autocracy is unsuccessful-if it fails to generate economic growth and raise living standards-it is liable to collapse.

# Squo Debate – Inequality

## Squo Achievement gap – general

#### Educational disparities rising—impacting children’s well-being and brain development

**Boser,** Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress, **and Baffour,** research associate, K-12 Education Policy, Center for American Progress, **2017**

(Ulrich and Perpetual, “Isolated and Segregated”, Center for American Progress, May 31, 2017, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2017/05/31/433014/isolated-and-segregated/>, accessed 7/5/17, GDI-JG)

Educational disparities between lower- and higher-income students have noticeably widened in recent years. In fact, income-based disparities among students are now larger than racial disparities,26 and low-income children are 15 percent less likely to graduate from high school than their high-income peers.27∂ The causes of this gap are many and well-documented. Many low-income students encounter a host of disadvantages outside of school that are likely to affect their educational achievement.28 For instance, low-income students are less likely to benefit from parents with postsecondary degrees. Studies have shown that the mother’s education level strongly predicts the achievement of the child, and among low-income families, the mother’s education level usually does not exceed a high school diploma.29∂ Children living in low-income neighborhoods also have increased exposure to hardship in their communities. These communities tend to lack access to meaningful job opportunities and face chronic unemployment. As a consequence, members are more likely to be distressed by mental health challenges, substance abuse, crime, and high levels of incarceration. Furthermore, residents of these communities are also excessively exposed to pollutants and environmental hazards. The trauma associated with all of these conditions poses serious negative consequences for a child’s well-being and brain development.30∂ But while family and community factors are strong predictors of student achievement, school-level factors matter as well. In fact, in 1966, James Coleman, an American sociologist and researcher, released a report that studied more than 650,000 students nationwide and found that the level of student poverty in a school is the single most determinative school-level factor in a student’s academic achievement.31∂ Since the Coleman report, study after study has shown that low-income children who attend high-poverty schools fare worse than low-income children who attend low-poverty schools.

#### Concentration of poverty and resource starved school increases achievement gap

**Jennings,** founder and former CEO, Center on Education Policy, Washington, D.C., and former General Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives' Committee on Education and Labor, **2015**

(Jack, “ESEA at 50”, Kappan Magazine, April 2015, Volume 96, Number 7, accessed 7/6/17, GDI-JG)

\*OECD: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

A final factor that should compel us to improve the schools is the extent of poverty in the U.S. and the implications that has for the life opportunities of children born into poverty. As the U.S. Secretary of Education’s Equity and Excellence Commission stated in its 2013 report, America does not compare favorably on this measure with other OECD nations:∂ . . . Our poverty rate for school-age children — cur- rently more than 22% — is twice the OECD average and nearly four times that of leading countries such as Finland. We are also an outlier in how we concentrate those children, isolating them in certain schools — of- ten resource-starved schools — which only magnifies poverty’s impact and makes high achievement that much harder (U.S. Department of Education 2013, p. 15).∂ To solve those two big problems — broad im- provement of the schools and a better education for disadvantaged students — the U.S. should follow through on its ideals and truly provide a good edu- cation for every student.

#### Poverty-concentrated schools are correlated with gaps in educational achievement

**Boschma**, senior associate editor, **Brownstein**, editorial director , **16** (Janie Boschma and Ronald Brownstein, “The Concentration of Poverty in American Schools”, TheAtlantic, February 26, 2016, <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/02/concentration-poverty-american-schools/471414/>, July 14, 2017) GDI AC

In almost all major American cities, most African American and Hispanic students attend public schools where a majority of their classmates qualify as poor or low-income, a new analysis of federal data shows.∂ This systemic economic and racial isolation looms as a huge obstacle for efforts to make a quality education available to all American students. [Researchers have found that the single-most powerful predictor of racial gaps in educational achievement](http://cepa.stanford.edu/content/patterns-and-trends-racialethnic-and-socioeconomic-academic-achievement-gaps-1) is the extent to which students attend schools surrounded by other low-income students.∂ Underscoring the breadth of the challenge, the economic segregation of minority students persists across virtually all types of cities, from fast-growing Sunbelt places like Austin, Denver, Dallas, and Charlotte to struggling Rust Belt communities like Detroit, Cleveland, and Milwaukee, to the nation’s largest metropolitan centers, including New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Houston. But cities, educators, and researchers are also exploring new ways to abate the negative impact of concentrated poverty on black and brown students.∂ In about half of the largest 100 cities, most African American and Latino students attend schools where at least 75 percent of all students qualify as poor or low-income under federal guidelines. These stark results emerge from an [analysis of data from the National Equity Atlas](http://nationalequityatlas.org/indicators/School_poverty). The Atlas is a joint project of PolicyLink and the University of Southern California’s Program for Environmental and Regional Equity, or PERE. Following federal guidelines, the National Equity Atlas defines low-income students as those eligible for the federal free- and reduced-lunch program. That includes students with incomes up to $44,863 for a family of four, or 185 percent of the federal poverty line. (Students from families with incomes up to the 130 percent of the poverty line, or $31,525 for a family of four, are eligible for free lunch; the remainder can obtain reduced price lunches.)∂ The overwhelming isolation of students of color in schools with mostly low-income classmates threatens to undermine efforts both to improve educational outcomes and to provide a pipeline of skilled workers for the economy at a time when such students comprise a majority of the nation’s public school enrollment. Educational reformers are quick to underscore that in individual schools around the country dedicated teachers and principals have produced impressive results even for students submerged in communities of pervasive poverty. But, overall, concentrated poverty is tightly correlated with gaps in educational achievement.∂ “It’s the measure of segregation that is most strongly correlated to the racial achievement gap,” said Sean F. Reardon, a professor at Stanford University’s graduate school of education and one of the nation’s leading experts on residential and educational segregation. “The difference in the rate at which black, Hispanic, and white students go to school with poor classmates is the best predictor of the racial-achievement gap.”∂ The latest figures from the National Center for Educational Statistics show that nationwide about three-fourths of both African American and Hispanic young people (compared to about one-third of white students) attend schools where most of their classmates qualify as low income. The analysis expands on that national portrait to examine the extent of economic isolation at the city level. That assessment points to one overwhelming conclusion: economic isolation and the concentration of poverty among students of color afflicts not only a few struggling cities, but virtually all cities—including many that have seen the most robust growth in jobs, incomes and population since the Great Recession.

#### The achievement gap undermines education and creates self fulfilling prophecy

**Anselem,** Policy Analyst, Education Policy Studies, Institute for Family, Community, and Opportunity, Heritage Foundation, **2014**

(Mary Clare, “Barriers to High School Completion Create Barriers to Economic Mobility”, Heritage Foundation, May 15, 2014, http://www.heritage.org/education/report/barriers-high-school-completion-create-barriers-economic-mobility, accessed July 14, 2017, GDI-JG)

Second, there is a large difference in the dropout rate among racial groups, often referred to as the racial achievement gap. For decades, black and Hispanic children have been performing much worse in school than their white or Asian counterparts. Disturbingly, this gap is now seen by many educators as a pre-determined given, without a proper focus on its causes. For the 2011–2012 school year, the adjusted cohort graduation rates (ACGR)[15] for black and Hispanic students were 69 percent and 73 percent, respectively. This is starkly different from the ACGR of white students, at 86 percent, or Asian students, 88 percent.[16] The achievement gap discourages many students from thinking they could ever succeed in school. Social science research indicates that this creates a self-fulfilling prophecy, meaning that the presence of the achievement gap has a strong psychological effect on minority children: “Self-fulfilling prophecies can have long-term and negative influences on the outcomes of targets who are perceived unfavorably, ultimately widening the gap between advantaged and disadvantaged groups.”[17] It is the achievement gap itself, regardless of its initial cause, that can cause students to expect little from themselves. In conjunction with a lack of expectations at home, children can easily lose motivation to succeed academically.∂ The third group at high risk of dropping out is children who come from poor homes. Children from low-income families find it extremely difficult to achieve the same quality of education as their middle-class peers. In the 2011–2012 school year, the ACGR for economically disadvantaged students was 72 percent, compared to the national average of 80 percent.[18] Sean Reardon’s 2011 study revealed that a parent’s income may be a much higher predictor of a child’s educational attainment than many other factors that were previously held to be high predictors, such as the parents’ education level or race. Reardon found that the “achievement gap between children from high- and low-income families is roughly 30 to 40 percent larger among children born in 2001 than among those born twenty-five years earlier.”[19] In contrast to the racial achievement gap, which has been slowly but surely closing over the past 50 years, the income achievement gap seems to only have gotten worse.

## Squo Achievement gap – students with disabilities

#### Despite recent reforms, the achievement gap remains high—especially for people with disabilities

**Pazey,** Assistant Professor, Department of Special Education and Department of Educational Administration, The University of Texas at Austin, **et al. 2016**

(Barbara L., “Incorporating Quality of Life Concepts Into Educational Reform: Creating Real Opportunities for Students With Disabilities in the 21st Century”, Journal of Disability Policy Studies, Hammill Institute on Disabilities, 2016, Vol. 27(2) 96–105, accessed 7/6/17, GDI-JG)

Over the last two decades, educators and policymakers have grappled with ways to better prepare students for suc- cess in a highly competitive, rapidly changing, and tech- nology-driven economy. Manifesting in what are deemed 21st-century skills, public education has been tasked with the responsibility of developing the knowledge and apti- tude in America’s next generation that is necessary for suc- cessful entry into the adult world. A special focus has been placed on college and career readiness to ensure our gradu- ates can compete on a world stage. Indeed, newly intro- duced curriculum standards and learning outcomes for students in public schools reflect this concern (Achieve, 2013a; Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2010; Bruett, 2006; Equity and Excellence Commission, 2013; P-16 Council, 2012; Partnership for 21st Century Skills [P21], n.d.; Plotner & Mazzotti, 2014; Salpeter, 2003; Trilling & Fadel, 2009).∂ Educational policy and related legislation has created a complex machinery of incentives, backed by punitive sanc- tions to secure support of the reform movement (see, for example, Blueprint for Reform, U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2010; Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act [IDEA], 2004; No Child Left Behind [NCLB] Act, 2002). Although the articulated intention and rhetoric of these changes may support success for all, research shows that the achievement gap between students who suc- ceed and those who have been traditionally marginalized in public schools continues to grow (Cole, 2006; McLaughlin, 2010). Many students are still not performing to the standards desired, and for some, the hope of graduating prepared for the challenges of 21st-century living is far from being realized. This shortcoming is particularly apparent for students with disabilities. Despite a strong push to graduate every student college and career ready (Fulton, Gianneschi, Blanco, & DeMaria, 2014; USDOE, 2010), equipped with the necessary 21st-century skills, there has been little discussion regarding how these initiatives can be incorporated to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

## Squo Achievement gap – racial and ethnic minority students

#### SES impacts academic achievement

Reardon, Stanford University Graduate School of Education professor, et al, 17 (Sean F., Demetra, Stanford Center for Education Policy Analysis research associate, Ken, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia with expertise in Educational Theory, Educational Policy, Econometrics, "The Geography of Racial/Ethnic Test Score Gaps", January 2017, http://cepa.stanford.edu/wp16-10, 7-8-17, GDI-EC)

First, racial differences in children’s home environments include differences in opportunities for learning at home—differences in the amount of time parents have to read to their children; in children’s access to computers, libraries, and museums; in parental investments in tutoring and other educational activities; in parental human and social capital; and differences in parental stress and depression. All of these experiences are affected by family socioeconomic status; high-income and highly-educated parents have, on average, more resources to foster and support their children’s academic skills outside of school (Bassok et al. 2016; Bradley et al. 2001; Chin and Phillips 2004; Lareau 2003; Phillips 2011). To the extent that these affect students’ academic achievement, it follows that racial differences in socioeconomic status would then lead to racial differences in academic achievement, net of other factors. Recent studies indicate this is the case; income affects children’s academic achievement (Dahl and Lochner 2012; Duncan, Morris and Rodrigues 2011), though the exact pathways through which these effects operate are not clear. Moreover, racial differences in family socioeconomic conditions explain a large portion of racial achievement gaps present when children enter kindergarten (Fryer and Levitt 2004; Fryer and Levitt 2006; Reardon and Galindo 2009; Rothstein and Wozny 2013). There is less clarity about whether racial achievement gaps grow in ways unrelated to socioeconomic background differences as children progress through school.

#### Achievement gap – racial and ethnic groups underperforming creates cascading underinvestment in low-income schools

**Chen,** PhD candidate at Saint Louis University, publishing in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal, **2015**

(Amy Yun-Ping, “Educational Inequality: An Impediment to True Democracy in the United States,” Sociology Study, Vol.5 No.5, May 2015, <http://www.davidpublisher.org/Public/uploads/Contribute/55f62bc2bf7b8.pdf>, accessed 7/10/17, GDI-JG)

In recent decades, education reforms have been sweeping the nation. Dramatically rising demands for accountability have given state and federal governments power to monitor fiscal inputs and determine the measurement of performance in public education (Ravitch 2010). Many states have adopted standardized tests, Common Core curricula, and teaching assessments in order to raise the quality and accountability of public education. Such drives for accountability often result in fiscal deficits and unequal opportunity for minority students (Ravitch 2010; Ravitch 2013; Sleeter 2007). The policies also neglect the actual problems of racial segregation (Lipman 2003). Educational resources are distributed unevenly on the basis of students’ test scores, and without adequate support for education. Black students are hardly able to improve their academic achievement. Lower test scores lead to insufficient resources from the state government, and sometimes schools struggle with losing accreditation or are forced to close their doors due to students’ poor testing performance (Lipman 2003; Pollock 2010; Ravitch 2010). As a consequence, racial inequality results in more complex problems in school environments. The White-Black achievement gap becomes wider. Black students in inner-city schools suffer unequal educational opportunities and are likely to encounter very low expectations for academic attainment (Carter and Welner 2013; MacLeod 2009; Murrell 2008; Putnam 2015; Sleeter 2007).

#### Economic and Racial Segregated Schools Have Demonstrably Less Resources Than Others—Damaging Students

Folley, AOL News, Social Media News Fellow and Latimer, NBC News, Assistant Producer 16 (Aris and Brian “Public Schools Becoming More Racially Segregated: Report” NBC News 5-18-2016 http://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/public-schools-becoming-more-racially-segregated-report-n576121 7-14-2017 GDI-JIJD)

Racial segregation has been deepening in public education, offering a sobering reminder of the nation’s history when it comes to racial and economic isolation in classrooms, according to a recent report published by the Government Accountability Office Tuesday.¶ Published on the anniversary of the landmark ruling of Brown v. Board of Education, the GAO found evidence of growing racial divides persisting in public education. The number of Black and Latino students enrolled in impoverished K-12 public schools increased 11 percent between 2001 and 2014.¶ These schools were found to be the most poverty-stricken, minority-segregated schools in the country, with more than 75 to 100 percent of Black and Latino students eligible for price-reduced lunch. This parameter is commonly used as an indicator of poverty.¶ These schools were also found to have offered fewer STEM courses and advanced placement, college-prep courses. About 48 percent of high-poverty schools offer AP courses, while 72 percent of low-poverty schools — with 0 to 25 percent of students on free, reduced lunches — offered these college-level courses.¶ These schools have higher rates of students unable to advance from the ninth grade, as well as more students who had been suspended or expelled. Five percent of students at low-poverty schools will received an out-of-school suspension, while 22 percent in high-poverty schools will be suspended more than once.

#### Statistics prove school segregation is high—that devastates educational attainment and exacerbates economic disparities among racial groups

**Chen,** PhD candidate at Saint Louis University, publishing in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal, **2015**

(Amy Yun-Ping, “Educational Inequality: An Impediment to True Democracy in the United States,” Sociology Study, Vol.5 No.5, May 2015, <http://www.davidpublisher.org/Public/uploads/Contribute/55f62bc2bf7b8.pdf>, accessed 7/10/17, GDI-JG)

During the school year 2009-2010, one in four Black students and nearly one in five Hispanic students still attended high schools where graduating was not the norm (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES] 2013). Furthermore, a study from Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government shows that a mere 11% of Black students and 15% of Hispanic students were well-advanced in math, as opposed to 42% of Whites and 50% of Asians (Love 2011). And in reading, only 13% of Black students and 4% of Hispanic students were proficient, compared with 40% of White students and 41% of Asian students (Love 2011). The data indicate that the racial and ethnic gap in academic achievement represents the significant educational disparities among different populations in the United States. Thus, what are the major factors causing achievement disparities? One of the most important answers is often attributed to race.∂ Throughout the history of the United States, race has existed as a set of interpretative codes and meanings that operate in the interactions of every aspect of life (Kozol 1991; Kozol 2006; Lipman 2003; Murrell 2008; Nieto 2005; Pollock 2010). In spite of the abolition of slavery, the decision of Brown v. Board of Education in 1954, and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, racial segregation and inequality continue to affect the quality of education nationwide (Carter and Welner 2013; Kozol 1991; Kozol 2006; Murrell 2008; Ravitch 2010). Racial categorizing is never a finished product; instead, it functions as a powerful, dynamic, and artificial context that applies to each individual. Public education plays a role in the production of race as a social category through both implicit and explicit lessons and practices. Racial inequality has consistently been a troublesome and disheartening reality in the U.S. education system, and it deprives many children of equal opportunity (Lipman 2003; Nieto 2005; Putnam 2015).∂ Today, numerous states’ public schools remain nearly as segregated as in earlier years, especially in urban communities where Black children are in the majority (Carter and Welner 2013; Pollock 2010). In many metropolitan areas, White children exclusively attend suburban public schools or private academies; by contrast, Black children primarily attend public schools in the city (Holme 2002; Murrell 2008). Continued school segregation leads to divided resources, low taxpayer support, and poor quality of education in these urban schools. Additionally, reformers often ignore racial segregation and accept it as inevitable. The consequences have been devastating for educational attainment and continuing economic disparities between racial groups.

## Squo funding shortfalls

#### **Trump hasn’t proposed cuts to Title I funding, but the future is unclear**

Mann, 17, Brown Center on Education Policy [Elizabeth; "3 observations on Trump’s education budget," 6-7-2017, Brookings, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2017/06/07/3-observations-on-trumps-education-budget/>; GDI-RJC]

1. Title I funding’s future is unclear Since initial passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Title I program to provide funds to school districts with high concentrations of students from low-income families has been the bedrock of federal spending on K-12 education. Title I funds are distributed by a formula grant, and Title I is the largest K-12 program administered by the Department of Education. Large cuts here would be felt by school districts—and House members representing those districts—across the country. It is no surprise, then, that the Trump administration did not propose major cuts here. However, determining the budget proposal’s implications for Title I funding is complicated. The proposal adds a new program under Title I, Furthering Options for Children to Unlock Success (FOCUS), with a proposed budget of 1 billion dollars. FOCUS would fund state school choice programs by providing “supplemental awards to school districts that agree to adopt weighted student funding combined with open enrollment systems that allow Federal, State, and local funds to follow students to the public school of their choice.” The federal government would not distribute FOCUS funds using the standard Title I formula, raising the question of whether this proposed budget increase should be considered an increase in Title I funds. Further complicating matters, Congress passed two budget laws in 2017–whether funding for Title I appears to increase or decrease in Trump’s budget depends on whether you compare his proposal to the 2017 annualized Continuing Resolution (CR) signed December 2016, or the 2017 fiscal year appropriation signed May 2017. As the figure below shows, compared to either 2017 budget law, Title I funds would increase in fiscal year 2018 if you include FOCUS funds. Omitting FOCUS funds, Title I funding is level compared to the 2017 CR but decreases compared to the 2017 fiscal year appropriation. Depending on what set of numbers one uses, it is thus possible to claim that proposed Title I funds are the same, higher, or lower than in 2017. This issue led to partisan sparring over how the Trump budget proposal could affect Title I, the central federal funding stream for K-12 education. In the June 6 Senate hearing on the budget, for example, Sen. Patty Murray (D-Wash.) and Education Secretary Betsy DeVos disagreed over whether the proposed budget would maintain or decrease Title I spending. In addition to concerns about funding levels, observers note that the FOCUS program, which is not mandated through legislation, requires states to adopt policies favored by DeVos and her department in order to receive federal funds. Sen. James Lankford (R-Okla.) expressed his concern to DeVos that this approach echoes the Obama administration’s strategy under Race to the Top, which ultimately aggravated many state education leaders who found this approach prescriptive.

#### Trump and DeVos school choice plans devastate funding for low-income students

**Ford,** Special Assistant, K-12 Education Team, Center for American Progress, **et al. 2017**

(Chris, “The Racist Origins of Private School Vouchers”, Center for American Progress, July 12, 2017, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2017/07/12/435629/racist-origins-private-school-vouchers/, accessed 7/14/17, GDI-JG)

Fast forward to 2017: President Donald Trump and U.S. Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos have championed a plan to provide federal funding for private school voucher systems nationwide, which would funnel millions of taxpayer dollars out of public schools and into unaccountable private schools—a school reform policy that they say would provide better options for low-income students trapped in failing schools. Their budget proposal would slash the Education Department’s budget by more than 13 percent, or $9 billion, while providing $1.25 billion for school choice, including $250 million for private school vouchers.2∂ When pressed on the risks and unintended consequences of potential exclusionary policies in voucher programs, Secretary DeVos refused to commit to aggressively enforce civil rights protections. In May of 2017 in her testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, Betsy DeVos declined to say whether she would protect students against discriminatory policies in private schools that receive federal funding through vouchers.3

## Squo Inequality – general

#### Educational inequality high now—school segregation and scoring gaps prove

**Singer,** social studies educator and historian, the Department of Teaching Learning Technology, Hofstra University, **2016**

(Alan, “Will Every Student Succeed? Not With This New Law”, Huffington Post, Dec 06, 2016, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/alan-singer/will-every-student-succee_b_8730956.html>, accessed 7/9/17, GDI-JG)

Last week the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly to jettison penalties for schools, districted and states mandated by the Bush era No Child Left Behind law. NCLB was signed into law by George Bush in 2002 and was supposedly designed to expose and solve “achievement gaps” in American education. It did this by mandating the continuous testing of students and required that all gaps be eliminated by 2014. While the testing industry has overwhelmed American schools, achievement gaps have not disappeared. The Senate is expected to pass the new bill, known as the Every Student Succeeds Act or ESSA, this week, maybe as early as Tuesday.∂ In the last fifteen years a lot of children have been left behind. A recent study published by the National Center for Education Statistics based on 2011 middle school math tests found that Black student performance was significantly lower than the performance by White students and the gap increased for Black students who attended racially segregated schools with large numbers of children from poor families. The scoring gap between Hispanic and White non-Hispanic students was not as high, but it continued to be large. NCLB forced almost every state to apply for a series of waivers from requirements because they could not possibly ensure that no child was left behind.∂ In 2009, President Barack Obama signed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act that established his signature educational program, Race to the Top. Obama-ED promised states educational grants if they imposed Common Core-aligned skill-based tests on public schools and used student scores to evaluate students, teachers, schools, and school districts. To get the competitive federal grants states made impossible promises that stirred up deep resentment from teachers and led to open rebellion by parents opposed to the high-stakes testing regime. It also became an excuse not to address the fundamental problems causing poor academic performance by Black and Latino youth, racial and ethnic segregation, persistent poverty and unemployment in their communities, and inadequate school funding. Even the federal Department of Education had to concede that RTTP was not working. In 2015, student performance declined on math tests for the first time since 1990.

#### Concentration of economic disadvantage impacts school

**Boser,** Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress, **and Baffour,** research associate, K-12 Education Policy, Center for American Progress, **2017**

(Ulrich and Perpetual, “Isolated and Segregated”, Center for American Progress, May 31, 2017, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2017/05/31/433014/isolated-and-segregated/>, accessed 7/5/17, GDI-JG)

EdBuild conducted a quantitative analysis of over 1,700 school districts to measure economic segregation within each district, or intradistrict segregation. Among the researchers’ sample, 40 percent—or 688 districts—would be considered “hypersegregated” or “hyperisolated” by income. The authors call this group of districts the “Diversity Watch List.”∂ In these 688 districts, most of their low-income students attend schools where at least 75 percent of their peers are also low-income, most of their higher-income students attend schools where at least 75 percent of their peers are also higher-income, and/or most of their schools have poverty rates that are at least 20 percentage points above or below the district average.∂ These districts enroll approximately 15 million students and 50 percent of students in the CAP sample. The authors also find that these districts tend to be larger—both geographically and in terms of student population—than other districts in the sample.∂ Although the sample is not well suited for estimating national trends, the sheer number of districts in the sample identified as segregated suggests that many districts experience intense economic segregation and isolation.∂ It is also important to note that these districts cover 49 out of 51 states and encompass regions stretching from the Deep South to the Midwest and Northeast. The urban nature of these districts also varies. Some districts are located in densely populated, urban areas—such as Baltimore City Public Schools in Maryland—while others are small, rural districts such as Knox County Public Schools in Kentucky. From this the authors conclude that school segregation in the 21st century is not a South, North, urban, suburban, or rural issue. It is a national issue.

#### Housing segregation and attendance zones increase education inequality

**Boser,** Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress, **and Baffour,** research associate, K-12 Education Policy, Center for American Progress, **2017**

(Ulrich and Perpetual, “Isolated and Segregated”, Center for American Progress, May 31, 2017, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2017/05/31/433014/isolated-and-segregated/>, accessed 7/5/17, GDI-JG)

Most students attend schools based on their neighborhood location, or their attendance zones. While this is the nature of traditional student assignment systems, the attendance zones often reinforce structures of residential segregation. Most often, more affluent students are zoned to schools filled with the affluent peers in their neighborhood, and lower-income students are zoned to schools with students of similar backgrounds.∂ In extreme cases, however, attendance zones are deliberately drawn to exclude poor students from affluent schools.60 However, gerrymandering attendance zones is far less common than drawing zones that merely reflect the characteristics of the local area.61 Most school assignment systems sort students based on their place of residence, mimicking patterns of housing segregation.∂ School district boundaries also add to the problem. Many high-poverty districts are unable to meaningfully integrate their schools because the students they serve are either entirely low-income or entirely high-income. To illustrate this point, consider the fact that nearly half of all low-income public students attend school in a district where 75 percent of their peers are also low-income.62∂ High-poverty districts also often border significantly wealthier districts. The neighboring districts of Detroit Public Schools and Grosse Pointe Public School System in Michigan offer a stark example of this trend. In Detroit, the median household income is $54,000,63 but in Grosse Pointe, the median household income is $101,000.64 Such stories highlight the saddening reality that, increasingly, wealth separates students at the classroom, school, and district levels.

## Squo - Graduation Rates students low income schools

### Uniqueness – graduation rates

#### Students in high poverty schools less likely to graduate

**Boser,** Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress, **and Baffour,** research associate, K-12 Education Policy, Center for American Progress, **2017**

(Ulrich and Perpetual, “Isolated and Segregated”, Center for American Progress, May 31, 2017, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2017/05/31/433014/isolated-and-segregated/>, accessed 7/5/17, GDI-JG)

But deeply ingrained and pervasive economic segregation in Austin’s public schools is no isolated incident. In fact, it reflects a disturbing, nationwide trend. Millions of students across the country attend schools that are intensely segregated by economic status. Today, 40 percent of all low-income children—or 10 million students—attend schools with poverty rates reaching 75 percent or higher.5∂ Rising income inequality has contributed to these trends of economic segregation6 and thus further exacerbates many of the nation’s student achievement issues. When it comes to high-school completion, students attending high-poverty schools—or schools where at least 75 percent of students are eligible for free and reduced-price lunch—only have a 68 percent chance of graduating.7 In comparison, students attending low-poverty schools—or where 25 percent or less of students qualify for free and reduced-price lunch—have a 91 percent chance of graduating.8∂ Moreover, all students—rich or poor, white and nonwhite alike—miss out on the substantial benefits of learning in richly diverse classrooms.9 As the research shows, students across the spectrum are better prepared for post-secondary success when they have been educated in diverse schools and have learned alongside peers who come from all walks of life.10

## Squo Teacher Quality – general

# SQuo Debate – Title I

## Title I Flawed – General

#### School districts currently underfund high-poverty schools—studies prove

**Liebman,** Simon H. Rifkin Professor, Columbia Law School, **and Mbikiwa,** Attorney, the High Court of South Africa, **2017**

(James S. and Michael, “EVERY DOLLAR COUNTS: IN DEFENSE OF THE OBAMA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S "SUPPLE-MENT NOT SUPPLANT" PROPOSAL”, Columbia Law Review Online, March 1, 2017, accessed via LexisNexis, accessed 7/14/17, GDI-JG)

Evidence compellingly demonstrates--as Congress famously recognized in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) n1--that children from economically disadvantaged backgrounds require more education-al resources than other students. n2 Yet, a half century later, many school districts still spend less money on high-poverty schools than on more privileged schools. n3 In 2011, a study by the U.S. Department of Education discovered that nationwide, more than forty percent of schools eligible for Title I funding based on their high-poverty status re-ceive less state and local funding for instructional and other personnel costs than non-Title I schools in the same dis-tricts at the same grade level. n4 A more recent study confirmed that more than 4.5 million low-income students attend Title I schools that on average receive about $ 1,200 less per student than non-Title I schools in the same district. n5

#### Funding inequities undermine educational quality for marginalized students in high poverty schools – appropriate enforcement of new compliance rules key to addressing funding gaps

**Sargrad, Managing Director of the K-12 Education Policy team at the Center for American Progress, 16** (Scott Sargrad, 10-3-2016, "Federal Regulations Should Drive More Money to Poor Schools," Center for American Progress, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2016/10/03/145214/federal-regulations-should-drive-more-money-to-poor-schools//HJ-GDI)

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was designed to provide additional resources to the most disadvantaged students in poor schools. But within years, it was clear that poor kids did not receive their fair share of education dollars.

To address this inequity, Congress approved the first supplement-not-supplant provision in 1970 to ensure that districts did not use federal money to replace state and local dollars. On September 6 of this year, the U.S. Department of Education issued draft regulations on ESSA’s updated supplement-not-supplant provision and in so doing, took another important step forward toward fulfilling the law’s intent.

Before I dive into the research and policy, I want to step back and note that we are not considering dry academic questions. Even as we sit here today, too many low-income students across the country sit in crumbling schools without access to the experienced and effective teachers, rigorous courses, and wraparound services that they need to have a chance at success. In fact, just two weeks ago, on an unseasonably hot September day, every school in Baltimore closed early because so many of them had no air conditioning, depriving these students of valuable learning time.

Money matters in education. And it matters particularly for students from low-income families. This is common sense—and it’s supported by a growing body of research. For low-income students, a 10 percent increase in per-student spending increased adult wages by almost 10 percent, according to a 2015 study. Similarly, a 2016 study found that greater state spending on low-income students dramatically improved student learning in reading and math.

Students in poorer schools, however, continue to receive less than their richer peers. In approximately 1,500 school districts across the country, there are about 5,700 Title I—or poor—schools that receive, on average, $440,000 less per year than wealthier schools. That’s a lot of money. With $440,000, a school could hire eight new guidance counselors, or give a $10,000 bonus to more than 40 teachers.

This inequity also happens across districts. While there is significant variation across states, high-poverty districts spend an average of 15 percent less per student than low-poverty districts. In Pennsylvania, poorer school districts spend 33 percent less per pupil than wealthier districts in the state.

As a result of these policies, children of color often suffer the most. Indeed, compared with high-poverty schools and schools with high percentages of students of color, wealthier schools and schools with lower percentages of students of color offer more rigorous core programs. Wealthier schools are twice as likely to offer a full range of math and science courses, offer three times as many Advanced Placement classes, and are twice as likely to offer dual enrollment opportunities.

But these are not just facts and figures. Every day, real students walk into schools with so few resources that every one of us would say they are unacceptable for our own child. In one Detroit elementary and middle school, black mold covers the gym floor, and the ceilings are full of exposed wires, wrote Lakia Wilson, a counselor at Detroit’s Spain Elementary-Middle School, earlier this year. And in the William Penn School District in Pennsylvania, students such as Jameria Miller “race to class to get the best blankets” to stay warm within the school’s uninsulated metal walls.

From the passage of the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965, the federal government’s role has been to protect historically disadvantaged students and ensure that they have the same opportunities as their more advantaged peers. Beginning with the original supplement-not-supplant provision in 1970, the federal government has had a responsibility to enforce this requirement of the law. Today’s ESSA is no different.

Districts have historically shown compliance with the supplement-not-supplant requirement by showing that every service purchased with Title I funds was supplemental and would not have been provided absent the Title I funds. This means that districts often limited their spending to programs that they could easily show were supplemental, such as pulling kids out of class for additional instruction, but that were not necessarily the most impactful.

The new law stops the short-sighted practice of making districts justify every purchase. Now districts must demonstrate that their methods of funding make sure that poor schools get their fair share.

Recognizing that historical funding inequities are a problem without an easy solution, the U.S. Department of Education provides in its proposed regulation multiple options for districts to demonstrate compliance, including allowing states to develop their own compliance test. The proposal also includes additional flexibility for districts with schools serving a lot of students with disabilities or English learners, those with small schools, and those with a single school. What’s more, the proposed regulations give districts additional time to comply, so they can phase in any changes needed to ensure that poor schools are getting their fair share.

While this change will require extra efforts, it does not mean districts must use completely new strategies to distribute school funding. Under the proposal, more than 90 percent of districts would already be in compliance with supplement not supplant. However, we cannot rest on our laurels. Those remaining 10 percent or so of districts must do the hard work of showing that they are fairly supporting poor schools with state and local funds before the addition of federal dollars.

But it’s worth it. Funding inequities for vulnerable children remain, and we must close this gap because money matters, especially to students from low-income families. The department’s regulations, which provide flexible options and time to comply, give districts the opportunity to be thoughtful about investing as part of a broader plan to support students who are most in need.

#### Current Title 1 misallocates resources and spurs inequality

**Moffitt,** Mary Tefft and John Hazen White Senior Assistant Professor of Political Science and Public Policy at Brown University, **2016**

(Susan L., “The State of Educational Improvement: The Legacy of ESEA Title I”, History of Education Quarterly, May 2016, Vol. 56, No. 2, accessed 7/3/17, GDI-JG)

4. Financing public education. Inequalities that emerge through the state and local control of education-related finances provide a fourth inherited challenge. Title I of the ESEA aims to reduce inequality of ed- ucational outcomes, yet it is overlaid on patterns of unequal interstate, intrastate, and intradistrict allocation of educational resources that cre- ated enormous inequality in the distribution of educational resources and thus educational opportunity.16 ESEA Title I layers on top of these inequalities and has done little to correct those fundamental patterns.

#### Status quo funding isn’t equitable—that decreases resources for schools serving disadvantaged students

**Chingos**, Senior Fellow, The Urban Institute, and Director, Education Policy Program, The Urban Institute, **2017**

(Matthew M., "How progressive is school funding in the United States?", Brookings, June 15, 2017, https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-progressive-is-school-funding-in-the-united-states/, accessed 7/8/17, GDI-JG)

But there are good reasons to believe that it is more expensive to provide the same quality of education to disadvantaged children—in other words, funding that is equal may not be equitable. For example, schools serving disadvantaged children likely find it harder (or more expensive) to recruit and retain high-quality teachers.[4] Additionally, poor children may have higher rates of disabilities or social service needs that require resources to appropriately address.∂ From this perspective, the fact that overall funding progressivity remains low despite two decades of reforms enacted by courts and state legislatures suggests a troubling lack of progress on equitable funding of public schools. This finding is consistent with our state-level analysis, which shows that states where the distribution of education funding is strongly progressive are the exception rather than the norm.∂ These descriptive findings based on district-level data can only depict patterns of school funding in broad strokes. They do not tell us how funding should be distributed, or even how it is currently distributed across different schools within the same district.[5] In the meantime, the available evidence provides compelling reasons for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners to pay careful attention to how much education funding is available, how it is distributed, and how it is spent.

## Title I Flawed – Comparability loophole

### ESSA leaves in place comparability loopholes

#### Effort and comparability standards unchanged by ESSA – means comparability requirement judged based on spending per student not number of teachers per student

**Knight,** Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. <http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/_Files/docs/papers/CERPS_Working_Paper_2016_2.pdf> accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

The federal government ensures Title I funding reaches the intended students through three requirements: (a) maintenance of effort; (b) comparability; and (c) supplement, not supplant.4 Maintenance of effort implies that no states or districts can decrease total or per-pupil funding by more than 10% from the prior year. ESSA makes no major changes to the maintenance of effort requirement.

Comparability requires districts to staff Title I schools with equal or more instructional staff per pupil compared to non-Title I schools. However, because more experienced teachers typically sort into more advantaged schools within districts (Clotfelter, Ladd, Vigdor & Wheeler, 2006; Goldhaber, Lavery & Theobald, 2015) and more experienced teachers earn higher salaries, comparability in pupil-staff ratios may not imply comparability in spending on instructional staff members (Haxton et al., 2012). Over the past decade, DOE representatives have argued that comparability should be judged based on spending on teachers per student, rather than simply the number of teachers or staff members per student (Government Accountability Office, 2011; Hanna, Marchitello & Brown, 2015; Heuer & Stullich, 2011; National School Board Association, 2013). While the DOE has used the enactment of ESSA to push for equalized spending on teacher salaries between Title I and non-Title I schools, ESSA makes no changes to the statutory language of the comparability requirement and the DOE has not suggested changes to the methods in which districts meet the comparability requirement.

### Comparability loopholes – teacher funding disparities

#### Comparability loopholes incentivizes teacher funding shenanigans

**Knight,** Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. <http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/_Files/docs/papers/CERPS_Working_Paper_2016_2.pdf> accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

Over the past four decades, policymakers in the Department to Education (DOE) have enacted various regulations to encourage school districts to allocate funding equitably across schools. Local school districts that meet certain eligibility requirements for receiving Title I funding are required to identify the “Title I schools” that will receive federal funds. Based on those classifications, the DOE currently requires districts to staff Title I schools with at least as many instructional personnel per student as non-Title I schools (the “Comparability Rule”). This policy is meant to ensure that districts will allocate federal funding equitably across schools.

However, in most cases, the highest-poverty schools within each district have higher teacher attrition rates and, as a result, the least experienced teaching staff (Goldhaber, Lavery & Theobald, 2015). Because districts typically use standardized salary schedules that offer higher compensation to more experienced teachers, districts that use equal staffing ratios across schools actually allocate less teacher salary funding per student to the highest-poverty schools. The “comparability loophole” refers to the lack of any requirement that districts spend equal dollars per student across Title I and non-Title I schools (Hanna, Marchitello, & Brown, 2015; McClure, 2008; Roza, 2008; Roza, Miller & Hill, 2008). A controversial policy that the DOE has pushed for, both historically and during the current rulemaking process required to implement ESSA, would mandate districts to equalize spending on teacher salaries between Title I and non-Title I schools.

#### Low-income students face inadequate funding— salaries calculations proves

**Liebman,** Simon H. Rifkin Professor, Columbia Law School, **and Mbikiwa,** Attorney, the High Court of South Africa, **2017**

(James S. and Michael, “EVERY DOLLAR COUNTS: IN DEFENSE OF THE OBAMA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S "SUPPLE-MENT NOT SUPPLANT" PROPOSAL”, Columbia Law Review Online, March 1, 2017, accessed via LexisNexis, accessed 7/14/17, GDI-JG)

It is well established that children from low-income families need more funds to succeed in schools than their more privileged counterparts. n89 Working from this premise, Congress designed Title I to provide compensatory funds to poor children. Since then, in the face of various attempts to undermine this goal, amendments to Title I have stood by this core principle, including by insisting that districts use Title I funds to supplement, not supplant, local funds for disadvantaged children.∂ Today, poor children face yet another threat to Title I's compensatory purpose: efforts to read the caveat barring the counting of teacher salaries for purposes of "comparability of services" into the rule requiring districts to supplement not supplant local with federal funds"--even though Congress has omitted that caveat from the "supplement not sup-plant" requirement for fifty years. Relying on this unpersuasive interpretation, and exploiting the difficulty of proving a subjective motivation to underspend on Title I schools, some districts seek to exclude from "supplement not supplant" consideration the many millions of dollars they spend on the salaries of their most effective and experienced teachers, who are disproportionately deployed to economically privileged non-Title I schools. If allowed to persist, this strata-gem will continue providing many fewer local dollars to Title I schools than to other schools, in direct violation of Title I's compensatory purpose.∂ To preserve Title I's compensatory purpose, the Department of Education in 2016 crafted a reasonable proposed regulation, which used a long-established and well-respected method of identifying actions taken pursuant to an unlaw-ful motivation--in this case, a motivation to supplant local with federal funds. It is unsurprising that the regulation came under fire from partisan constituencies aiming to preserve the local funds districts have been diverting to econom-ically advantaged schools by concentrating their most experienced and effective teachers there and not counting the extra dollars they spend on those teachers. It is surprising, however--and regrettable--that the nonpartisan CRS lent conse-quential aid and comfort to this effort through poor legal reasoning--reasoning the Obama administration likely consid-ered when abandoning this important proposal.

## Title – State waivers school wide programs

#### School wide programming qualification changes – states can request waivers to spend on school wide programs without 40% requirement

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

A second change in ESSA relates to the schoolwide provision. Under the No Child Left Behind Act, schools could use Title I funding for schoolwide purposes if at least 40% of students qualified as low-income. Schools receiving Title I funding that did not have more than 40% of students qualify for funding were required to spend the funding specifically on academically struggling students. Schools could target funding by providing those students with, for example, smaller class sizes, after school programs, targeted professional development for their teachers, or some other targeted intervention. ESSA would permit states to apply for waivers that would allow schools to use Title I funding on schoolwide purposes, regardless of whether those schools met the 40% threshold.

In summary, ESSA may lead to two primary changes in the way Title I funding is allocated and regulated. The law could lead to a change in the SNS requirement from equal staff members per pupil between Title I and non-Title I schools to equal spending on teachers between the two school types. States may also receive waivers from the regulation that prohibits Title I schools with fewer than 40% of students in poverty from spending Title I funding on schoolwide programs.

#### Increased access to waivers may increase title I acceptance from schools, decreasing available resources

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

Not all schools that districts determine are eligible for Title I provide the program. Of the schools eligible for Targeted Assistance programs, only 62% actually provide the program (and 38% do not provide a Title I program). About 78% of schools eligible for the Schoolwide program actually use the program and 6% choose instead to use the Targeted Assistance program (and the other 16% do not provide a Title I program, see Table 2). Schools eligible for the Schoolwide program are more likely to provide the Targeted Assistance program when they have lower enrollment, lower percent of students of color, and when more schools in the same district also use the Targeted Assistance program instead of the Schoolwide program.7 About 17% of all schools are eligible for the Targeted Assistance program and would therefore be impacted by the waivers that may be available through ESSA. As noted earlier, a potential change in ESSA may allow Targeted Assistance schools to operate Schoolwide programs if their state acquires a special waiver. An open question is whether those schools that are eligible for, but do not use the Targeted Assistance program, would accept Title I funds if given the opportunity to use the Schoolwide program. This change would cause districts’ Title I funding to be spread more thinly across schools.8

## Title I Flawed – Supplement no Supplant

### U – ESSA gives DOE power to decide SNS standards

#### DOE rulemaking power on supplement not supplant - current proposals to increase per pupil funding rejected

**Malkus, research fellow in education policy studies at the American Enterprise Institute, 17** (Nat “Ask DeVos about Title I funding” AEI 17-1-17 <https://www.aei.org/publication/ask-devos-about-title-i-funding/>, 7-3-17, GDI-JIJD)

In today’s confirmation hearing for President-elect Donald Trump’s nominee for U.S. secretary of education, Betsy DeVos will undoubtedly be grilled about her position on school choice. Given DeVos’ long history of advocating for school choice and Trump’s proposed $20 billion investment in it, her pointed position deserves a full discussion. However, the bulk of the secretary’s responsibilities will center around traditional public schools, and the knotty issues directly impacting those schools should not be lost in the shuffle. DeVos is poised to take the helm at the U.S. Department of Education at a particularly busy time, as the department must figure out how to implement many aspects of the 2015 Every Student Succeeds Act before next school year. A key issue DeVos will likely have to decide soon is the act’s supplement-not-supplant rule. That rule is meant to ensure that federal Title I funds intended to help low-income students are added on top of (supplement) local funds and not used to backfill (supplant) inequitable local funding. Last summer, there was an uproar over then-Secretary John King’s apparent intention, in defiance of congressional will, to issue a rule that would have significant disruptive effects on districts across the nation. Leading up to the election, many anticipated that King would issue his controversial regulation. But the Education Department has still not made a ruling, and unless it releases one in the next three days, it will become Betsy DeVos’ problem. Supplement-not-supplant runs up against a thorny equity problem for Title I schools – high-poverty schools that receive supplemental federal funding – which often receive less local funding than other district schools. These funding disparities occur within districts because of three interconnected facts. First, most district spending goes to teachers’ salaries and benefits. Second, districts pay teachers, and send teachers, not dollars, to local schools. Third, Title I schools tend to have less experienced, and therefore lower salaried, teachers. Under this common arrangement, fewer local dollars per students end up in Title I schools, even if all district schools receive the same numbers of teachers per student. The equity issue is largely moot if schools are compared by how many teachers a school receives per student. Comparing schools in dollars spent, which would include these salary differences, results in significant and persistent funding differences between Title I and non-Title I schools. Federal education law has long allowed districts to satisfy its supplement-not-supplant provision by showing similar staffing allocations, purposefully avoiding comparisons in dollar terms and tacitly allowing spending inequities. When Congress debated and passed the Every Student Succeeds Act in 2015, this issue was a sticking point that went unresolved. Congress left it up to the Education Department to negotiate a new supplement-not-supplant rule so long as it did not prescribe a specific methodology or require equalized spending. Despite congressional guardrails, King proposed a rule that would require districts to spend at least as many dollars per pupil in Title I schools as are spent in non-Title I schools. While the proposed rule sounded reasonable and was well-intended, many groups, including congressional Republicans, governors, teachers’ unions and district leaders, opposed it. Because most school spending is spent on teachers, in practice the rule could prove very disruptive, require forced transfer of teachers to Title I schools, upend teacher compensation systems and collective bargaining agreements or necessitate billions of dollars in new funding. Opponents are breathing ever easier as King nears the end of his term without having issued his proposed rule. 1 However, DeVos will face a choice similar to King’s, between two lousy options. A rule that required equalized spending would be disruptive for hundreds of large districts serving hundreds of thousands of students. One that didn’t would be unlikely to make significant changes to longstanding funding inequities shortchanging hundreds of thousands of disadvantaged kids. The supplement-not-supplant dilemma is reflective of many of the tough calls the secretary of education will have to make. The rule deals with a substantial and complex problem rooted in the structure of public schools – in the way districts are funded, in how teachers are hired and paid, in thousands of collective bargaining agreements, affecting thousands of teachers’ work-life decisions and the prospects of untold numbers of students. On top of that complexity, the secretary has limited influence over how state and local authorities run public schools, leaving her with unenviable choices like doing something that won’t work well or doing nothing at all. DeVos can certainly promote school choice as secretary, but the bulk of her responsibility will remain with traditional public schools. At her confirmation hearing, senators may learn more about how DeVos will approach her work as secretary, both for choice and for public schools, by asking about how she will deal with issues like supplement-not-supplant, where there are few good choices and no easy answers.

#### DeVos won’t implement SNS rule propsed under Obama

Hart, Administrators at Truth in American Education, 17 (Shane Vander, “Supplement Not Supplant Is Dead”, Truth in American Education, 1-19-17, <https://truthinamericaneducation.com/elementary-and-secondary-education-act/supplement-not-supplant-dead/>, 7-4-17, GDI-JIJD)

The U.S. Department of Education yesterday killed their draft rule for Title I funding in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) known as “Supplement, Not Supplant.” It’s not an issue that we’ve written a whole lot on here, but it highlighted one way that the Secretary of Education could gut any flexibility members of Congress thought they had when they passed ESSA. If you were not familiar with the rule it basically said that in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as recently revised by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), that federal funds must supplement, and may not supplant, state and local funds. Civil rights activists and department bureaucrats were concerned that federal funding would replace state and local funding to the detriment of lower-income schools. “For too long, the students who need the most have gotten the least,” said U.S. Secretary of Education John B. King Jr said in a released statement announcing the proposed rule last Summer. “The inequities in state and local funding that we see between schools within districts are inconsistent not only with the words ‘supplement-not-supplant’ but with the civil rights history of that provision and with the changes Congress made to the law last year. No single measure will erase generations of resource inequities, and there is much more work to do across states and districts to address additional resource inequities, but this is a concrete step forward to help level the playing field and ensure compliance with the law.” Betsy DeVos, President-elect Donald Trump’s nominee for Secretary of Education, during her confirmation hearing on Tuesday also expressed concern with this proposed rule and promised to enforce ESSA in way that “Congress has intended.”

### ESSA – SNS changes

#### ESSA gives states flex to determine SNS compliance – no cost by cost possible

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

Instead, the DOE has pushed for equalized spending on teachers between Title I and non- Title I schools through the supplement, not supplant (SNS) requirement (Gordon, 2016). Under SNS, federal dollars may not be used for purposes that state law already requires schools to spend money on – federal dollars must supplement, not supplant, state and local dollars.

Determining how districts would fund schools in the absence of Title I is not straightforward. In previous iterations of the federal education law (ESEA, later reauthorized as the No Child Left Behind Act), schools demonstrated compliance with SNS by reporting, on a cost-by-cost basis, what was purchased with Title I funds. Past research has shown that because funds allocated to the core instructional program are difficult to justify as “extra” or supplemental, most schools choose instead to use Title I funding for external programs (Gordon, 2016). The result is that schools create fragmented budgets that allocate Title I funding to ineffective add-on programs or special pull-out programs that remove high-needs students from the mainstream curriculum (Gordon & Reber, 2015).

The SNS regulation is substantially changed under ESSA. Congress now prohibits the requirement that districts provide a cost-by-cost basis of Title I spending to show compliance with SNS. Instead, ESSA allows states and districts to design their own methodology to determine whether the SNS requirement is met. The goal of this change is to remove the burdensome reporting requirements under SNS, while maintaining some degree of accountability. While federal lawmakers left final determination of the general compliance requirements up to the DOE, congress included language prohibiting the DOE from prescribing “the specific methodology a local educational agency uses to allocate state and local funds to each school receiving assistance,” (ESSA, 2015). The DOE has used this limited authority to argue that districts should be required to prove compliance with SNS by showing equal average state and local per-pupil expenditures on teacher salaries between Title I and non-Title I schools. Members of Congress have pushed back on the DOE interpretation of ESSA, arguing that requiring equal expenditures is too stringent (Gordon & Reber, 2015).

### SNS – misallocation of Title I funds

#### Supplement-not-supplant policy undermines proper allocation of Title 1 resources

**Gordon,** Nonresident Senior Fellow, Economic Studies, Center on Children and Families, Brookings Institution, **2016**

(Nora, “What you need to know about ED’s proposed rule on Title I supplement-not-supplant”, Brookings, October 21, 2016, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2016/10/21/what-you-need-to-know-about-eds-proposed-rule-on-title-i-supplement-not-supplant-sns/>, accessed 7/8/17, GDI-JG)

That’s because the rule on its own does not solve the problem motivating it—that poor kids don’t have equal access to good schools, not just high-spending ones. Requiring that districts move closer to equal spending across schools, as the proposed rule does, may simply shift high-cost, but less effective resources to students in need.∂ High-poverty schools—many of which are not served by Title I—spend less than richer schools. As Sec. John King told Michel Martin of NPR, differences in teacher experience levels (and therefore, differences in salary) are “a very large driver” of such school spending gaps. The lower average teacher experience levels in high poverty schools stem from their higher rates of teacher turnover, itself a symptom of a bigger problem: research shows that teacher turnover is related to problems with school leadership.∂ Sending more money to schools with high turnover would change funding gaps, but won’t necessarily change school leadership gaps or teacher effectiveness gaps. It’s very likely that these new funds would come in the form of experienced teachers from elsewhere in the district—who, as I’ve explained here, the district is contractually obligated to employ somewhere, but may well be expensive without being good.∂ Even more perversely, the proposed rule would actively work against districts that want transparent and consistent resource allocation systems. Instead, districts would have to do significant parts of their budgeting in an ad hoc manner to make the numbers come out right each and every year.∂ The rule also could prompt districts to change which of their eligible schools participate in Title I: a district’s total allocation of Title I funds is set according to student, not school characteristics, and districts themselves have considerable discretion over how much to concentrate those funds in their poorest schools or to spread them more thinly over more schools. Different districts choose different strategies: according to NCES Public School Universe data, thousands of Title I schools nationally have fewer than a third of their students eligible for free lunch, while at the same time thousands of non-Title I schools have over half their students eligible. The proposed rule wouldn’t change the amount of discretion districts have over Title I participation at the school level, but could mean that compliance concerns, rather than educational ones, dictate the choice.

# Solvency – Title I Formula Changes

## Solvency – comparability loophole

### Close loophole – increases overall funding

#### Closing the Comparability Loophole Solves Educational Inequality – stimulates state and local funding

Hanna, Center for American Progress Senior Policy Analyst et al. 15 (Robert Hanna, Max Marchitello, and Catherine Brown, “Comparable but Unequal: School Funding Disparities” Center For Amerian Progress, 3-11-15, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/03/11/107985/comparable-but-unequal/ 7-6-17, GDI-JIJD)

Students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds deserve the same opportunities at their peers from higher-income families. Notwithstanding the fact that comparability is the law of the land, the way districts comply with the provision undermines its true intent. Under the current fiscal policy, districts can spend less of their own state and local dollars on the schools with the highest needs, and most do spend millions of dollars less in these schools. Therefore, Congress should close the comparability loophole by requiring that districts fund their Title I schools at the same level as or higher than—based on actual spending—their other schools.

To truly address the problem of fiscal inequity, Congress must seize this opportunity to close the comparability loophole. An improved comparability provision could go a long way toward ensuring that all low-income students get their fair share of state and local funding.

### Real dollar expenditure measures solve

#### Phased in shift to actual expenditures addresses education gaps

Hanna, Center for American Progress Senior Policy Analyst et al. 15 (Robert Hanna, Max Marchitello, and Catherine Brown, “Comparable but Unequal: School Funding Disparities” Center For Amerian Progress, 3-11-15, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/03/11/107985/comparable-but-unequal/ 7-6-17, GDI-JIJD)

The comparability calculation must be based on actual expenditures, including actual teacher salaries.¶ Districts should be required to achieve comparability between Title I and non-Title I schools only by demonstrating that Title I schools receive state and local funding that is at least equal to the average of the district’s non-Title I schools.¶ Districts that serve only Title I schools must show that higher-poverty schools receive no less than the average total of state and local funds for lower-poverty schools.¶ Under current guidance from the U.S. Department of Education, districts can demonstrate comparability at the 90 percent level. In other words, districts can claim that they spend comparable amounts at Title I schools as long as those schools provide at least 90 percent of services offered in other schools. Districts can interpret that percentage as a ceiling not a floor. The department’s guidance should not allow for this amount of leeway.¶ Some have argued that the only way for districts to close the comparability gap is to force experienced teachers to transfer to high-poverty schools, which typically employ teachers with fewer years of experience and lower salaries. In fact, states and districts could provide a host of additional resources to the high-poverty schools and leave the staffing distribution as is. By purchasing the kind of enrichment activities listed in the “What could $668,900 buy?” text box above, districts would comply with the requirement.¶ In addition, districts could change their compensation systems to reward effectiveness instead of seniority or educational degree attainment. In this way, districts can pay highly effective teachers more, particularly those working in schools serving high concentrations of low-income students. With more highly effective teachers clustered in high-poverty schools, these districts could close the comparability gap through supporting highly effective teachers in these schools rather than forcing teachers to move to high-poverty schools.¶ At the same time, actually achieving comparability given that schools have been inequitably funded throughout history will not be easy. That is why Congress should require meaningful compliance with the comparability provision to be phased in gradually. Priority would first be given to the schools that have been most egregiously shortchanged. Full compliance would be required within five years. The following timetable would serve that end:¶ Year one: All districts must publicly report all expenditures by school level. These facts must be made available in an easy-to-read format that is available to the public. The report must also include the percentage of students eligible to receive free and reduced-price lunches. In each subsequent year, the district continues to report this data.¶ Year two: States and districts begin to fill in funding gaps. States would rank their Title I schools by per-pupil expenditures and ensure that the lowest-spending 25 percent of schools are funded to at least 100 percent of the average level of their districts’ comparison schools. These gaps could be closed through state or local actions or a combination of both.¶ Year three: States ensure that the lowest-spending 50 percent of Title I schools are funded to at least 100 percent of the average level of their districts’ comparison schools.¶ Year four: States ensure that the lowest-spending 75 percent of Title I schools are funded to at least 100 percent of the average level of their districts’ comparison schools.¶ Year five: States ensure that all Title I schools are funded at least to the level of the average of their districts’ comparison schools.¶ Under current law, districts already risk losing their Title I dollars if they fail to comply with comparability requirements. Congress should expand this provision to hold states accountable for the gaps outlined above as well. Here, the guiding principle is that states hold the ultimate responsibility for operating inequitable funding systems. Specifically, states should risk losing their full allocation of Title I dollars each year that they fail to keep on track with the above timeline. This arrangement would be a strong deterrent to states and districts that wish to continue their current approaches to funding their most disadvantaged schools. Nationally, this amounts to a reasonable trade-off. For example, we found that in the second year—the first year of narrowing comparability gaps—states and districts would be responsible for closing gaps by around $2.3 billion in exchange for receiving more than $14.6 billion in federal Title I funds.

#### \*Creating Title I Transparency Solves Resource Allocation and Creates Results – real dollar expenditures better measure of comparability

Miller **K-12 Education Researcher, Research Director FutureEd** 12 (Reagan, Frederick M. Hess, Cynthia G. Brown, “Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Offers a New Chance to Improve Education”, Center for American Progress, 3-6-12, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2012/03/06/11315/reauthorization-of-the-elementary-and-secondary-education-act-offers-a-new-chance-to-improve-education/>, 7-4-17, JIJD-GDI)

Jennifer Cohen of the New America Foundation and CAP’s Raegen Miller, by shedding light on Title I’s comparability requirement, point out that some of the nation’s poorest schools are being shortchanged when it comes to funding. In their paper, “Evidence of the Effects of the Title I Comparability Loophole,” using a dataset including school-level expenditures and other information on 2,500 Florida schools over seven years, the authors find compelling evidence that high-poverty schools tend to enjoy fewer state and local resources, when measured in actual dollars per pupil, than low-poverty schools in the same districts. These findings corroborate existing research on school-level expenditure patterns, and they are utterly unremarkable given that the majority of school funds go to teacher salary. Salary closely tracks teacher experience, and experienced teachers tend to migrate to the low-poverty schools in their districts in search of better working conditions. Yet the findings are remarkable in that they have no bearing on whether districts in Florida are in compliance with the Title I comparability requirement. The reason for this seeming contradiction is that the existing requirement specifically excludes salary differentials due to teacher experience in determinations about whether a district’s Title I and non-Title I schools receive reasonably comparable shares of state and local resources. We see this exclusion as a form of dishonesty. And while we differ on what federal policymakers should do to redress districts’ failures when it comes to comparability, we agree on how comparability should be assessed. Accordingly, we jointly embrace two of the recommendations advanced by Cohen and Miller: Districts should annually report school-level expenditures to the Department of Education. These school-level expenditure figures in actual dollars—including all dollars devoted to teacher salary, as experience differentials or otherwise—should be used as the basis for comparability determinations. It is important to make clear that together we take no further stance on the manner of comparability determinations or on what consequences should befall a district that fails to ensure comparable services in Title I and non-Title I schools. Our recommendations above are strictly meant to foster transparency in government and simple “truth in advertising.” Further, policymakers should leverage momentum toward greater transparency in education funding created by a one-time reporting requirement embedded in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The Department of Education’s analyses of the school-level expenditure data gathered under the Recovery Act highlighted difficulties that some districts and states had in producing what should be routinely available numbers. That’s reason enough to keep collecting these data, which also happen to show that the patterns detected by Cohen and Miller in Florida are widespread. In an era of chronic fiscal challenges, school leaders, district officials, and policymakers need to become accustomed to asking tough questions about resource allocation. Yet traditional budgeting and reporting practices—allocating staff instead of actual dollars and reporting district-level averages instead of school-level figures—shield the parties from operating with data of appropriate granularity or validity. And relatedly, yielding substantial gains in student achievement will require that districts allocate resources more strategically—with an eye toward results rather than what’s politically expedient. An annual appraisal of how resources are allocated to schools, where the rubber hits the road, is a prerequisite for strategic-resource allocation.

### Solvency – in person quality reviews for compliance

#### School quality reviews solve better for compliance under ESSA

Aldeman, principal at Bellwether Education Partners, working on Policy and Thought Leadership, 16 (Chad, “Grading Schools”, Bellwether Education Partners, 10/16, <https://bellwethereducation.org/sites/default/files/Bellwether_GradingSchools_FINAL.pdf>, 7-6-17, JIJD-GDI)

After a decade under the No Child Left Behind Act and several more years of large-scale waivers from NCLB, states now have the time and the opportunity to design their own accountability systems. There are reasons to be concerned about how that might go. The easiest thing for states to do will be to simply tweak their existing accountability systems into a sort of NCLB-lite. But we know what will happen under this approach. When states identify “low-performing” schools only by where their students end up, they’re much more likely to pinpoint places where students enter school further behind—whether because of weaknesses in their prior schools or lack of access to quality early learning before starting school. Continuing to place too much emphasis on particular grades and subjects will detract from other societal goals for public schools.¶ States have also struggled to make the leap from identifying schools for improvement to actually helping them to improve. NCLB was not particularly nuanced on this front. It forced states to identify for improvement any school where any subgroup of students was underperforming, but then it applied the same list of interventions regardless of why the school was identified.¶ The system outlined above would represent a break from that past. It would still use test scores, which remain one of the cheapest, most reliable ways to determine student performance on a grand scale. But states should use those test scores in smarter ways, make sure they’re capturing progress over time, and rely on test results merely as a flag for further investigation. This paper proposes intensive, on-site school quality reviews as a way to accomplish all the other objectives of accountability systems.¶ While ESSA’s requirements fit more neatly with numeric school rating systems, there are reasons to think school quality reviews could (or at least should) pass muster with federal officials. For example, there is evidence that school quality reviews can provide a reasonable amount of differentiation across schools. As of the most recent data from England, 18 percent of primary schools were rated “Outstanding,” 67 percent were rated “Good,” 14 percent rated “Requires Improvement,” and 1 percent were rated “Inadequate.”19 This spread suggests reviewers are able to tell the difference between a great school and one that’s merely mediocre, and one that may have a few flaws versus one that needs more wholesale reform. As in England, states would need to periodically evaluate their results to ensure they were sufficiently differentiating across schools.¶ School quality reviews could also be tailored to investigate how schools were working for particular groups of students. This “disaggregation” would look different under a qualitative system like on-site reviews, but even the British model includes a separate indicator for “outcomes for individuals and groups of pupils.” Applied here, states would expand that indicator and disaggregate school quality as received by subgroups of students. If, for example, the reviewers observed that Hispanic students were disproportionately assigned to classes where low-quality instruction occurred, that would register in the report as an issue the school should address. Similarly, the on-site reviews already include student interviews, and in this context they could over-sample particular groups of students for those conversations.

## Solvency – Change concentration grants

#### Concentrated funding flaw undermine the effectiveness of Title I – reforms to increase targeting at high poverty school districts solves

Boser and Brown,founding director of American Progress’ science of learning initiative, 15 (Ulrich, “5 Key Principles to Guide Consideration of any ESEA Title I Formula Change”, Center for American Progress, July 7 2015, <https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/ESEA-brief.pdf>, July 3rd 2017; GDI AC)

Title I dollars are often spread too thinly. Wealthy and middle-class areas such as Palo Alto, California, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, Arlington, Virginia, and Melrose, Massachusetts, all receive Title I dollars. So do districts serving only a dozen children from poor families, such as Robein, Illinois, and Milnor, North Dakota.6 In fact, a full 67 percent of schools nationwide receive Title I funds despite the fact that the program is designed to help needy students receive a better education.7 ¶ Title I dollars are dispersed widely in part because schools can receive the funding even if they only serve a few students in poverty. Under current law, Basic grants allocate federal dollars to districts solely based on the number of children living in poverty. So a district such as Cedar Bluffs, Nebraska, receives federal dollars for its 10 poor children even though those children live in a community where the child- poverty rate is less than 5 percent.8 ¶ 4 Center for American Progress | 5 Key Principles to Guide Consideration of any ESEA Title I Formula Change¶ This wide dispersion of Title I dollars is a problem. Significant amounts of research shows that it is not just poverty that limits a student’s life outcomes; living in high-poverty areas and attending school among other poor students—in other words, concentrated poverty—have significant effects as well. It has also been shown that money has the greatest impact when it is invested in improving the education of low-income students who come to school with the greatest needs when compared to their more affluent peers.9 And although there are poor students in many—if not most—schools, schools serving more affluent populations have larger budgets overall. More affluent schools are better positioned to afford compensatory services for low-income students without the need for Title I support. ¶ Moreover, the purpose of ESEA is to compensate for the fact that schools in higherincome areas typically have larger budgets than schools in low-income communities. By sending limited Title I funds to middle-class and affluent areas, the formula undermines its basic intent.¶ A better approach would be to exclude affluent districts from Title I eligibility, thus making more funds available for students living in concentrated poverty. Federal money would have a bigger impact if it were more targeted to schools with a greater percentage of students in need. This point is particularly important to keep in mind during any sort of formula debate. For lawmakers, there is good reason to spread the wealth, but the purpose of the program is to help create a level playing field for schools with large numbers of low-income students.

#### **Title I reforms would distribute funds so that students living in high concentrated poverty would receive most benefits like the program intended**

Boser & Brown, 15, Vice President of Education Policy at American Progress [Ulrich & Catherine; 7-7-2015, American Progress "5 Key Principles to Guide Consideration of any ESEA Title I Formula Change," Center for American Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/07/07/116696/5-key-principles-to-guide-consideration-of-any-esea-title-i-formula-change/> ; RJC]

2. Ensure money supports students living in areas of concentrated poverty

Title I dollars are often spread too thinly. Wealthy and middle-class areas such as Palo Alto, California, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York, Arlington, Virginia, and Melrose, Massachusetts, all receive Title I dollars. So do districts serving only a dozen children from poor families, such as Robein, Illinois, and Milnor, North Dakota. In fact, a full 67 percent of schools nationwide receive Title I funds despite the fact that the program is designed to help needy students receive a better education.

Title I dollars are dispersed widely in part because schools can receive the funding even if they only serve a few students in poverty. Under current law, Basic grants allocate federal dollars to districts solely based on the number of children living in poverty. So a district such as Cedar Bluffs, Nebraska, receives federal dollars for its 10 poor children even though those children live in a community where the child- poverty rate is less than 5 percent.

This wide dispersion of Title I dollars is a problem. Significant amounts of research shows that it is not just poverty that limits a student’s life outcomes; living in high-poverty areas and attending school among other poor students—in other words, concentrated poverty—have significant effects as well. It has also been shown that money has the greatest impact when it is invested in improving the education of low-income students who come to school with the greatest needs when compared to their more affluent peers. And although there are poor students in many—if not most—schools, schools serving more affluent populations have larger budgets overall. More affluent schools are better positioned to afford compensatory services for low-income students without the need for Title I support.

Moreover, the purpose of ESEA is to compensate for the fact that schools in higher-income areas typically have larger budgets than schools in low-income communities. By sending limited Title I funds to middle-class and affluent areas, the formula undermines its basic intent.

A better approach would be to exclude affluent districts from Title I eligibility, thus making more funds available for students living in concentrated poverty. Federal money would have a bigger impact if it were more targeted to schools with a greater percentage of students in need. This point is particularly important to keep in mind during any sort of formula debate. For lawmakers, there is good reason to spread the wealth, but the purpose of the program is to help create a level playing field for schools with large numbers of low-income students.

## Solvency – Fair Funding reforms

#### Using fair funding incentive grants provides resources for disadvantaged students

**CAP Education Policy Team, 2015**

(Center for American Progress, “A Fresh Look at School Funding”, May 18, 2015, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/05/18/113397/a-fresh-look-at-school-funding/>, accessed 7/3/17, GDI-JG)

President Barack Obama’s budget for fiscal year 2016 requested an additional $1 billion for Title I in order to provide additional resources to states and districts that would support implementation of key reform efforts. These new resources are sorely needed, but they should be specifically targeted to help states move toward progressive funding systems that would close the resource gaps between high- and low-income districts that have been created by inequitable state school finance systems.∂ CAP’s proposal would make the $1 billion available in new funding under Title I for Fair Funding Incentive Grants to be distributed to states; states would then distribute the funds to districts via the existing Title I formula. The grants would provide additional administrative funds for states to develop and implement progressive funding systems. To be eligible to receive a grant under this new funding stream, states would need to commit to match their grant amount with state funds that are directed at inequitably funded low-income districts in order to close across-district funding gaps. This match requirement would be waived for states that can demonstrate that all low-income districts spend more state and local funds than all high-income districts. All states would be required to either continue to match the grant amount with state funds on an annual basis or implement fully progressive funding systems that provide more resources to low-income districts than high-income districts. If this requirement were not met, the state would lose access to the additional funding. States would also publicly report on gaps in actual expenditures between high- and low-income districts and disclose whether these gaps are closing.∂ In addition to receiving a Fair Funding Incentive Grant, states that do not yet have progressive funding systems but commit to develop and implement such systems within five years would receive the authority to reserve an additional 1 percent of their total Title I funding for state-level activities to support these systems. These states would need to demonstrate progress toward increasing funding equity in order to continue to receive these additional funds.∂ Providing additional resources for low-income schools through an increase in the Title I program would be a good step for Congress to take toward ensuring that disadvantaged students have the supplemental resources they need to achieve at high levels. However, using these additional resources to create incentives for states to contribute additional state funds toward the goal of equitably funding their low-income districts would make these federal resources even more effective.

## Solvency – increase funding

#### School funding reforms spur achievement and attainment for disadvantaged students—studies prove

**Chingos**, Senior Fellow, The Urban Institute, and Director, Education Policy Program, The Urban Institute, **2017**

(Matthew M., "How progressive is school funding in the United States?", Brookings, June 15, 2017, https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-progressive-is-school-funding-in-the-united-states/, accessed 7/8/17, GDI-JG)

Policymakers, advocates, and the public have long been concerned with inequities in funding levels between schools attended by students from low-income families and their more affluent peers. School funding has received increased attention in recent years as multiple high-quality studies have found that school funding reforms initiated by courts and state legislatures improved the outcomes of disadvantaged students, both in terms of academic achievement (test scores) and attainment (high school graduation and college enrollment).[1]

#### Title I helps needy students – quality teachers, enrichment programs, and additional tech

Korry, staff writer at Youth Today, 2016

(Elaine, “High-Poverty School Districts Shortchanged by Title I” Youth Today, October 11, <http://youthtoday.org/2016/10/high-poverty-school-districts-shortchanged-by-title-i/>, accessed 7-5-17, GDI-RH)

Under a complicated formula based on poverty, roughly one-third of Barstow pupils (31.3 percent) are eligible for special funding under Title I of the Elementary & Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The law, passed in 1965 as part of Lyndon Johnson’s War on Poverty, supplements state and local education funding to bolster students who are at risk of failing academically. Last year, according to U.S. Department of Education figures, the Barstow school district received more than $2 million from Title I, which breaks down to $995 per eligible pupil — money Malan used to address achievement gaps. “One of the best uses of Title I funds is for quality teachers and staff to support students that need intervention or academic services, whether it’s English-language instruction or mathematics or any other subject,” he said. Title I also funds enrichment programs that take place outside of the school day, “all those things that help our students to be successful — early childhood intervention, after school, summer school, all that — and additional technology or devices and materials to support students who have academic needs.”

## Solvency – funding cost of living adjustments

#### **Changing Title I formulas allow for fair distribution of funding to schools, taking the cost of living to allocate funds**

Boser & Brown, 15, Vice President of Education Policy at American Progress [Ulrich & Catherine; 7-7-2015, American Progress "5 Key Principles to Guide Consideration of any ESEA Title I Formula Change," Center for American Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/07/07/116696/5-key-principles-to-guide-consideration-of-any-esea-title-i-formula-change/> ; RJC]

1. Make the Title I formula more fair and transparent

Today, Title I, Part A, funds are distributed through four complex formulas: Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, Targeted Grants, and Education Incentive Finance Grants, or EIFG. These formulas have different eligibility requirements, weighting systems, and purposes. For example, the Education Finance Incentive formula rewards states that spend equally on poor and non-poor students alike. Other formulas do not.

This complexity makes it nearly impossible for policymakers, school system leaders, and the public to understand how money is distributed. It also makes it hard for the federal law to incentivize thoughtful actions at the state and local level since the reward system is so opaque. In order to fix this problem, the formulas should be condensed into a single, straightforward method of allocating funds. In short, dollars should go to schools in a fair and easy to understand manner based on a few simple factors that are predictable. This policy fix would enable local leaders to better understand the state and district’s Title I allocation, as well as develop more reliable projected education budgets.

In particular, the formula should take cost of living into account more precisely. In areas with high costs of living—such as Boston, Los Angeles, and Chicago—it can cost twice as much to pay teachers than it does in low-cost communities. But the current formulas do not expressly take that differential into account when allocating funds. Instead, the current formulas reward states for the amount that they have spent on education in the previous year, which serves as an inadequate proxy for cost of living.

“Educational costs vary, sometimes significantly, from district to district and from state to state. Title I allocations should account for these variations not with invalid proxies for cost such as state per-pupil spending, but with state- and district-level cost factors grounded in empirical research and updated every few years,” wrote Goodwin Liu, a school finance expert and former professor of education law at University of California, Berkeley. “Congress could use estimates that are presently available, or it could commission new studies,” he continued.

Education researchers have developed a sound statistical way to account for differences in the cost of living across states and districts, and the approach, known as the Comparable Wage Index, or CWI, is widely used. Any change to the Title I formula should include a variable that accounts for the differences in cost of living across schools and districts and streamlines the formula itself. This set of policy fixes would go a long way to help state and district leaders better predict their annual allocations and more fully understand the impact of local policy decisions.

## Solvency – Meta reforms

### Formula reforms – general

#### Formula reforms – multiple reforms improve resource allocation, enhance forecasting future allocation

Gordon, non-resident Senior Fellow at the Brookings, 2016 (Nora, “Increasing Targeting, Flexibility, and Transparency in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to Help Disadvantaged Students”, Brookings, March 2016, <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Full-Paper.pdf>, gdi-JM)

Current law delivers (and ESSA would continue to deliver) Title I, Part A via the four formulas described in table 1, and is often criticized as lacking in transparency and progressivity (e.g., Miller 2009). I propose that we greatly simplify two of these formulas (Basic Grants and Targeted Grants) and eliminate the remaining two (Concentration Grants and Education Finance Incentive Grants). The resulting allocation of funds would better target funds to districts with greater shares of children in poverty. It would have the additional benefit of providing a more transparent framework for forecasting future allocations, and exposing the distributional effects of any proposed formula changes in subsequent reauthorizations. Specifically, formula reform should have the following components. 1. Retain Basic Grants. Introduce language to ensure that Basic Grants consume no more than half the total appropriation for Title I, Part A (they currently allocate 45 percent). Change eligibility requirements so only school districts with at least 5 percent of children in poverty are eligible, as opposed to the current formula that permits districts with at least 2 percent of children in poverty or ten poor children to collect funds. The national child poverty rate in 2014 was 22 percent, and the median school district had 19 percent of children eligible for Title I, so this change is quite modest. 2. Eliminate Concentration Grants. The existing Concentration Grants formula is exactly the same as the formula for Basic Grants, with just one difference: the eligibility requirements. Concentration Grants are awarded to all districts with at least 6,500 eligible children or at least 15 percent children eligible; two-thirds of all districts are eligible for these grants. I propose eliminating this formula from the law and directing the 9 percent of Title I, Part A funds to LEAs allocated via Concentration Grants in 2015 to the modified Targeted Grants formula below. 3. Eliminate Education Finance Incentive Grants. Education Finance Incentive Grants have the most complicated formula of the four Title I grants. These grants are a well- intentioned attempt to reward states for having a greater ratio of per-pupil spending to per-capita income (effort), and lower variance in per-pupil spending across districts (equity), but they have several critical flaws. First, even if Congress could get states to spend more and try to equalize fully, this could inadvertently penalize efficient spending, or encourage school finance regimes that result in a “race to the bottom.” Second, effort and equity are functions of budget decisions at the state and local levels; as difficult as it would be to incentivize state legislatures with this opaque formula, motivating the local school boards or voters who must approve tax changes is unrealistic. Finally, though political decisions affect equity and effort, so do other factors that cannot be readily manipulated by education policy (e.g., longstanding patterns of economic residential segregation within a state), so the formula bestows some rewards arbitrarily. Similar to my proposal for Concentration Grants, I propose to remove the Education Finance Incentive Grants funding mechanism from the law and redirect its budget share (nearly a quarter of Title I, Part A funds to LEAs in 2015) to Targeted Grants. 4. Use freed-up funds to expand Targeted Grants, using poverty rates , rather than counts, to allocate those funds. The current law calculates weights per eligible student based on poverty rates, then again using poverty counts, and chooses whichever calculation is most beneficial to each district. This procedure is referred to as “number weighting.” In practice, with a fixed appropriation to distribute, this directs funds toward districts with a large number, but not share, of poor kids and away from smaller, high poverty– share districts. In July 2011 Representative Glenn Thompson (R-PA) sought to address this with his All Children are Equal (ACE) Act. ESSA flags number weighting in particular for study by the Institute of Education Sciences. I propose to eliminate number weighting in Targeted Grants and apply weights to all districts based on poverty rates. (Basic Grants do not use weights so they would be unaffected.) 5. Remove state-level spending per pupil from all remaining formulas. Language in Section 1303 of ESSA specifies that eligible children are to be multiplied by “40 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure in the State, except that the amount determined under this subparagraph shall not be less than 32 percent, or more than 48 percent, of the average per-pupil expenditure in the United States.” The defense for this method is that teachers cost more in states with higher costs of living, and that the spending per pupil is a proxy for aggregate state-level differences in teacher salaries. In practice, states with greater spending per pupil (and therefore higher Title I allocations, all else equal) have less poverty; the correlation between state spending per pupil and the share of children eligible in the state is -0.19. I propose to replace the language above with language to multiply weighted eligible children by “6 percent of the national average per-pupil current expenditure in the United States.” Though 6 percent may seem a major cut from the 40 percent (of state spending) in current law, note that Congress now funds Basic Grants at about 14 percent of what full funding would require. At current levels, using approximately this factor would fully fund the proposed program (using all proposed reforms), entailing no ratable reductions for at least for one year. 6. Eliminate the small state minimum. This is the most politically visible aspect of the formula changes and would generate major reductions in allocations for Alaska, Hawaii, Montana, North Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming, bringing their allocations per eligible child in line with the rest of the country (see figures 1 and 2). 7. Phase in the changes above over a four-year period using hold harmless, then eliminate hold harmless going forward. Hold districts harmless at 80 percent (regardless of counts or rates of eligible children in the district) of FY2015 allocation levels in year one, at 50 percent in year two, and at 20 percent in year three. By year four, district allocations will be calculated using the formula, with no role for previous funding levels. (One option here would be to allow federal or state waivers for districts who present evidence of short- term demographic shocks and who expect enrollments to return.) During the transition, hold district- but not state- level funding harmless.

The net impact of this set of formula reforms yields major distributional improvements: first, per-eligible-pupil Title I funds will increase more rapidly with poverty rates than they do under the current regime (see figure 2). Second, the variance in per-eligible-pupil allocations conditional on poverty rates would be much reduced—that is, similar places would be treated equally under the law. And finally, the allocation of funds will be more transparent and predictable. Though most individual school districts not affected by the small state minimum would experience relatively limited changes in their allocation per eligible individual, the changes should be phased in via the hold harmless schedule outlined above over the four-year period of ESSA to allow districts time to plan and fulfill short-run contractual obligations. That is, the new formulas would go into use immediately, but hold harmless would slow their implementation. Figure 3 shows the state- level allocation of funds under the proposed formula. (These simulated allocations assume constant demographics and appropriations, and are based on no hold harmless; this would summarize allocations four years from implementation of the proposal, once changes were fully phased in.)

### Formula reforms – increase state funding

#### Formula reforms result in tradeoffs within funding – states increase in funding

Gordon, non-resident Senior Fellow at the Brookings, 2016 (Nora, “Increasing Targeting, Flexibility, and Transparency in Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to Help Disadvantaged Students”, Brookings, March 2016, <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Full-Paper.pdf>, gdi-JM)

Politically, it is natural to measure the impact of the changes on allocations at the level of a state or congressional district. These proposals assume no change in the total amount appropriated, so any increases in some agencies’ allocations come from reductions in the allocations of others. Thirty-six states would gain Title I funds per eligible child. The median “winner” state would gain about $300 per eligible, a 29 percent increase in funds. Mississippi would have the greatest increase, with a 64 percent increase of about $700 per eligible.

### Formula reforms – multiple types of districts and schools benefit

#### Complexity of formulas disadvantage small state, mid sized cities, areas with concentrated poverty – create tradeoffs because Title I underfunded now

Camera and Cook, education reporter at U.S. News & World Report, 16 (Lauren and Lindsey, "Title I: Rich Schools Districts Get Millions Meant for Poor Kids" US News, June 1 2016, https://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016-06-01/title-i-rich-school-districts-get-millions-in-federal-money-meant-for-poor-kids, Accessed July 4th 2017, GDI AC

Title I, the largest federal K-12 program, was how Johnson planned to do that. And since children from poor families often enter schools with a host of more-costly educational needs – from less exposure to reading and math to social, emotional and nutritional problems – it's important the limited federal dollars are funneled to those who need them most, he reasoned. How is it then that a school district like Nottoway, with a child poverty rate of 30 percent, receives so much less in federal support than Fairfax, one of the wealthiest districts in the country? The answer lies in a complicated and outdated formula that's used to distribute the Title I money – a formula that's resulted in a series of significant funding discrepancies that can shortchange school districts with high concentrations of poverty, and benefit larger districts and big urban areas instead of poorer, rural districts and small cities. "The places that are less poor are getting more money per poor kid," says Nora Gordon, an associate professor at the McCourt School of Public Policy at Georgetown University who recently conducted an analysis of the Title I program for The Hamilton Project. "This is what happens when you have four different formulas that are very opaque and interact in different ways. You can have a lot of things in the law that seem like a good idea, but the net result is not a progressive one." In fact, the net result often means that in addition to the formula overlooking poor rural school districts, like Nottoway, it also shortchanges smaller high-poverty urban districts, like Flint, Michigan, which similarly faces challenges that affluent districts often don't, such as dated facilities and teacher shortages. Discrepancies are also visible in the amount of Title I money districts receive per poor child. Virginia’s Mecklenburg County, for example, with a child poverty rate of 30 percent, receives $1,000 per poor student through Title I – the same amount as poor students in York County, where the child poverty rate is less than 6 percent. For more information about your school district, use our interactive table. To be sure, when policymakers crafted the current formula in 2001 as part of the No Child Left Behind Act, they did so intending to correct a formula that was directing even fewer dollars to concentrations of poor students than it does today – one that allowed Claiborne Parish in Louisiana, with a child poverty rate of 36 percent, to infamously use its Title I funds to build not one, but two Olympic-sized swimming pools for students. But the formula has proven a sort of intractable beast – one that politicians and policymakers have had little success altering, despite its glaring shortcomings. "In the context of deeply inadequate funding overall, formula changes are always seen as a zero sum game," says Michael Dannenberg, director of strategic initiatives for policy at Education Reform Now. "More money for one district or state is coming at the expense of needy children in someone else's district or state." "Politically it's very hard," he says. "It's not impossible, but it's very hard." Dannenberg would know. He first tried – and failed – to change the formula while working for former Sen. Clairborne Pell of Rhode Island. Years later, as a senior policy adviser for Sen. Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts, Dannenberg was part of the push to update the formula as part of No Child Left Behind. That version is still used today. "To be clear, the wealthiest school districts are getting more per Title I child than high poverty school districts," he says. "But the effort to improve targeting of Title I funding [to concentrations of poor students] was realized in part as a result of the No Child Left Behind Act. We had a degree of success, but not nearly as much as one would hope." Still, the changes weren't insignificant. For example, from 2002, when the law went into effect, through 2010, data show that roughly $6 billion in Title I funding was directed to high-poverty school districts that otherwise wouldn't have been under the old formula, according to data from the Education Department. "That's a lot of bake sales," says Dannenberg. A Formulaic Failure? The formula, which is really four separate formulas rolled into one, is intended to send more money to poor districts. But it leaves much to be desired, many education policy experts say, and one of its biggest criticisms is that it spreads dollars too thin. According to the Center for American Progress, a left-leaning think-tank based in Washington, 67 percent of schools get Title I funding despite the fact that only half have relatively high concentrations of poverty. In Virginia alone, 134 districts get a slice of the Title I pie despite only 79 having higher than average levels of concentrated poverty. That's because districts can tap the federal purse even if they serve only a handful of low-income students. Falls Church City Public Schools, for example, another manicured Virginia district just outside of Washington, receives money for its 76 poor children even though the child-poverty rate there is less than 3 percent. "Title I was never meant to be general education aid," says Liz King, senior policy analyst and director of education policy at The Conference on Civil and Human Rights. "It was meant to be targeted to serve students in concentrations of poverty." The formula, however, places more weight on the number of poor students in a district than on the concentration of poor children in a district – one of the biggest reasons places like Fairfax, at 195,000 students big, gets as much money as it does. In addition, the formula directs extra funding to states with small populations – an attempt to channel more money to rural states, like New Mexico, that often depend on federal support for things like attracting and retaining teachers to remote schools. But wealthy states like Delaware and Connecticut have small populations because they are geographically small, and therefore qualify for the additional funds despite not needing them. Because of this fluke of the law, these small states with lower child poverty rates receive more Title I funds per poor child than poor states. Find them in the top left quadrant of the scatterplot. Meanwhile, many high poverty, rural states that don’t benefit from this rule or the prioritization of large districts. They appear in the bottom right quadrant of the scatterplot because they have a high child poverty rate, but receive less money per poor child. Another oft-cited critique of the formula is that it rewards states and districts for investing more of their own dollars in education. While the goal is to incentivize states to spend more themselves, it tends to compound existing inequalities since wealthier states and districts tend to invest more heavily in education anyway. Mississippi best illustrates this dilemma. Especially in the state's Delta region, where poverty rates soar up to 60 percent, local revenue rarely breaks $1 million, and in some cases schools use their Title I money for bare necessities, like paying the electric and water bills. "We don't want to allow states to roll back their spending," says Gordon. "But the reason why Mississippi is getting so little money per poor pupil is because they are spending very little money."

### Formula reforms – teacher quality

#### **\*\*\*Current Title I funding is too complicated, the plan allows for proper Title I funding that supports students and teachers.**

Boser & Brown, 15, Vice President of Education Policy at American Progress [Ulrich & Catherine; 7-7-2015, American Progress "5 Key Principles to Guide Consideration of any ESEA Title I Formula Change," Center for American Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/07/07/116696/5-key-principles-to-guide-consideration-of-any-esea-title-i-formula-change/> ; RJC]

Last year, the federal government spent more than $14 billion to help educate low-income students as part of Title I, Part A, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, or ESEA. For schools, particularly low-income schools, these federal investments make a huge difference. If Title I was used to only fund teachers, for instance, it would support the jobs of more than 200,000 educators.

But while federal education dollars bring many benefits for students, they are distributed in a way that is deeply unfair both between and within states. This unfairness stems from the following flaws in the allocation formula.

It is overly complex and opaque. Title I today is allocated based on four separate formulas with conflicting incentives. State and local legislators and education officials have almost no way to know how much their allocation will change from year to year due to changes in district or state policy, population, or distribution of students living in poverty. This lack of transparency severally limits the formula from serving as an incentive for policy change or from enabling states and districts to plan for the future.

It sends more money to wealthier states. Wealthier states have historically invested more heavily in education, and those investments are favored by the current Title I formula. This results in a system that compounds existing inequities by giving more to the haves than to the have nots. Furthermore, the formula’s emphasis on the number of children who live in poverty means that more affluent districts that serve only a handful of such children receive Title I dollars. This dilutes the pool, leaving fewer resources for those places with more concentrated poverty.

It shows clear bias against rural states and mid-sized cities. As a result of this distortion, the so-called small state minimum, which gives more money to smaller states for no other reason than their small population, “states with small populations and low concentrations of poor children receive radically larger grants on a per-poor-child basis than states with larger populations, including those with substantial rural poverty.” What’s more, the formula prioritizes larger districts. Detroit, for instance, gets much more per student than Flint, Michigan, and Los Angeles gets more than Sacramento, California, due to the formula’s heavy weighting of large communities over mid-sized and rural communities.

To be clear, there is no perfect school funding formula. By definition, formulas distribute limited pots of money among diverse schools and districts, and most districts, if not all, could benefit from more resources. Formula decisions, in other words, force difficult trade-offs. Should the formula spread the funding to more students or leverage it most heavily among the neediest? Should it reward states and communities for investing in education, or should it compensate for the fact that they have not made such investments, which has real and often dire consequences for the students living in those communities? Should the formula fund communities with large concentrations of poor students or fund poor students in more socioeconomically diverse communities? These are difficult questions without easy answers.

The goal for every member of Congress—when considering modifying the Title I formula—should be to maximize public utility or the public good and to find the trade-off point where the greatest number of students receive the maximum boost to their life prospects.

## Solvency – progressive funding structures

#### SQuo disincentivizing state funding – need reforms that would encourage funding equity and effort

Boser & Brown, 15, Vice President of Education Policy at American Progress [Ulrich & Catherine; 7-7-2015, American Progress "5 Key Principles to Guide Consideration of any ESEA Title I Formula Change," Center for American Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/07/07/116696/5-key-principles-to-guide-consideration-of-any-esea-title-i-formula-change/> ; RJC]

3. Leverage funds to incentivize evidence-based state funding formulas

The United States is one of just three Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, or OECD, countries that provides fewer resources for educating students living in poverty than their peers. Educational outcomes in the United States, which differ significantly by socioeconomic status, reflect this approach. Title I reform could help rectify that problem by providing a greater incentive for states to create progressive funding structures.

Today, the EFIG formula, one of the four Title I formulas, factors in whether states fund Title I and non-Title I schools equitably. Unfortunately, this approach has the perverse effect of disincentivizing states from investing more significantly in schools serving low-income students. A funding formula truly aimed at closing the student-achievement gap should send a clear and unambiguous message to states that they should implement progressive funding systems—such as weighted-student funding systems that allocate resources on the basis of student need—which provide more money to students with greater needs.

The Title I formula should also include a fiscal effort factor. In other words, the formula should include a measure of whether states invest more state and local funds in education. This approach does not disadvantage poorer states because the measure evaluates on the amount of money that states invest relative to other fiscal priorities. As part of a reauthorized ESEA, both priorities—funding equity and effort—should be incorporated into the base formula or required in order for states to retain their administrative funds.

### Solvency—increase Per-Pupil Funding

#### Requiring states to increase progressive funding to title I school – solve resource disparity and increases education

**CAP Education Policy Team, 2015**

(Center for American Progress, “A Fresh Look at School Funding”, May 18, 2015, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/05/18/113397/a-fresh-look-at-school-funding/>, accessed 7/3/17, GDI-JG)

School funding is a necessary condition of a high-quality education. Despite this, investments in education vary wildly across the country, and many states and districts fail to provide enough money to meet this minimum threshold. In the 2011-12 school year, for instance, some 300 school districts spent less than $7,500 per student after adjusting for cost of living and student needs. In unadjusted figures, these low-spending districts generally spend between $5,351 and $8,233; on average, they spend around $7,130 per student.∂ For a number of reasons—ranging from weak funding systems to tax cuts—some states have not demonstrated that they provide all of their districts and schools with an adequate amount of school funding. As a result, there is a role for federal government to set clear expectations for school funding via a minimum spending threshold for districts to be eligible to receive Title I funds. CAP recommends that the federal government establish a national per-pupil spending minimum of $7,500 per student after adjusting for differences in cost of living. Even after making cost-of-living adjustments, $7,500 per pupil annually is a minimal amount to spend on a child’s education.∂ As a benchmark, this figure is clearly reasonable. A few years ago, some of the country’s leading experts in school finance estimated that to educate effectively, a district should spend at least $10,980 per pupil in 2012 inflation-adjusted dollars. In short, this minimum figure is thousands of dollars less than what some experts estimate, and it should therefore be a reasonable benchmark to identify only the districts with the most needs. The cost to provide an adequate education varies across states, but this amount is consistent with base funding levels established in several states. For example, in their state funding formulas for fiscal year 2015, North Dakota and Rhode Island each allocate districts at least around $9,000 per pupil.∂ Using data from 2012—the most recent data available—CAP found that there were 19 states where at least one school district spent less than the $7,500 mark. Among these states, there were five—Arizona, California, Idaho, Texas, and Utah—where more than 10 percent of districts spent less than $7,500 per student, even after adjusting for cost of living. In Utah, almost 40 percent of school districts spent less than $7,500 per pupil, while 26 percent of districts in California spent below the threshold. Many of these low-spending districts are rural, but some are in suburban or urban areas, such as Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District on the outskirts of Houston and Burbank Unified School District outside Los Angeles. Nevertheless, it is important to note that California’s new state education funding formula was enacted in the year after these data were released. Known as the Local Control Funding Formula, California’s approach would allocate each district around $7,600 per student, on average, almost certainly putting a great many of the state’s districts above the $7,500 threshold after adjusting for differences in cost of living.∂ To address this issue, CAP recommends that all states with a district below the minimum threshold should have to provide a plan to ensure that all districts in the state meet this threshold within three years. States would have an opportunity to request a waiver of the minimum threshold from the secretary of education if they could show that their districts had sufficient funding to meet the needs of all students. This waiver authority is important, since CAP’S adjustments for cost of living might not adequately adjust for all differences in cost. Under this proposal, the secretary also would have the ability to adjust the minimum threshold, given changes in economic conditions.∂ The U.S. Department of Education would review and approve these plans. If a state could not demonstrate that all of its districts were meeting the minimum-spending threshold after three years, the state would forfeit its Title I administration funds. The recaptured funds would then be distributed directly to high-need school districts based on the Title I formula.∂ This proposal would require a significant increased investment in public education in many districts. By establishing this spending floor, however, the federal government would make clear the expectation that all districts, regardless of their demographics, have enough resources to provide all children with a high-quality education.

#### Increase in per-pupil funding leads to reduction in likelihood of grade repetition and school penalties- lessens risk of criminal involvement

Johnson, University of California, Berkeley professor of public policy, 15 (Rucker C., "Follow the Money: School Spending from Title I to Adult Earnings", The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences, 12-17-15, www.rsfjournal.org/doi/full/10.7758/RSF.2015.1.3.03, 7-5-17, GDI-EC)

To examine intermediate educational outcomes leading up to high school graduation, looking beyond overall years of education reveals a similar pattern of significant results for the likelihood of grade repetition and other school-related outcomes. Among poor children, 20 percent repeated a grade at some point, and 28 percent were suspended or expelled from school. Among nonpoor children, 11 percent were held back and 17 percent were suspended or expelled. The results presented in table 4 indicate that a $100 increase in per-pupil Title I funding leads to a 2 percentage point reduction in the likelihood of grade repetition (column 1, marginally significant), a 2 percentage point increase in the likelihood of placement in an advanced or gifted class (column 2), and roughly a 2 percentage-point reduction in the likelihood of ever being suspended or expelled from school (column 3, marginally significant). These results are particularly noteworthy because, as mentioned, grade repetition and suspension or expulsion from school are often early antecedents to high school dropout and behavior problems. They are also key risk factors for subsequent criminal involvement among individuals raised in high-poverty, high-crime neighborhoods. The final column of table 4 shows that a $100 increase in per-pupil Title I funding is significantly associated with a 0.44 percentage-point reduction in the likelihood of ever being incarcerated by age thirty-five, which corresponds with about a 10 percent reduction in the risk, on average, for poor children. Recall that a $100 increase in per-pupil Title I funding corresponds with about an $800 increase in Title I funding per poor child for the average district.

## Solvency – SNS reforms

**SNS reforms – should consider actual expenditure**

\*also a neg card against the comparability reform version

**Liebman,** Simon H. Rifkin Professor, Columbia Law School, **and Mbikiwa,** Attorney, the High Court of South Africa, **2017**

(James S. and Michael, “EVERY DOLLAR COUNTS: IN DEFENSE OF THE OBAMA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S "SUPPLE-MENT NOT SUPPLANT" PROPOSAL”, Columbia Law Review Online, March 1, 2017, accessed via LexisNexis, accessed 7/14/17, GDI-JG)

The "comparability of services" objection is more serious but also fails. As the CRS acknowledged, n77 if the ca-veat excluding teacher salaries and seniority is applied not only to the distribution of "services" (the sole focus of the comparability rule), but also to the distribution of "funds" (the subject of the distinct, "supplement not supplant" rule), districts could systematically assign their most experienced, most expensive teachers to non-Title I Schools and thus spend far less on instruction at Title I than at non-Title I schools. Doing so would directly contradict Title I's recogni-tion that low-income schools need more funds for instruction. Even so, the CRS suggested that, without ever saying so, Congress intended the treatment of teacher salaries it wrote into the "comparability" rule to apply as well to the "supplement not supplant" rule. n78∂ This interpretation is flawed. The "comparability" and "supplement not supplant" provisions are distinct, and they must be interpreted as distinct. As their words plainly signify, comparability applies only to the distribution of "ser-vices"; n79 "supplement not supplant" applies only to the expenditure of "funds." n80 That distinction must be given operative significance, or each provision would render the other superfluous--violating a well-established rule against interpreting statutes to contain redundancies or superfluous provisions. n81∂ Congress itself has always treated the two rules distinctly. It limits the comparability rule to service differentials other than those tied to differences in teacher seniority but has never applied a parallel caveat to the "supplement not supplant" rule. n82 By reading into the statute a requirement Congress added in one place but left out of another, the CRS violated another established rule of statutory interpretation: that Congress is assumed to have intended "the exclu-sion of language from one statutory provision that is included in other provisions of the same statute." n83∂ Congress has perfectly sensible--indeed, compelling--reasons for treating the distribution of services and funds dif-ferently in regard to teacher seniority and salaries. Absent the "teacher seniority" caveat, the requirement of comparable teacher services might be thought to depend on the quality of each individual teacher providing services. If that were so, the comparability provision would require districts to rate each teacher to identify how much "value added" each pro-vides and then use the aggregate of all teachers' "value added" to see if different schools get less or more. Under these circumstances, Congress had three good reasons not to use teacher seniority or salary as a proxy for teacher quality: Doing so is: inaccurate; n84 administratively burdensome, given the many millions of teachers nationwide whom dis-tricts would have to rate individually; and demoralizing to teachers, some of whom districts would have to declare less worthy than others. The simple solution is the one the ESEA's comparability provision has long used: Treat each teacher as equal to all others by defining comparability of services in terms of pupil-teacher ratios and district-wide sala-ry schedules.∂ The "supplement not supplant" rule is very different. It applies to something classically and inherently fungible: money. Because each dollar actually spent is no different from or more administratively burdensome to track than any other dollar, no matter what the dollar pays for, there is no reason for districts not to count every dollar spent on each of its schools, including dollars spent on teachers--which is exactly what the new Act requires districts to do and to report publicly. n85 Indeed, it is the CRS proposal to treat money spent on teachers differently from money spent on every-thing else that resurrects all the problems Congress aimed to avoid through the "comparability of services" caveat: Its proposal is inaccurate (treating schools that spend vastly different amounts as if they spend the same), administratively burdensome (requiring the Department to segregate and track different types of dollars), and demeaning (to disadvan-taged children on whom the CRS interpretation lets districts spend less).∂ It is thus entirely consistent for Congress to treat each teacher the same when talking about services and each dollar the same when talking about spending. And it makes perfect sense for the Department to use the spending data that Congress now requires districts to make public--in reports that must treat dollars spent on teachers the same as dollars spent on everything else--when applying the "supplement not supplant" rule.

### Neutrality standards – solves

#### Reforms to SNS for neutrality test increases innovation without increasing burden of compliance

Miller **K-12 Education Researcher, Research Director FutureEd** 12 (Reagan, Frederick M. Hess, Cynthia G. Brown, “Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Offers a New Chance to Improve Education”, Center for American Progress, 3-6-12, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2012/03/06/11315/reauthorization-of-the-elementary-and-secondary-education-act-offers-a-new-chance-to-improve-education/>, 7-4-17, JIJD-GDI)

The supplement-not-supplant, or SNS, requirement aims to prevent school districts from using Title I funds to free up state and local funds for purchasing goods and ser- vices they would not otherwise have been able to afford or to provide tax relief. In their paper, “How the Supplement-Not-Supplant Requirement Can Work Against the Policy Goals of Title I,” attorneys Melissa Junge and Sheara Krvaric—founders of the Federal Education Group, a firm that helps clients comply with federal regulations—offer several options for modifying this long-standing requirement. We embrace the option that would make SNS amenable to innovation while greatly reducing the burden of compliance. The idea is to replace the primary test currently in use with a simpler, more objective test, specifically: If districts can document that the manner in which they allocate state and local resources to schools is “Title I neutral,” they should be clear of suspicion around supplanting nonfederal funds with Title I dollars. The neutrality test does not arise out of thin air. It’s rooted, as the authors explain, in a test originally designed for schoolwide Title I programs. But the neutrality test does represent a major departure from the traditional cost-by-cost approach required to refute presumptions of supplanting. This departure makes sense to us for the following three reasons: First, the cost-by-cost approach is inherently hostile to innovation. Each purchase of a good or service made with Title I funds is matched with an unobserved, counterfactual speculation about whether the purchase would have been made in the absence of Title I funds. Thus, the subjective judgments of state auditors play a prominent role in SNS enforcement, and it’s simply wrong to characterize SNS as a crisp fiscal requirement. Rather, it’s an idiosyncratic, psychological one. What’s more, SNS gives school officials strong incentives to perpetuate past spending practices—even hopelessly ineffective ones—that did not tar them with an audit exception. Second, cost-by-cost analysis is burdensome, in addition to the fact that devoting scarce resources to compliance is wasteful in the face of an alternative approach, especially one that frees local officials to take conscious steps toward using Title I funds to improve student achievement. Third, a switch to the neutrality test would pave the way for consolidation of federal funds in schoolwide Title I programs that serve 87 percent of students receiving Title I funds. This practice is allowable under federal rules and the flexibility it affords in bypassing cost-by-cost reporting, for example, should be popular. Fund consolidation, however, is rare in some states and virtually unknown in others. Such is the stifling nature of the current supplement-not-supplant requirement.

#### Neutrality Test SNS and Comparability Solves

Miller **K-12 Education Researcher, Research Director FutureEd** 12 (Reagan, Frederick M. Hess, Cynthia G. Brown, “Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Offers a New Chance to Improve Education”, Center for American Progress, 3-6-12, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2012/03/06/11315/reauthorization-of-the-elementary-and-secondary-education-act-offers-a-new-chance-to-improve-education/>, 7-4-177-4-17, JIJD-GDI)

The last of the seven papers we commissioned offers a district perspective on the “back office” requirements of Title I. In their paper, “The Consequences of Distrust,” Jon Fullerton of Harvard University and Dalia Hochman, an independent consultant, explain how Title I requirements support an apparatus and culture of compliance inimical to the goals of the program—enhancing the educational experience of children living in concentrated poverty. We jointly endorse two of the authors’ thoughtfully presented recommendations. In fact, we’ve already supported these recommendations, which bear repeating: Base supplement-not-supplant on the test of Title I neutrality, as detailed by Junge and Krvaric. Base the comparability requirement on actual expenditures, as introduced by Cohen and Miller, and driven home by West. Reauthorization of ESEA is an infrequent, semiregular but nonetheless critical opportunity for federal policymakers to steer the course of K-12 education. This brief has laid out a number of recommendations for changing key “back office” provisions of Title I, the law’s signal program. Both CAP and Frederick Hess believe these policy options, if enacted, would go a long way toward improving the alignment of the ambitious goals of Title I and its implementation.

### Solvency - Require Title I spending on tutorials

#### Individualized Tutorials Helps Disadvantaged Students Math Education

Ander et al.,University of Chicago, Crime lab and the Education Lab,Executive Director, 16 (Roseanna, Jonathan Guryan, Jens Ludwig, “Improving Academic Outcomes for Disadvantaged Students: Scaling Up Individualized Tutorials”, The Hamilton Project, 3-28-16, http://www.hamiltonproject.org/papers/improving\_academic\_outcomes\_for\_disadvantaged\_students\_scaling\_up\_individua, 5-7-17, GDI-JIJD)

Based on the results described above, we propose that schools serving economically disadvantaged students set up an educational safety net by delivering individualized math tutorials during the school day. Specifically, we propose that all school districts receiving schoolwide Title I funds provide individualized daily tutorials to all third through tenth grade students who are at least two grades behind grade level in math. In the tutorials, one tutor would work with two students for a full class period every day. Since we find in our Chicago data that the Match/SAGA tutorial program doubles or triples the amount of math students learn over the course of a year, the expectation would be that most students would need a year or two of this intensive safety-net intervention to catch back up to grade level, at which point they would begin to benefit from regular classroom instruction. Put differently, we view our proposal as a complement to and acknowledgment of, but not a substitute for, ongoing policy discussions about strengthening regular classroom instruction and other common targets of school reform.

Under our proposal, all students in the third through tenth grades would be assessed either at the beginning of the school year or at the end of the previous school year to determine which students are two grades or more behind grade level in math. These students would be assigned to receive individualized Match/SAGA tutorials each day of the school year, with each tutorial taking place during a full class period of about 50 minutes. Where appropriate (e.g., in middle and high school grades), the tutorials would be treated as a required course: students would receive a grade and it would be credit-bearing. Students would be enrolled in these math tutorials in addition to their regular math class. If the student progresses to grade level, the tutorials could be discontinued. Students who remain behind grade level could continue in the math tutorials for multiple years.

### Solvency—Fiscal Assistance Teams

#### Implementing fiscal assistance teams ensures proper allocation of Title 1 funding

**CAP Education Policy Team, 2015**

(Center for American Progress, “A Fresh Look at School Funding”, May 18, 2015, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/05/18/113397/a-fresh-look-at-school-funding/>, accessed 7/3/17, GDI-JG)

School dollars are not always spent in ways that help students. Some school systems overspend their funding due to outdated governance structures; others invest in weak programs or practices. The federal government can do far more to help states and districts and give them dedicated support to improve fiscal outcomes. Virginia has been a leader in this space, and in a program started under then-Gov. Mark Warner (D), the state has provided technical support to districts that helps them spend their school dollars more wisely through fiscal assistance teams.∂ Specifically, CAP recommends that fiscal assistance teams should be an explicitly allowable use of the funds currently available for state administration and for supporting low-performing schools under Title I. In other words, state-level Title I funds should be allowed to pay for technical assistance teams that provide fiscal support, which includes but is not limited to evaluating key operational functions, such as budgets, staffing, and administration. The state would provide a recommended list of outside vendors that districts could use; districts would be required to help pay for some portion of the program out of their own budgets. While such uses of Title I funds might be allowable in certain circumstances under current law, this proposal would include amending the ESEA to ensure that this specific use of funds is permitted.∂ By encouraging states to use their funds for this purpose—and making it explicitly allowable under Title I—this proposal would create incentives to reduce inefficiencies in the spending of federal, state, and local dollars. More importantly, the policy effort would increase the real dollars available to support students without an increase in overall spending, and these dollars would be available to increase services targeted toward low-income schools that improve outcomes for low-achieving students.∂ The proposal has already secured the support of now-Sen. Warner. “As Governor, I was proud to establish a program that encouraged school systems to conduct efficiency reviews to identify how we could better allocate limited resources to get the maximum impact in the classroom,” Sen. Warner said. “This commonsense best practice should be available to school districts nationwide that are seeking more efficient ways to use existing resources. This proposal would do just that, and I’m happy to support it going into reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.”∂ Conclusion∂ The Elementary and Secondary Education Act’s original purpose was to improve the education of disadvantaged students and to ensure that the schools and districts that serve these students had additional resources to meet their needs. Unfortunately, fiscal inequities continue to persist, with low-income districts and schools receiving less funding than their higher-income counterparts. It has now been nearly 14 years since the law has been reauthorized, and Congress should consider fresh ideas for supporting states and districts in equitably funding their low-income schools. If Congress fails to remedy funding problems now, an entire generation of students may miss out on fair and effective funding. Focusing ESEA on funding issues should be a key priority in any reauthorization discussion moving forward.

#### Lack of information and misinformation fixed with audits and dissemination

**Gordon,** Associate Professor, Georgetown University, McCourt School of Public Policy, **and Reber,** Associate Professor, University of California, Los Angeles, Luskin School of Public Affairs, **2015**

(Nora and Sarah, “The Quest for a Targeted and Effective Title I ESEA: Challenges in Designing and Implementing Fiscal Compliance Rules”, The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences, Volume 1 Issue 3, December 2015, <http://www.rsfjournal.org/doi/full/10.7758/RSF.2015.1.3.07>, accessed 7/8/17, GDI-JG)

We concur with Duncan and Murnane when they write, “The challenge is to devise organizational structures that provide high-poverty schools with the resources, knowledge, and freedom to choose the collection of supports they need” (2014, 136). To the extent that Title I's fiscal rules—and those of the web of other federal and state categorical programs contributing to district budgets—impinge on that freedom, we have two concrete recommendations. First, replace existing guidance with new, clear, and concise guidance and disseminate it. The dissemination challenge is significant, requiring a concerted effort by the federal government to get word to state education agencies who in turn must get the word out to local districts. Guidance should reach not only Title I personnel in districts and schools, but also others involved in allocating instructional resources. Clear guidance would empower districts to push back against state agencies that require them to remove legally permissible uses of Title I funds from their federal funding applications, and to question their preliminary single-audit findings before the results are finalized and passed on to federal authorities. It would also empower school district staff more closely associated with the work of instruction itself—in offices of teaching and learning, or curriculum and instruction, for example—to question district-level Title I administrators when they deny them access to funds on the basis of supplanting. Finally, it is critical for this guidance to reach auditors. Decision-makers need to know what they are allowed to do, and that legal uses of funds will not yield inaccurate and damaging audit results.∂ Our second recommendation relates to the challenge districts face in handling multiple streams of state and federal categorical funding, each with their own compliance requirements. Title I schoolwide programs are permitted to consolidate their Title I funds with other federal, state, and local funds so that they do not have to maintain distinct fiscal trails for each separate program. But a recent survey found only 6 percent of districts operating schoolwide programs took up this option, and found that “state or district accounting rules and fear of potential audit exceptions were major barriers to consolidation of funding” (Chambers et al. 2009, xxvii). Consolidating funding is not the explicit focus in this article, and our recommendation here is correspondingly broad: states and local governments should reconsider the impact of their rules on schools’ ability to use funds productively. The U.S. Department of Education requires each state education agency to “eliminate State fiscal and accounting barriers so that these funds can be more easily consolidated” (2015, 8). The federal government and national nongovernmental organizations could potentially play an important role in providing technical assistance in these efforts. We view both these policy recommendations as necessary but not sufficient for addressing the big problem—the lack of instructional capacity in school districts. We do not offer a magic bullet for building this elusive capacity, but instead hope that reducing the complexity of compliance and enhancing flexibility will contribute to creating an environment where efforts to do so have a better chance of flourishing.

### Solvency—United for Students Act reforms

#### The United for Students Act promotes educational progress and equity—resulting in higher student achievement and US competitiveness

**Jennings,** founder and former CEO, Center on Education Policy, Washington, D.C., and former General Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives' Committee on Education and Labor, **2015**

(Jack, “ESEA at 50”, Kappan Magazine, April 2015, Volume 96, Number 7, accessed 7/6/17, GDI-JG)

To achieve this, I propose a new approach to fed- eral education policy that expands and transforms the federal role. The congressional creators of fed- eral aid in the 1960s believed the obstacle to better schooling was a lack of money: Once sufficient fund- ing was provided to equalize expenditures among school districts, educators would know what to do to improve education. The architects of the standards/ tests/accountability reforms of the 1990s and 2000s believed that student academic achievement could be improved by setting high academic standards, using tests to measure attainment of those standards, and holding teachers and schools accountable for poor results. Providing more money to assist with this job was not necessary in the minds of many proponents of this second reform.∂ Neither of those two extremes proved to be correct in their assumptions. The past 50 years’ experiences have shown that education is too complex to have easy answers. The truth lies in taking the best from each reform movement. Thus, I propose a signifi- cant expansion of federal aid to schools that is not restricted to particular categories of students but that is contingent on states’ willingness to address the most fundamental issues that impede educational progress. This expanded general aid program could be called the United for Students Act (USA).∂ Under this new policy, the federal government, working with the states, would focus on improving classroom teaching and learning. The objectives of this new approach should be to improve students’ readiness for school, raise the quality of the teach- ing force, encourage mastery of more challenging curricula, and provide sufficient funding for schools to do the job. The current policy of inserting a little extra help for students into an inequitable system of schooling has not brought about the quality of edu- cation we need. The other current federal strategy — demanding extensive testing of students — has not resulted in a broad increase in student achieve- ment. These reforms rooted in past times must be abandoned as ineffective. Instead we should adopt a more direct and equitable way to bring about real improvement.∂ In addition, we must put in place legal and con- stitutional guarantees of students’ rights to a good education. Presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama have called education the civil rights issue of our time. It is — but presidential rhetoric won’t win that battle. What is needed is a guarantee that is as strong as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which helped win the struggle for rights in the 1960s. If this is the civil rights issue of our time, then it deserves the full protection and sanction of con- stitutional law.∂ My own views in this area have evolved. In the nearly three decades I worked for Congress, I helped create the targeted funding programs and also the standards/testing/accountability framework. In var- ious public forums, I argued for these approaches and defended them against criticism. But my views are different now because progress has not been suf- ficient and because the world is changing at such a fast pace that I feel we cannot procrastinate. If we want improvement, we must let go of resistance to change and sweep aside old excuses to adopting new and better ways.∂ This reorientation of national efforts to improve the public schools will make America a world leader again in the area of education. But I also recognize that others may have different ideas. My hope is that in joining this debate we take the time to consider our past experiences with federal aid and also what research shows us about the impact of federal in- tervention.∂ Having knowledge without taking action is not good enough. American schools can be the best in the world, and American students can be both knowl- edgeable and creative. But, we must get moving — and right now!

# Solvency – Title I Portability

## Solvency – achievement gap

#### Schools choice solves achievement gap

#### School choice resolves the achievement gap and motivates students to succeed

**Anselem,** Policy Analyst, Education Policy Studies, Institute for Family, Community, and Opportunity, Heritage Foundation, **2014**

(Mary Clare, “Barriers to High School Completion Create Barriers to Economic Mobility”, Heritage Foundation, May 15, 2014, http://www.heritage.org/education/report/barriers-high-school-completion-create-barriers-economic-mobility, accessed July 14, 2017, GDI-JG)

School Choice. Perhaps the best way to address the problem is to give parents real choice over which school to send their children. School choice is rapidly expanding all over the country. If students are able to attend high-quality public schools or charter schools, regardless of where they live, factors that contribute to the achievement gap such as race or income will start to diminish. Different children thrive in different environments and in different academic areas. School choice gives parents the freedom to match their children to the school that best fits their particular talents and needs. When students are in an environment of their or their parents’ choosing they have more motivation to succeed.∂ The research seems to support such benefits of choice. A National Bureau of Economic Research study, for instance, found that “winning the lottery to attend a chosen school has an immediate impact on absences and suspensions after notification, and that this result is particularly strong for older male students.”[61] School choice has positive effects on motivation and school performance. The U.S. Department of Education found that simply receiving a scholarship to attend a school of choice increased graduation rates by about 12 percent.[62] These children are doing better in school, and parents reported feeling that their children are in a safer environment. The Education Department’s evaluation revealed, “School safety is a valued feature of schools for the families who applied to the Opportunity Scholarship Program. A total of 17 percent of cohort 1 parents at baseline listed school safety as their most important reason for seeking to exercise school choice—second only to academic quality (48 percent) among the available reason.”[63] (Cohort 1 parents were those who opted for school choice. They found themselves significantly more satisfied with their children’s educational environment than parents who did not choose their children’s school.) The increase in graduation rates alone shows that giving parents a voice in how and where their children receive an education can significantly improve academic outcomes.

#### Portability good – restrictions on states coupled with lack of portability limit effective programming for disadvantages students

Furtick and Snell, a policy analyst and director of education, 2014(Katie Furtick and Lisa Snell, “Federal School Finance Reform: Moving Toward Title I Funding Following the Child”, Policy Brief 125, September 2014, ?Database?, July 3, 2017,)GDI/DCM

The current Title I spending safeguards do not ensure that funds are allocated to disadvantaged students in ways that most benefit them and improve academic outcomes—the goal of the program at its inception in the 1960s. To rectify this deficiency, Title I funding should be made portable.

The program’s existing regulations prohibit federal Title I funds from being combined with state financial efforts to improve educational outcomes for low- income and disadvantaged students, thereby limiting the reach of many state-run programs proven to improve academic outcomes for the students they serve. The same regulations also restrict how states may disburse funds and which schools may receive Title I funds, resulting in funding inequities (especially for schools with large numbers—but a smaller percentage—of low-income students). Further, the supplement-not-supplant and comparability requirements of Title I create an unnecessary administrative burden and hinder the creation of comprehensive and innovative programs. Together, these complications and problems inherent to the Title I program make it difficult to achieve the goals of the program and limit its effectiveness.

Spending decisions should be made by those closest to the students Title I funds are intended to support, with the students’ benefit at the forefront. Title I funding should be gauged by students’ results rather than on the basis of inputs and spending decisions. Schools, educators and administrators need to be held accountable primarily by outcomes, rather than by fulfilling reporting and compliance requirements.

#### Per pupil funding and litany of regulations make Title I ineffective at closing achievement gaps – only portability would solve

Koteskey, Education Policy Analyst, 15 (Tyler, "Title I funding portability is key to ESEA reform"; the hill; 7/9/15 thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/education/247300-title-i-funding-portability-is-key-to-esea-reform, 7/3/17, GDI AC)

The current Title I program is broken. A meta-analysis of 17 federal studies on its effectiveness indicated only a modest overall impact, while another by Harvard University concluded the program had failed in its original mission of closing achievements gaps between disadvantaged and wealthy students. Examining what schools have to go through to get Title I funding, it is easy to see why. The program’s litany of regulations forces the administrative staff of states and districts to spend resources proving compliance with requirements on how they spend their grants to avoid losing eligibility. This wastes time and money that could be used to allocate the funding in ways that best serves their schools’ individual needs. The “supplement not supplant” and “comparability” provisions, discussed at length in the Reason Foundation’s Title I reform analysis, restricts states’ abilities to combine these dollars with pre-existing state funding for low-income students to create comprehensive programs. And because Title I allocates grants to schools rather than individual students, it actually promotes per-student funding inequalities between schools, especially at larger schools with high numbers but low-percentages of low-income kids. Scott’s Title I portability amendment has the potential to change all of this. Tying Title I funds to eligible students relieves administrative burdens by removing the need to justify expenditures. It also ensures that every school gets the same amount of per-student grants for every low-income child they educate. By making these funds portable, wherever these students enroll, low-income pupils will be able to expand their educational options. They will benefit from administrators with new incentives to attract and retain them to get access to the dollars they bring. Portable Title I funding could even be combined with expanding state voucher, tax-credit scholarship programs, and education savings accounts, with proven positive effects on achievement for disadvantaged students to give even more families access to better options.

## Solvency – better education – general

#### Mobile Funding key to better educational results, Title 1 solves

Furtick, Policy Analyst, 14 (Katie, “Federal School Fiance Reform: Moving Toward Title 1 Funding Following the Child”; Reason.org, 9/?/14, <http://reason.org/files/federal_school_finance_reform.pdf>, 7/3/2017, GDI AC)

The best way to solve the problems inherent in the current system of Title I funding is to make Title I funds portable—in other words, allocate funds on a per-pupil basis and require that funds follow pupils to the school of their choice. There are a number of advantages to such a system: First, allocating Title I funds on a per-pupil basis rather than through the existing, stringent funding mechanism simply and clearly ties the funding to the child in need, which is where it is supposed to go. Moreover, attaching extra funding to individual, disadvantaged students gives schools an incentive to attract and retain such students (and the funding that goes with them). This will encourage schools to compete to come up with the best ways to serve disadvantaged students, leading to more innovation and better educational outcomes. Furthermore, this would facilitate the national trend toward families being able to choose the schools their children attend because the child would bring the funding with him. Second, principals should be given both the professional freedom and the incentive to raise low-income students’ achievement. Currently, restrictions like supplement-not-supplant attempt to tightly control principals’ and districts’ use of Title I funds, with significant administrative burdens of management and enforcement. Instead of managing the process by which funding is used, principals could be given greater freedom in how they use that funding, in return for delivering higher achievement scores among the targeted student population. When school principals have greater autonomy over how Title I funds are spent, Federal School Finance Reform | 11 they can use innovative and flexible approaches that serve their particular students’ needs, allowing them to more fully perform the role of school leader. The flip-side of greater financial autonomy is that principals should be more directly held accountable for student outcomes. Judging a principal by students’ academic outcomes assigns responsibility where it is due, and greater autonomy over use of funding to achieve those outcomes confers the authority to foster those achievements. This decentralized approach promotes better results than a one-size-fits-all model. Findings from Reason Foundation’s 2013 edition of the Weighted Student Formula Yearbook suggest that in school districts that use a portable school funding framework to finance schools, more school-level autonomy over school budgets leads to faster improvement in student achievement and a greater likelihood of closing achievement gaps.27

#### Current failure of Title 1 grants sustain educational inequality—portability solves

**Burke,** Will Skillman Fellow in Education Policy in the Institute for Family, Community, and Opportunity at The Heritage Foundation, **2015**

(Lindsey M., “From Piecemeal to Portable: Transforming Title I into a Student-Centered Support System”, Heritage Foundation, September 28, 2015, <http://www.heritage.org/education/report/piecemeal-portable-transforming-title-i-student-centered-support-system>, accessed 7/4/17, GDI-JG)

At the federal, state, and local level, policymakers and education-reform advocates have been striving to improve educational options and outcomes for all children, focusing in particular on improving outcomes for children from disadvantaged families. This effort is not new, nor is the sense that K–12 education is falling short, particularly for those children who need education options the most. In fact, President Lyndon B. Johnson’s support for, and the subsequent enactment of, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1965—the first significant federal intervention into education, which continues to authorize the bulk of federal K–12 spending today—was born out of a belief that existing education programs and spending were not adequate for poor children.∂ Title I refers to Title I of the ESEA, which was viewed as the education component of Johnson’s Great Society initiatives and today remains the nation’s largest federal law governing education policy. Johnson outlined four challenges confronting U.S. policymakers as they considered the ESEA: (1) to provide better education to millions of poor children; (2) to improve education innovations and equipment; (3) to improve teacher training and technology; and (4) to incentivize lifelong learning. “But most of all,” Johnson implored, “we must provide a good education for every boy and girl—no matter where he lives.”[1]∂ Johnson proposed to give first priority to a program of aid to low-income school districts, a priority that would form the basis of Title I.[2] Today, the nearly $15 billion Title I program consists of a stream of convoluted formula grants that have little relationship to actual poverty. These “opaque and unaccountable”[3] grant streams have done little to address education-related issues in schools in districts of concentrated poverty, evidenced in part by the presence of academic achievement and attainment gaps between disadvantaged children and their non-poor peers, which have persisted over the decades since the ESEA was signed into law.∂ Instead of continuing to funnel the bulk of ESEA funding through the labyrinthine Title I program, federal policymakers should give states the option to make Title I dollars portable, following children to any school or education option of choice. Restructuring Title I funding formulas into a single formula stream based on a set per-pupil allocation, and providing states the option to allocate Title I dollars to students in the form of a flexible education savings account (ESA), would create a powerful tool for low-income families to direct their own children’s education, limit federal bureaucracy, and provide a better chance of achieving Johnson’s goal of a quality education for every child “no matter where he lives.”

## Solvency – funding flexibility

#### Title 1 portability spurs funding flexibility—providing crucial resources for families

**Burke,** Will Skillman Fellow in Education Policy in the Institute for Family, Community, and Opportunity at The Heritage Foundation, **2015**

(Lindsey M., “From Piecemeal to Portable: Transforming Title I into a Student-Centered Support System”, Heritage Foundation, September 28, 2015, <http://www.heritage.org/education/report/piecemeal-portable-transforming-title-i-student-centered-support-system>, accessed 7/4/17, GDI-JG)

Federal Title I portability proposals should give states the option to make dollars portable, and states that opt in to a Title I portability arrangement should afford poor students as much flexibility with those dollars as possible. State policymakers should allow students to use Title I funding for individual courses, online learning, textbooks, and a host of other education-related services, products, and providers.∂ Federal policymakers should:∂ Simplify Title I funding formulas and establish a set per-pupil amount. Congress should streamline the four existing Title I grant streams into a single, clear formula based on the number of children from low-income families by state. At the same time, Congress should establish a straightforward determination of Title I award amounts per pupil based on the total amount appropriated to Title I divided by the number of eligible children from low-income families in a state. The amount per pupil would be roughly $1,000, and could then be weighted by the cost of living in different states.[31]∂ Allow states to make their Title I dollars portable. As a start, Congress should allow states to make their Title I dollars portable, following a child from a low-income family to a private school of choice. Senator Tim Scott (R–SC) and Representative Luke Messer (R–IN) have each introduced proposals (Title I portability amendment to S. 1177/H.R. 5477, 114th Cong.) that, in certain circumstances, would give states the option to make their share of Title I dollars portable, following children to any school that meets their unique learning needs.∂ State policymakers should:∂ Establish education savings accounts. States should follow the lead of Arizona, Nevada, Florida, Mississippi, and Tennessee and establish ESAs. Through ESA options, states deposit a portion of the money that the state would have spent on a child in a public school into a parent-controlled, restricted-use savings account. Parents can then use those dollars to pay for any education-related service, product, or provider, including private school tuition, online learning, special education services and therapies, textbooks, curricula, and college courses, among other education expenditures. Notably, parents can roll over unused funds from year to year to save for anticipated future education-related expenses, such as high school or college tuition.∂ Allow parents to deposit Title I dollars into state or district school choice programs. States should establish school choice options, such as vouchers, tuition tax credit scholarships, and ESAs, and should then allow Title I dollars to be deposited into those options. For example, states should establish ESAs, and then under a federal Title I portability option, choose to allow parents to deposit their Title I funds into their child’s ESA. In Nevada, students from low-income families who participate in the ESA option will have $5,700 annually deposited into their accounts beginning in the 2015–2016 school year. If Title I portability were established federal policy, Nevada could then opt in to the portability arrangement, and parents could have an additional amount (likely close to $1,000) deposited into their ESA, taking their account distribution closer to $6,700 annually, greatly increasing their education purchasing power.

#### Portable Title I improves education

Burke and Sheffield; Lindsey Burke: Director, Center for Education Policy and Will Skillman Fellow in Education in the Institute for Family, Community, and Opportunity; 2013

(Lindsey and Rachel, “13 ways the 113th congress could improve education in America”, The Heritage Foundation, May 15, 2013, http://www.heritage.org/education/report/13-ways-the-113th-congress-can-improve-education-america , GDI – TFW)

Policymakers in the 113th Congress should avoid a wholesale eighth reauthorization. Instead, federal policymakers should simplify existing law by eliminating all of the law’s duplicative and ineffective programs and allowing cross-program flexibility among the remaining K–12 programs operated by the Department of Education. At the same time, they should allow states to make their Title I dollars portable, following children to a private school of choice. **5. To better serve low-income children, Congress should allow states to make their Title I dollars portable.**Title I of No Child Left Behind provides federal funding to states in order for the states to provide additional funds to low-income school districts. While the intent of Title I is to provide resources to low-income children, its design is “neither student-centered nor transparent. Instead, Title I funds are delivered through complex funding formulas created over decades of congressional policymaking.”[[15]](http://www.heritage.org/education/report/13-ways-the-113th-congress-can-improve-education-america" \l "_ftn15) As researcher Susan Aud writes: The funding formulas used to determine each school district’s total Title I, Part A allocation are prohibitively complex, with provisions that render the final results substantially incongruent with the original legislative intention. Additionally, as grants have been added to the program, the complexity of the funding system has increased exponentially. Consequently, it is likely that no more than a handful of experts in the country clearly understand the process from beginning to end or could project a particular district’s allocation based on information about its low-income students. The result is a funding system that is opaque and unaccountable.[[16]](http://www.heritage.org/education/report/13-ways-the-113th-congress-can-improve-education-america" \l "_ftn16) In order to make Title I work for the disadvantaged children it was originally intended to help, the program’s funding formula should be simplified. It should be simplified using a set per-pupil allocation to ensure maximum funding reaches poor children, rather than diluting it due to formula complexity and administrative requirements. Congress should also permit states to make Title I funding portable, allowing funding to follow a child to the school of his parents’ choice—public, private, charter, or virtual.

## Solvency – private schools autonomy

#### Title I Vouchers increase access to private schools or educational services for underserved students

Doyle, 17 (Michelle L., “Federal Support for Eligible Private School Students: Elusive Equity and Ways to Capture It”, Fordham Institute, 1-18-17, https://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/%2801.18%29%20Federal%20Support%20for%20Eligible%20Private%20School%20Students.pdf, 7-10-17, GDI-JIJD)

Another model to look at for possible modification of Title I is state voucher programs that provide scholarship funds that follow the child to his or her private school. It is vital to retain Title I's focus on educational need. Title I funds generated by low-income children residing in Title I attendance areas could be pooled into a scholarship organization that would grant parents vouchers for students with academic need who attend private schools. The parents would use these Title I vouchers to obtain additional education services for their children, including services provided by the private schools. By allowing parents to decide where the voucher goes—to their child’s private school, the local tutoring center, a favorite teacher for after-school tutoring—the additional funds could be used in a way that adds educational value tailored to the individual child. But the funding available per individual child ($estimated at $500-$700 per child, but as low as $250 per child) would yield many fewer services than an effectively administered Title I program.

#### Title 1 portability provides private school autonomy—allowing resources to follow students

**Burke,** Will Skillman Fellow in Education Policy in the Institute for Family, Community, and Opportunity at The Heritage Foundation, **2015**

(Lindsey M., “From Piecemeal to Portable: Transforming Title I into a Student-Centered Support System”, Heritage Foundation, September 28, 2015, <http://www.heritage.org/education/report/piecemeal-portable-transforming-title-i-student-centered-support-system>, accessed 7/4/17, GDI-JG)

∂ The Elementary and Secondary Education Act includes important protections for private schools. Specifically, section 9506 of the ESEA states that nothing in the law shall be construed to (a) “affect any private school that does not receive funds or services under” ESEA; (b) “affect a home school”; or (c) “permit, allow, encourage, or authorize any Federal control over any aspect of any private, religious, or home school.” Private schools that participate in Title I’s equitable services provision specifically are not subject to ESEA’s Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) requirement nor to the law’s Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) mandate.∂ ∂ Stakeholders in the private school community occasionally raise objections to Title I portability out of concern over the possibility of federal regulations following dollars to participating private schools. To mitigate those concerns, any portability proposal should include strong protections for private school autonomy.∂ ∂ Private School Participation. Existing private school participation in the Title I program is already significant. More than 20 percent of private schools currently participate in Title I programs. Notably, the proportion of religious private schools that participate in Title I is much higher. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, nearly half of all Catholic schools (47.8 percent) participate in Title I programs, along with 13 percent of schools designated as “other religious.” Taken together, nearly one-quarter (24.9 percent) of religiously affiliated schools already participate in Title I. Fewer non-religious schools (8 percent) participate in Title I.[28]∂ ∂ ∂ ∂ Strong Protections for Private Schools. Any proposal to allow states to have their Title I dollars follow children to private schools of choice must be coupled with strong protections for private schools. Title I portability proposals should incorporate language similar to that included in the law authorizing the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, which provides scholarships to children from low-income families living in the nation’s capital to attend a private school of choice. Many private schools do not want to be considered “recipients of federal financial assistance” out of concern that such a designation would make them subject to the onerous federal regulations and enforcement actions (such as those that fall under Title IX) of the federal civil rights agencies, including the U.S. Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR). The Institute for Justice crafted language for the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program that specified that children, not schools, received scholarship proceeds and thus schools were not to be considered recipients of federal funds. Subsections 308(d) and (e) of the D.C. School Choice Incentive Act of 2003 (Title III in Division C of Public Law 108-199) state:∂ ∂ This language was necessary because of the unfortunate United States Supreme Court decision in Grove City College v. Bell in 1984, which held that colleges that accepted students participating in the federal Pell Grant program were recipients of federal funds and therefore subject to federal oversight. This led Grove City and Hillsdale Colleges to withdraw from the Pell Grant program.∂ ∂ Title I portability would allow money to follow the student rather than being a payment to a school. Adding those federal dollars to a state-awarded scholarship should not impact school operations, mission, or culture, as such funds would be provided directly to the participating student. Including language used in the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program authorizing statute would provide a framework for additional protections within a portability option.[30]

#### Title 1 portability provides private school autonomy—resolving resource misallocation and providing school choice

**Burke,** Will Skillman Fellow in Education Policy in the Institute for Family, Community, and Opportunity at The Heritage Foundation, **2015**

(Lindsey M., “From Piecemeal to Portable: Transforming Title I into a Student-Centered Support System”, Heritage Foundation, September 28, 2015, <http://www.heritage.org/education/report/piecemeal-portable-transforming-title-i-student-centered-support-system>, accessed 7/4/17, GDI-JG)

Government-run public schools have depended on regulations to ensure conformity to standards. In a marketplace of educational options, parents’ ability to choose among options drives schools’ interest in pursuing standards of excellence. The kinds of regulations used in a government-provider system (which have not served public schools well) are inappropriate in a marketplace and can have the net effect of limiting the schooling choices available to families. Private schools already operate under the most rigorous form of accountability: Parents who are dissatisfied for any reason can “vote with their feet” and choose another schooling option. The Title I programs and services that are made available to students in participating private schools are subject to this strictest form of accountability—the voluntary nature of parents’ choice to attend a given private school.∂ By extension, strong protections for private schools must be included in any portability proposal that gives states the option for Title I dollars to be student-centered and portable. Private schools should not be bound by new regulations or otherwise have to compromise their culture and autonomy as a result of Title I portabilty. Shifting to a system of student-centered Title I funding that is portable will not only better target dollars and increase the likelihood that funding reaches the low-income students it was designed to help, but will have the additional benefit of catalyzing school choice expansion at the state level, which could be one of federal portability’s most significant potential impacts.

## Solvency – school choice

#### Title I reform benefits the ESEA by helping low income students in need

KOTESKEY, 15, Policy analyst [Tyler; “Title I funding portability is key to ESEA reform," 7-9-2015, The Hill, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/education/247300-title-i-funding-portability-is-key-to-esea-reform> ; RJC]

This Tuesday, the Senate began floor debate on reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)—a centerpiece of federal education policy dating back to Lyndon Johnson’s “war on poverty.” The ESEA has not been renewed since its expiration in 2007, so the upcoming debate holds key opportunities to improve our federal education appropriation system and ensure that it does the most to help vulnerable students.

One of the best ways to improve the ESEA this week is through Title I reform. Title I of the ESEA (the Act’s largest funding program) gives out grants for low-income students, and is designed to close achievement gaps between them and their wealthier peers. Sen. Tim Scott (R-S.C.) is expected to reintroduce an amendment to allow Title I dollars to follow individual students to the private or public school of their choice. Given the counterproductive funding requirements currently tied to Title I grants, Scott’s amendment holds promise. It would reduce state and district-level administrative burdens, fix school-funding inequities caused by Title I regulations, and create competitive incentives for schools to better serve their kids.

The current Title I program is broken. A meta-analysis of 17 federal studies on its effectiveness indicated only a modest overall impact, while another by Harvard University concluded the program had failed in its original mission of closing achievements gaps between disadvantaged and wealthy students.

Examining what schools have to go through to get Title I funding, it is easy to see why. The program’s litany of regulations forces the administrative staff of states and districts to spend resources proving compliance with requirements on how they spend their grants to avoid losing eligibility. This wastes time and money that could be used to allocate the funding in ways that best serves their schools’ individual needs. The “supplement not supplant” and “comparability” provisions, discussed at length in the Reason Foundation’s Title I reform analysis, restricts states’ abilities to combine these dollars with pre-existing state funding for low-income students to create comprehensive programs. And because Title I allocates grants to schools rather than individual students, it actually promotes per-student funding inequalities between schools, especially at larger schools with high numbers but low-percentages of low-income kids.

Scott’s Title I portability amendment has the potential to change all of this. Tying Title I funds to eligible students relieves administrative burdens by removing the need to justify expenditures. It also ensures that every school gets the same amount of per-student grants for every low-income child they educate. By making these funds portable, wherever these students enroll, low-income pupils will be able to expand their educational options. They will benefit from administrators with new incentives to attract and retain them to get access to the dollars they bring. Portable Title I funding could even be combined with expanding state voucher, tax-credit scholarship programs, and education savings accounts, with proven positive effects on achievement for disadvantaged students to give even more families access to better options.

Scott’s Title I amendment should be a key piece of the ESEA reauthorization. It reduces administrative costs, increases funding equality, gives parents more power, and gives administrators an incentive to provide the best education possible to underserved kids. If we really care about giving our most disadvantaged the best shot in life, this is a big part of how to do it.

#### Title 1 portability provides options and flexibility for low-income families

**Burke,** Will Skillman Fellow in Education Policy in the Institute for Family, Community, and Opportunity at The Heritage Foundation, **2015**

(Lindsey M., “From Piecemeal to Portable: Transforming Title I into a Student-Centered Support System”, Heritage Foundation, September 28, 2015, <http://www.heritage.org/education/report/piecemeal-portable-transforming-title-i-student-centered-support-system>, accessed 7/4/17, GDI-JG)

Currently, private schools can access Title I funds, but only by way of having students enrolled in their schools participate in public school programs and services offered through Title I. It is clear that Title I, as currently allocated to private schools, is convoluted and in need of reform. Instead of serving as a funding source that is student-centered, Title I dollars are made available to private schools through the equitable services provision, which provides private schools that meet eligibility criteria access to Title I programs and services, not Title I dollars. Existing law stipulates that Title I funds are not to benefit a private school, and that a subgrantee is barred from using program funds to support existing instruction or the general needs of students enrolled in a private school.[27] Schools accessing Title I cannot use funds for any particular program; funding is provided to schools proportionally, to cover the cost of access to a relatively small list of federally approved Title I programs in which eligible students can then participate—separated from the rest of the students who are not Title I eligible.∂ Today, convoluted Title I formulas coupled with policies in some states that assign students to public schools based on their parents’ zip code, do not make Title I a vehicle conducive to achieving its primary purpose of “provid[ing] a good education for every boy and girl—no matter where he lives.” By reforming Title I to give states the option to make dollars portable, following children from low-income families to schools or education options of choice, policymakers would create much-needed flexibility for schools and families, and increase the likelihood of achieving that goal. Title I portability would significantly increase families’ abilities to match education options to their children’s unique learning needs.

# Solvency – Resources

### Solvency resources – distribution

#### Resource allocation key to teacher experience and quality – and equitable distribution across high and low poverty schools

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

Finally, we find that holding constant local cost factors, districts that receive more funding per student, spend more, or offer higher salaries, relative to other districts in the same state or county, have lower teacher salary expenditure gaps, lower teacher-pupil ratio gaps, and in most cases, lower teacher experience gaps. In sum, additional resources appear to help districts allocate funding more equitably. Moreover, in districts that receive greater funding per student relative to otherwise similar districts in the same state or county, teacher experience is more equitably distributed across high- and low-poverty schools.

### Solvency resources – funding levels

#### Funding key factor – holding constant other district difference doesn’t alter impact on resource gaps

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

Next, we test how the relationship between funding and teacher resource gaps differs for different types of districts. We find that poverty rate, district percent of student of color, urbanicity, and district size are all unrelated to the relationship between funding and teacher resource gaps (interactions are all insignificant). In other words, resources appear equally as important in closing teacher resource gaps regardless of district poverty, student demographics, urbanicity, and enrollment size (although other unobservable district characteristics may influence the relationship between district funding and teacher resource gaps).

#### Resources necessary to address teacher quality and experience

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

Third, the study has implications related to efforts to address educational inequality more broadly. Much of the recent policy debates surrounding the inequitable access to effective teachers has centered on state laws related to teacher tenure, transfer, and dismissal (for example, Vergara v. California, Wright v. New York, and others). The role of equitable and adequate resources across school districts is notably absent from the discourse. This study demonstrates the importance of district funding rates, especially relative to otherwise similar districts in the same state or county, in helping districts close teacher experience gaps. Although other factors related to human capital management policies may play a role, district administrators’ ability to provide students with equitable learning opportunities across schools depends on their ability to improve teaching and learning conditions in their highest-need schools, which likely requires a sufficient level of resources. Although money is not a panacea for improving working conditions, sufficient resources may be a necessary condition (Grubb, 2009).

### Solvency – resources improve teacher quality

#### Resources necessary to address teacher quality and experience

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

Third, the study has implications related to efforts to address educational inequality more broadly. Much of the recent policy debates surrounding the inequitable access to effective teachers has centered on state laws related to teacher tenure, transfer, and dismissal (for example, Vergara v. California, Wright v. New York, and others). The role of equitable and adequate resources across school districts is notably absent from the discourse. This study demonstrates the importance of district funding rates, especially relative to otherwise similar districts in the same state or county, in helping districts close teacher experience gaps. Although other factors related to human capital management policies may play a role, district administrators’ ability to provide students with equitable learning opportunities across schools depends on their ability to improve teaching and learning conditions in their highest-need schools, which likely requires a sufficient level of resources. Although money is not a panacea for improving working conditions, sufficient resources may be a necessary condition (Grubb, 2009).

#### Need increase in resources to equalize the teacher quality

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

These findings have important policy implications. First, potential regulations that would require districts spend equal proportions on teacher salaries between Title I and non-Title I schools, which the DOE has argued should be part of ESSA, would have major implications for school districts. Most districts already allocate teacher salary expenditures equitably across schools, and about a quarter of students attend districts with either all or no Title I schools.

However, the data show that approximately 939 districts provide more teacher salary expenditures per student to non-Title I elementary schools, compared to their Title I elementary schools (46% of the 2,030 districts with at least one Title I elementary school and at least one non-Title I elementary school). A total of 7.0 million students attend Title I elementary, middle, or high schools in districts where non-Title I schools receive more per-pupil teacher salary funding, on average, than Title I schools at the same grade level. We find that the total expenditure required to equalize average funding in Title I schools to that of non-Title I schools across all districts nationally is $3.3 billion (a 2.2% increase in total state and local teacher salary spending nationally). Given standardized teacher salary schedules, districts would most likely accomplish this by increasing teacher-student ratios in Title I schools. Without additional revenues however, districts would need to implement forced teacher placements, which prior research shows are largely ineffective (Miller & Lee, 2014), or reassign Title I and non-Title I schools.

#### Resources increases improve teacher quality and remedy experience gap – statistically significant

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

Given that our sample is limited to districts with at least four elementary schools (for analyses of elementary teacher resource gaps), some of our fixed effects estimates may not draw on a sufficient number of districts within states or counties, potentially limiting the ability to observe within-state or within-county comparisons. However, our results are consistent when we limit the sample to states with at least 40 districts that meet sample requirement. Results from county fixed effects are also consistent when we limit the sample to only counties with at least 10 districts. The coefficient for per-pupil funding in county fixed effects models that predict teacher experience gaps increases to .008 when the sample is limited to counties with at least 10 districts, implying that each additional $1,000 per student relative to districts in the same county is associated with a reduction in the teacher experience gap of 8.7% of a standard deviation.

### Solvency – Title I resources

#### Title I provides wide ranging support for students to address inequality

Sonnenberg - Statistician Annual Reports and Information, NCES, Specialties and Functions:Allocations, Digest of Education Statistics 2k16 (William “Allocating Grants for Title I” National Center on Education Statistics published- January 2016, accessed- 7/03/17 url- ,file:///C:/Users/randomness/Downloads/Xanthia-national%20center%20for%20education%20statistics%20(2).pdf GDI-XRL)

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act (ESEA), is the U.S. government’s largest educational program to assist disadvantaged children. Established in 1965 as a “War on Poverty” program, Title I now funds programs intended to improve learning for students at risk of educational failure. Such students include low-achieving children in our Nation’s highest-poverty schools, English Learners, children of migrant workers, children with disabilities, Indian children, children who are neglected or delinquent, and young children and their parents who are in need of family-literacy services. Title I funds are intended to provide instruction and instructional support for these disadvantaged children so that they can master challenging curricula and meet state standards in core academic subjects. The law does not stipulate how Title I funds are to be spent. Instead, Title I is an example of flexible funding that local and state educational agencies may use as they deem best. Title I funds are commonly used to support extended-day kindergarten programs; learning laboratories in mathematics, science, and computers; special after-school and summer programs to extend and reinforce the regular school curriculum; and other services to extend and accelerate academic progress. In addition, some Title I funds are also used to pay for additional teachers, professional development, and computers.

### Solvency – target SEAS

#### Focusing on SEAs to leverage incentives best method to improve the teacher quality – competitive grants

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

At the same time, the federal government’s ongoing efforts to improve disadvantaged students’ access to high-quality teachers may be misguided. Districts’ ability to close teacher resource gaps likely depends, in part, on the availability of resources, relative to observationally similar districts in the same state or county. Policies that provide more funding for underfunded school districts may help those districts narrow teacher quality gaps. Thus federal efforts to provide more equitable access to high quality teachers may benefit from redirecting pressure from school districts to state school finance systems. The federal government has exhibited substantial influence on state education agencies through competitive grants (i.e., Race to the Top) and waivers from federal policies (Wrabel, Saultz, Polikoff, McEachin & Duque, 2016).

Unfortunately, in contrast to state education agencies, the federal DOE has little direct influence over state legislatures, which control school district funding levels. Most of the external pressure placed on state legislatures to alter school funding has historically come through state and federal judicial decisions. The federal government’s focus on state education agencies and district human capital policies may simply be a response to lack of authority over state legislatures.

However, identifying incentives for state legislatures to increase the equity and overall level of funding across districts, perhaps by expanding Title I funding through the Education Finance Incentive Grants (which currently comprise 23% of Title I funding) may be a more effective approach to improving equitable access to high-quality teachers within districts.

# Economic Growth/Competitiveness internals and impacts

### Internal link - Education quality key to competitiveness

#### Improving education key to competitiveness and economic prosperity

**Jennings,** founder and former CEO, Center on Education Policy, Washington, D.C., and former General Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives' Committee on Education and Labor, **2015**

(Jack, “ESEA at 50”, Kappan Magazine, April 2015, Volume 96, Number 7, accessed 7/6/17, GDI-JG)

A worldwide job market exists today in which U.S. students will have to compete for jobs with Korean students, among many others, once they leave school. We ignore at our peril the economic and technological changes that have led to higher educational demands.∂ As Marshall S. Smith, a former professor and high- ranking official in the Carter and Clinton adminis- trations, has noted:∂ . . . the challenges of a global economy, a complex and changing international environment, and the tech- nology and communication revolutions have dra- matically increased our collective national need to ensure our future prosperity. As a nation, we are ever more dependent on the quality of our human capital to carry us into a productive and safe future. Our schools are better than many think, but we must ask them to change and become smarter (2011, p. 233).

#### Despite ESSA’s efforts, lack of accountability persists—ensuring the success of high-achieving, low-income students key to economic competitiveness

**Wright,** Editorial Director, Thomas B. Fordham Institute, **2017**

(Brandon L., “Early ESSA plans don't do enough to signal that all students are important”, Thomas B. Fordham Institute, April 26, 2017, <https://edexcellence.net/articles/early-essa-plans-dont-do-enough-to-signal-that-all-students-are-important>, accessed 7/7/17, GDI-JG)

Only seven of the first seventeen states to submit ESSA plans will measure achievement with performance indexes or average scale scores. Put another way, close to two-thirds will repeat No Child Left Behind’s mistaken focus on proficiency rates alone—measures that, as Morgan Polikoff observes, incentivize states to lower their standards, encourage schools and teachers to ignore low- and high-achievers, throw away vast quantities of useful information, and misrepresent achievement gaps and school effectiveness.∂ The news is a little better for growth. Two states, Colorado and New Mexico, deserve gold stars, as growth will count for at least 50 percent of summative grades in elementary and middle schools, and for at least as much as achievement in high schools. Another four come close. In Illinois and New Jersey, for example, growth constitutes 50 percent of summative ratings for elementary and middle schools, but 0 percent for high schools. And Tennessee and Vermont measure growth for all schools, including counting growth for more than 40 percent for grades K–8, but each misses the 50 percent mark. Meanwhile, one state, Oregon, has decided not to issue summative school grades; and two states, Maine and Massachusetts, have not yet determined the weight of their growth measures. Still, that leaves seven states that have missed this opportunity to make growth for all students a major factor in their ESSA accountability systems.∂ These various shortcomings signal to schools that high achievers—including those from disadvantaged backgrounds—don’t deserve to have their education maximized. Policymakers across the country seem to be acting on the oft-said but always-misguided view that higher-achieving students require less attention because they’ll be fine no matter what. Such neglect is inequitable. The students most harmed are disadvantaged high achievers—boys and girls who face such challenges as disability or poverty, or who comes from homes in tough neighborhoods, with ill-educated parents who don’t speak English. They depend far more than upper-middle-class students on the public education system to do right by them. So if they don’t receive the attention that they—like all children—deserve, many will fall by the wayside, destined by circumstances beyond their control never to realize their full potential.∂ The country also needs these children to be highly educated in order to ensure its long-term competitiveness, security, and innovation. Our highest achievers are young people who hold perhaps the greatest promise for making major advances in science, technology, medicine, the humanities, and much more. Our nation’s economic vitality and growth depend heavily on the quality and productivity of our human capital and its capacity for innovation.∂ In sum, sixteen of the first seventeen state ESSA plans fail to include accountability indicators that fully signal a commitment to providing all students with the education they deserve. And six of the sixteen do virtually nothing on this score. If we see a similar pattern with the states that submit plans in September, many of America's high achievers—especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds—will continue to be an afterthought, a fate no child should suffer.

#### Improving education key to competitiveness and economic prosperity

**Jennings,** founder and former CEO, Center on Education Policy, Washington, D.C., and former General Counsel, U.S. House of Representatives' Committee on Education and Labor, **2015**

(Jack, “ESEA at 50”, Kappan Magazine, April 2015, Volume 96, Number 7, accessed 7/6/17, GDI-JG)

A worldwide job market exists today in which U.S. students will have to compete for jobs with Korean students, among many others, once they leave school. We ignore at our peril the economic and technological changes that have led to higher educational demands.∂ As Marshall S. Smith, a former professor and high- ranking official in the Carter and Clinton adminis- trations, has noted:∂ . . . the challenges of a global economy, a complex and changing international environment, and the tech- nology and communication revolutions have dra- matically increased our collective national need to ensure our future prosperity. As a nation, we are ever more dependent on the quality of our human capital to carry us into a productive and safe future. Our schools are better than many think, but we must ask them to change and become smarter (2011, p. 233).

#### Despite ESSA’s efforts, lack of accountability persists—ensuring the success of high-achieving, low-income students key to economic competitiveness

**Wright,** Editorial Director, Thomas B. Fordham Institute, **2017**

(Brandon L., “Early ESSA plans don't do enough to signal that all students are important”, Thomas B. Fordham Institute, April 26, 2017, <https://edexcellence.net/articles/early-essa-plans-dont-do-enough-to-signal-that-all-students-are-important>, accessed 7/7/17, GDI-JG)

Only seven of the first seventeen states to submit ESSA plans will measure achievement with performance indexes or average scale scores. Put another way, close to two-thirds will repeat No Child Left Behind’s mistaken focus on proficiency rates alone—measures that, as Morgan Polikoff observes, incentivize states to lower their standards, encourage schools and teachers to ignore low- and high-achievers, throw away vast quantities of useful information, and misrepresent achievement gaps and school effectiveness.∂ The news is a little better for growth. Two states, Colorado and New Mexico, deserve gold stars, as growth will count for at least 50 percent of summative grades in elementary and middle schools, and for at least as much as achievement in high schools. Another four come close. In Illinois and New Jersey, for example, growth constitutes 50 percent of summative ratings for elementary and middle schools, but 0 percent for high schools. And Tennessee and Vermont measure growth for all schools, including counting growth for more than 40 percent for grades K–8, but each misses the 50 percent mark. Meanwhile, one state, Oregon, has decided not to issue summative school grades; and two states, Maine and Massachusetts, have not yet determined the weight of their growth measures. Still, that leaves seven states that have missed this opportunity to make growth for all students a major factor in their ESSA accountability systems.∂ These various shortcomings signal to schools that high achievers—including those from disadvantaged backgrounds—don’t deserve to have their education maximized. Policymakers across the country seem to be acting on the oft-said but always-misguided view that higher-achieving students require less attention because they’ll be fine no matter what. Such neglect is inequitable. The students most harmed are disadvantaged high achievers—boys and girls who face such challenges as disability or poverty, or who comes from homes in tough neighborhoods, with ill-educated parents who don’t speak English. They depend far more than upper-middle-class students on the public education system to do right by them. So if they don’t receive the attention that they—like all children—deserve, many will fall by the wayside, destined by circumstances beyond their control never to realize their full potential.∂ The country also needs these children to be highly educated in order to ensure its long-term competitiveness, security, and innovation. Our highest achievers are young people who hold perhaps the greatest promise for making major advances in science, technology, medicine, the humanities, and much more. Our nation’s economic vitality and growth depend heavily on the quality and productivity of our human capital and its capacity for innovation.∂ In sum, sixteen of the first seventeen state ESSA plans fail to include accountability indicators that fully signal a commitment to providing all students with the education they deserve. And six of the sixteen do virtually nothing on this score. If we see a similar pattern with the states that submit plans in September, many of America's high achievers—especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds—will continue to be an afterthought, a fate no child should suffer.

### Internal link - Education quality key to graduation

#### Low-income students face myriad health and educational problems—resolving proficiency gaps increases overall college graduation

**Porter,** writer, Economic Scene column, The New York Times, **2015**

(Eduardo, “Education Gap Between Rich and Poor Is Growing Wider”, The New York Times, September 22, 2015, https://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/23/business/economy/education-gap-between-rich-and-poor-is-growing-wider.html, accessed 7/11/17, GDI-JG)

Earlier this week, Professor Waldfogel and colleagues from Australia, Canada and Britain published a new book titled “Too Many Children Left Behind” (Russell Sage). It traces the story of America’s educational disparities across the life cycle of its children, from the day they enter kindergarten to eighth grade.∂ Their story goes sour very early, and it gets worse as it goes along. On the day they start kindergarten, children from families of low socioeconomic status are already more than a year behind the children of college graduates in their grasp of both reading and math.∂ And despite the efforts deployed by the American public education system, nine years later the achievement gap, on average, will have widened by somewhere from one-half to two-thirds.∂ Even the best performers from disadvantaged backgrounds, who enter kindergarten reading as well as the smartest rich kids, fall behind over the course of their schooling.∂ The challenges such children face compared to their more fortunate peers are enormous. Children from low socioeconomic backgrounds are seven times more likely to have been born to a teenage mother. Only half live with both parents, compared with 83 percent of the children of college graduates.∂ The children of less educated parents suffer higher obesity rates, have more social and emotional problems and are more likely to report poor or fair health. And because they are much poorer, they are less likely to afford private preschool or the many enrichment opportunities — extra lessons, tutors, music and art, elite sports teams — that richer, better-educated parents lavish on their children.∂ When they enter the public education system, they are shortchanged again. Eleven-year-olds from the wrong side of the tracks are about one-third more likely to have a novice teacher, according to Professor Waldfogel and her colleagues. They are much more likely to be held back a grade, a surefire way to stunt their development, the researchers say.∂ Financed mainly by real estate taxes that are more plentiful in neighborhoods with expensive homes, public education is becoming increasingly compartmentalized. Well-funded schools where the children of the affluent can play and learn with each other are cordoned off from the shabbier schools teaching the poor, who are still disproportionally from black or Hispanic backgrounds.∂ Even efforts to lean against inequality backfire. Research by Rachel Valentino, who received her Ph.D. in education policy at Stanford University this year, found that public prekindergarten programs offered minorities and the poor a lower-quality education.∂ Perhaps pre-K programs serving poor and minority children have trouble attracting good teachers. Perhaps classrooms with more disadvantaged children are more difficult to manage. Perhaps teachers offer more basic instruction because disadvantaged children need to catch up. In any event, Ms. Valentino told me, “the gaps are huge.”∂ This is arguably education’s biggest problem. Narrowing proficiency gaps that emerge way before college would probably do more to increase the nation’s college graduation rate than offering universal community college, easier terms on student loans or more financial aid.∂ “If we could equalize achievement from age zero to 14,” Professor Waldfogel told me, “that would go a long way toward closing the college enrollment and completion gaps.”∂ It can be done. Australia, Canada — even the historically class-ridden Britain — show much more equitable outcomes.

#### Graduation rates low – and value of a diploma low limits workplace readiness

**Anselem,** Policy Analyst, Education Policy Studies, Institute for Family, Community, and Opportunity, Heritage Foundation, **2014**

(Mary Clare, “Barriers to High School Completion Create Barriers to Economic Mobility”, Heritage Foundation, May 15, 2014, http://www.heritage.org/education/report/barriers-high-school-completion-create-barriers-economic-mobility, accessed July 14, 2017, GDI-JG)

Low-Quality Schools. Liberals and conservatives alike agree that many parts of the public school system in America are failing, especially in low-income communities. Too many young students are trapped in failing public schools simply because of where they were born. Place of birth should not be a life sentence to low economic mobility. The Brookings Institution Education Choice and Competition Index highlights the poor opportunities that American children face all over the country, especially in public schools.[20]∂ Public high school graduation rates are on an upward trend, reaching 80 percent[21] in 2012, an achievement that should be celebrated with caution. Graduation rates alone are not a reliable indicator of a quality education and future success. It could be that while completion rates have slightly increased, the value of a high school degree has not. Indeed, according to the American Diploma Project, launched by the Achieve Organization, more and more students are heading to college without the skills necessary to complete college coursework. Over half of college students take a remedial English or math class.[22] Students who go directly from high school to the workforce are not faring much better. The American Diploma Project finds that employers are also disappointed that high school graduates are not skilled for the jobs for which a high school diploma should qualify them: “More than 60 percent of employers rate graduates’ skills in grammar, spelling, writing and basic math as only ‘fair’ or ‘poor.’”[23]

#### Graduation key to social and economic mobility

**Anselem,** Policy Analyst, Education Policy Studies, Institute for Family, Community, and Opportunity, Heritage Foundation, **2014**

(Mary Clare, “Barriers to High School Completion Create Barriers to Economic Mobility”, Heritage Foundation, May 15, 2014, http://www.heritage.org/education/report/barriers-high-school-completion-create-barriers-economic-mobility, accessed July 14, 2017, GDI-JG)

One of the most crucial factors that determine a child’s ability to move up the economic ladder is education. Today, completing high school is essential for any chance to achieve financial success in life. College experience is important, but failing to graduate from high school is likely to be economically disastrous. Despite the overwhelming evidence that high school completion leads to greater earnings and happiness in adulthood, thousands of students drop out every year, due to a variety of factors. This Discussion Paper examines barriers to high school completion that create barriers to economic mobility.∂ The question is not whether a child is intelligent enough to complete high school. With the proper resources and support, almost every child is capable of earning a high school diploma. The question is which skills a student must develop in order to succeed in high school. Despite recent upward trends in high school graduation rates, it is still unclear whether students are developing the non-cognitive skills during high school that will enable them to survive setbacks, including during their high school career, and to persevere through life’s challenges in order to prosper economically and socially. If one can identify the non-cognitive skills that are needed to succeed in school, and how to foster them, high school completion rates can increase. Social skills, perseverance or “grit,” ambition, and a strong set of values are all components of a child’s personality that are essential to success. However, many schools—especially public schools serving low-income communities—fail to develop these skills and leave their students with the options of dropping out or graduating with a meaningless diploma. As the late Gary Becker, a Nobel-prize winner in economics, wrote, “The degree of mobility would increase significantly if ways could be found to efficiently lower the high school dropout rate.”[1] Indeed, economic mobility for low-income children would greatly improve if they could achieve the significant step of earning a (meaningful) high school diploma.

### Internal link - Education quality key to community economies

#### Improved educational investments enhance family income and improve economy overall

Darling-Hammond, Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education education professor and faculty director, 15 (Linda “Society Benefits When We Spend More on Education” New York Times 3-26-2015 https://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2015/03/26/is-improving-schools-all-about-money/society-benefits-when-we-spend-more-on-education 7-14-2017 GDI-JIJD)

The promise of equal opportunity, most especially in education, is at the heart of the American dream: If you study and work hard, the promise goes, you can achieve your aspirations.¶ Yet our schools are among the most unequally funded in the industrialized world, with some states spending more than double what others spend per pupil, and some districts within each state spending double or triple what others can allocate.¶ Proper funding can, in many cases, eliminate the gap in adult outcomes between those raised in poor and in non-poor families.¶ Worse still, many states spend less in school districts that serve low-income students and new immigrants who need more support to succeed. While some students attend spacious, well-outfitted schools with extensive libraries, science labs, computers and small classes, others attend crumbling, overcrowded buildings where they lack access to basic textbooks and trained teachers.¶ More than 40 states have experienced school funding lawsuits about these unjust conditions, and in each case, defense attorneys bring in experts who argue that money doesn’t make a difference. Yet money that is properly spent on the right educational resources for students who need them the most — especially on well-qualified educators and keeping classes at reasonable sizes — can make a huge difference.¶ A recent study of school funding reforms over the last 40 years or so shows just how much of a difference money can make: For low-income students who spent all 12 years of school in districts that increased their spending by 20 percent as a result of court-ordered reforms, graduation rates rose by 23 percentage points and adult poverty rates fell by 20 percentage points. The students’ family incomes were about 52 percent higher than they would have been without the greater education investment. The effects were large enough in many cases to entirely eliminate the gap in adult outcomes between those raised in poor families and those raised in non-poor families. ¶ When young people are gainfully employed rather than in prison or on welfare, when they are earning higher wages and paying greater taxes that support the retirement, health care and social needs of other citizens, everyone wins. Money, invested well in education, makes an enormous difference to the welfare of everyone in our society.

### Internal link – teacher quality key to lifetime earning

#### Higher-performing teachers increase student lifetime earnings- monumental impact over time

Tuan, University of Washington College of Education dean, 16 (Mia, "Invest in great teaching for all students — it can mean better lifetime earnings", The Seattle Times, 9-11-16, www.seattletimes.com/opinion/invest-in-great-teaching-for-all-students-it-can-mean-better-lifetime-earnings/, 7-11-17, GDI-EC)

Teaching quality is the single most important school-based factor influencing student achievement, and a great teacher can change the entire trajectory of a student’s life. We need teachers who can prepare our students to succeed in Washington’s knowledge-based economy and participate in a thriving civic democracy.

Consider research showing that if we place a student in a classroom with an above-average-performing teacher — rather than an average-performing teacher — for just one year, it improves achievement enough to increase lifetime earnings by more than $10,000.

Multiplied by a class of 24, a single higher-performing teacher can generate more than $240,000 in additional lifetime earnings for their students every single year. With more than 1 million students in our public schools, raising the performance of every teacher in Washington could deliver more than $11 billion in additional lifetime earnings to our students, year after year.

#### Quality teachers affect multiple aspects of student outcomes- college quality, earnings

Chetty, Stanford University economics professor, et al, 14 (Raj, John N., Brown University economics associate professor, Jonah E., Columbia Graduate School of Business professor, "Measuring the Impacts of Teachers II: Teacher Value-Added and Student Outcomes in Adulthood", American Economic Review, September 2014, https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/30749606/w19424.pdf?sequence=1, 7-11-17, GDI-EC)

\*VA= value-added

We find that teacher VA has substantial impacts on a broad range of outcomes. A 1 SD improvement in teacher VA in a single grade raises the probability of college attendance at age 20 by 0.82 percentage points, relative to a sample mean of 37%. Improvements in teacher quality also raise the quality of the colleges that students attend, as measured by the average earnings of previous graduates of that college. Students who are assigned higher VA teachers have steeper earnings trajectories in their 20s. At age 28, the oldest age at which we currently have a sufficiently large sample size to estimate earnings impacts, a 1 SD increase in teacher quality in a single grade raises annual earnings by 1.3%. If the impact on earnings remains constant at 1.3% over the lifecycle, students would gain approximately $39,000 on average in cumulative lifetime income from a 1 SD improvement in teacher VA in a single grade. Discounting at a 5% rate yields a present value gain of $7,000 at age 12, the mean age at which the interventions we study occur. We also find that improvements in teacher quality significantly reduce the probability of having a child while being a teenager, increase the quality of the neighborhood in which the student lives (as measured by the percentage of college graduates in that ZIP code) in adulthood, and raise participation rates in 401(k) retirement savings plans.

#### Teacher quality correlated with increased life time earnings for students

Goldhaber, University of Washington, Bothell Center for Education Data & Research Director, 16 (Dan, "In Schools, Teacher Quality Matters Most", Education Next, Spring 2016, educationnext.org/in-schools-teacher-quality-matters-most-coleman/, 7-10-17, GDI-EC)

Finally, although the lion’s share of teacher-quality research since the Coleman Report has focused on the connections between teacher quality and student test scores, new evidence is shining a light on the extent to which teachers affect other long-term non-test student outcomes as well. Important work by Stanford University researcher Raj Chetty and his colleagues finds that value-added measures of teacher quality predict students’ outcomes long into the future. Students assigned to high-value-added teachers are more likely to graduate from high school, go to college, be employed, and earn higher wages (see Figure 2). This has profound implications: Chetty and colleagues estimate that replacing a teacher whose value added is in the bottom 5 percent of the distribution with an average teacher would increase the present discounted value of students’ lifetime income by more than $250,000 for a typical class (of  28 students).

#### Teachers impact future student earnings- students have steeper earning trajectories

Chetty, Stanford University economics professor, et al, 14 (Raj, John N., Brown University economics associate professor, Jonah E., Columbia Graduate School of Business professor, "Measuring the Impacts of Teachers II: Teacher Value-Added and Student Outcomes in Adulthood", American Economic Review, September 2014, https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/30749606/w19424.pdf?sequence=1, 7-11-17, GDI-EC)

\*VA= value-added

Earnings Trajectories. Next, we analyze how teacher VA affects the trajectory of earnings by examining wage earnings impacts at each age from 20 to 28. We run separate regressions of wage earnings at each age on teacher VA using the same specification as in Column 1 of Table 3. Figure 2b plots the coefficients from these regressions (which are reported in Appendix Table 9), divided by average earnings at each age to obtain percentage impacts. The impact of teacher quality on earnings rises almost monotonically with age. At early ages, the impact of higher VA is negative and statistically significant, consistent with our finding that higher VA teachers induce their students to go to college. As these students enter the labor force, they have steeper earnings trajectories than students who had lower VA teachers in grades 4-8. Earnings impacts become positive at age 23, become statistically significant at age 24, and grow through age 28, where the earnings impact reaches 1.65%, as in Figure 2a.

An alternative way to state the result in Figure 2b is that better teachers increase the growth rate of students’ earnings in their 20s. In Column 6 of Table 3, we verify this result directly by regressing the change in earnings from age 22 to age 28 on teacher VA. As expected, a 1 SD increase in teacher VA increases earnings growth by $286 (2.5%) over this period. This finding suggests that teachers’ impacts on lifetime earnings could be larger than the 1.34% impact observed at age 28.

b

### internal link – mid sized cities key to economy

#### midsized cities key to the economy – continue largest percentage of urbanites

**Isenberg, Professor of Entrepreneurship Practice @ Babson Executive Education, and Onymah, Associate Professor of Sales and Marketing @ Babson College,2017**

(Daniel and Vincent, “Midsize Cities Are Entrepreneurship’s Real Test” Harvard Business Review January 24, 2017 <https://hbr.org/2017/01/midsize-cities-are-entrepreneurships-real-test> accessed GDI - TM)

When it comes to entrepreneurship-driven regional growth, a few big population centers garner the glamor, whether Boston, Northern California’s Bay Area, Bangalore, or Beijing. This is not mere optics: the large portion of the $50 billion global venture capital pie fueling entrepreneurial growth is concentrated in or near a few big urban regions. Furthermore, mega-cities seem to be natural hotbeds for growth: as just one example, London, with around 10 million people, currently has a 50% greater incidence of high growth firms compared to other UK regions, and a quarter of the high growth firms in the nation overall.

But the visibility of megacities masks the reality that billions do not live in these entrepreneurial epicenters. In fact, midsize cities and their associated regions are where most people live, work, and play, and will continue to do so into the future: Forecasts tell us that even in 2050 megacities will still number just a few dozen, while thousands of midsize cities (.5 to 5 million people) will house 92% of the world’s urbanites.

### Internal link – rural communities

#### Small towns connect rural and urban economies

IIED 17 [International Institute for Environment and Development; March 2017; Briefing; "Why small towns matter: urbanisation, rural transformations and food security"; pubs.iied.org/pdfs/10815IIED.pdfl accessed 7-14-17; GDI-PAC]

The economic interdependence between urbanbased enterprises, rural producers and urban markets is often stronger around small towns. Traders based in these centres can provide access to markets for small-scale producers who may find it otherwise difficult to attract the interest of large supply chains that usually require consistent quality and relatively large quantities of produce. As incomes grow, domestic demand increases for locally produced perishable foodstuffs, supporting related processing activities in small towns.4,5,6 Value-adding processing of food is also an increasingly important function of enterprises based in small towns. In many cases, this is the basis of successful diversification of the local economic base.

Small towns also act as centres for the provision of manufactured goods and services for people living in the surrounding rural area. In this way, small towns are where the growth and consolidation of non-farm activities and employment are located within the rural region, either through the development of small and medium-sized enterprises or through the relocation of branches of private and public enterprises. In so doing, small towns attract migrants looking for non-farm employment or work as seasonal agricultural waged labour for local family farms (see Box 1).7,8

#### Rural centers key to cheap food and energy

Zwagerman, Drake University Agricultural Law Center Associate Director, 17 [Jennifer; 1-19-17; The Conversation; "Rural America matters to all Americans"; theconversation.com/rural-america-matters-to-all-americans-69756; accessed 7-14-17; GDI-PAC]

Farming and agricultural production are obvious examples. Agriculture makes up approximately 6 percent of the overall economy and provides almost 10 percent of U.S. employment. U.S. agricultural exports are expected to reach more than US$130 billion in 2017.

The safety and low cost of the food that U.S. farmers provide is often taken for granted. Americans spend less of their income on food than any other country – just over 6 percent of household income. That compares to Canada – 9.2 percent, Germany – 10.22 percent, France – 13.3 percent and Italy – 14.2 percent.

But rural America is about more than farming. Rural communities are also the home of many of the country’s energy production resources, such as coal mining, renewable fuels like ethanol and biodiesel, wind and solar energy, and gas and oil production. Approximately 20 percent of the manufacturing industry is located in rural America.

### Internal link – achievement gap undermines economy

#### Achievement gaps represent lost economic gains as well as increase social costs of inequality

**Auguste,** Opportunity@Work president and co-founder, **et al. 09** (Byron “The economic cost of the US education gap” McKinsey & Company 06-09 http://www.mckinsey.com/industries/social-sector/our-insights/the-economic-cost-of-the-us-education-gap 7-14-2017 GDI-JIJD)

A persistent gap in academic achievement between children in the United States and their counterparts in other countries deprived the US economy of as much as $2.3 trillion in economic output in 2008, McKinsey research finds.1 Moreover, each of the long-standing achievement gaps among US students of differing ethnic origins, income levels, and school systems represents hundreds of billions of dollars in unrealized economic gains. Together, these disturbing gaps underscore the staggering economic and social cost of underutilized human potential. Yet they also create room for hope by suggesting that the widespread application of best practices could secure a better, more equitable education for the country’s children—along with substantial economic gains.

How has educational achievement changed in the United States since 1983, when the publication of the seminal US government report A Nation at Risk2 sounded the alarm about the “rising tide of mediocrity” in American schools? To learn the answer, we interviewed leading educational researchers around the world, assessed the landscape of academic research and educational-achievement data, and built an economic model that allowed us to examine the relationships among educational achievement (represented by standardized test scores), the earnings potential of workers, and GDP.

We made three noteworthy assumptions: test scores are the best available measure of educational achievement; educational achievement and attainment (including milestones such as graduation rates) are key drivers in hiring and are positively correlated with earnings; and labor markets will hire available workers with higher skills and education. While these assumptions admittedly simplify the socioeconomic complexities and uncertainties, they allowed us to draw meaningful conclusions about the economic impact of educational gaps in the United States.

Four substantial achievement gaps emerged from our work (Exhibit 1). The first is the international one. As recently as the 1960s, the United States led the world in a variety of educational outcomes. Yet the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) found that in 2006, America ranked 25th out of 30 industrialized countries in math and 24th in science. Moreover, cross-country comparisons of US students at two different ages—9–10 and 15—suggest that the closer they get to joining the labor force, the further they lag behind their international counterparts in reading, math, and science. The gap’s impact is startling: if the United States had closed it by 1998 and reached the level of the top performers, such as Finland and South Korea, the US GDP could have been $1.3 trillion to $2.3 trillion higher in 2008. To put the facts another way, the gap imposes a higher recurring annual economic cost on the US economy than the current recession does.

Next we looked at other gaps in US educational achievement. A second one emerges among US students of different ethnic origins. As researchers have long known, black and Hispanic students score, on average, two to three years behind white students of the same age on standardized tests—a gap that persists regardless of how it is measured. These differences too represent sizable missed opportunities. If the gap had been bridged by 1998, the 2008 US GDP could have been up to $525 billion higher than it was. When we looked at the implications of the achievement gap on US earnings, we found that in aggregate they could have been up to $160 billion higher in 2008 had it been eliminated. Left unchecked, the magnitude of such disparities will rise in coming years as blacks and Hispanics account for a larger share of the US population.

The two remaining achievement gaps we studied—one between students at different income levels, the other between higher- and lower-performing school systems—also appear to exact a heavy price. We define lower-income students as those eligible for free lunch through a government program. Had the achievement gap between them and other students been bridged by 1998, a decade later US GDP might have been as much as $670 billion higher than it was. If the gap between low-performing states and the US average had been closed, the 2008 US GDP could have been up to $700 billion higher. Collectively, the economic impact of the four achievement gaps we studied is significant—comparable, in their effect on the US economy, to recessions since the 1970s (Exhibit 2).

#### Achievement gap economic costs equivalent to recession size economic losses

Miller, Senior Advisor, Mckinsey & Company,09 (Matt, “The economic impact of the achievement gap in America’s schools” McKinsey on Society 04-09 http://mckinseyonsociety.com/the-economic-impact-of-the-achievement-gap-in-americas-schools/ 7-14-2017 GDI-JIJD)

The achievement gaps described above raise moral questions for a society committed to the ideal of equal opportunity. But they also impose concrete economic costs. Estimating the economic impact of underutilized human potential is necessarily an imperfect process, requiring assumptions about the pace of educational improvement, the relationship of student achievement to economic growth, and the nature of labor markets as workforce skills are enhanced. But even with these challenges, McKinsey believes that scoping the rough magnitudes of the economic cost of America’s educational achievement gaps is important; without such estimates it is difficult to judge how efforts to lift student achievement should rank among national economic priorities.¶ To make these estimates, McKinsey built on an approach pioneered by economist Eric Hanushek of Stanford University for linking trends in student achievement to growth in GDP.13,14 The scenario we chose to model runs as follows. Suppose that in the 15 years after the 1983 report “A Nation at Risk” sounded the alarm about the “rising tide of mediocrity” in American education, the United States had lifted lagging student achievement to higher (but in our view achievable) benchmarks of performance? What would have been the effect in 2008 of having reduced America’s achievement gaps in this way? And what was the difference between actual economic performance in 2008 and what it would have been had these improvements been made? This becomes our measure of the underutilization of human potential in the economy. In a desire to avoid false precision we used a range of growth factors to compute a range of GDP impacts in the year 2008. The results square with our common intuition that there is a high price for failing to make full use of the nation’s human potential:¶ • If the United States had closed the international achievement gap between 1983 and 1998 and raised its performance to the level of such nations as Finland and Korea, US GDP in 2008 would have been between $1.3 trillion and $2.3 trillion higher, representing 9 to 16 percent of GDP.¶ • If the United States had closed the racial achievement gap and black and Latino student performance had caught up with that of white students by 1998, GDP in 2008 would have been between $310 billion and $525 billion higher, or roughly 2 to 4 percent of GDP. (The magnitude of this effect will rise in the years ahead as blacks and Latinos become a larger proportion of the population.)¶ • If the United States had closed the income achievement gap so that between 1983 and 1998 the performance of students from families with income below $25,000 a year had been raised to the performance of students from homes with incomes above $25,000 a year, then GDP in 2008 would have been $400 billion to $670 billion higher, or 3 to 5 percent of GDP.¶ • If the United States had closed the systems achievement gap so that between 1983 and 1998 states performing below the national average on NAEP were brought up to the national average, GDP in 2008 would have been $425 billion to $700 billion higher, or about 3 to 5 percent of GDP.15¶ By underutilizing such a large proportion of the country’s human potential, the US economy is less rich in skills than it could be. The result is that American workers are, on average, less able to develop, master, and adapt to new productivity-enhancing technologies and methods than they could otherwise have been. Also, these achievement gaps have a clustering effect akin to economic dead zones, where communities with low-achieving local schools produce clusters of Americans largely unable to participate in the greater American economy due to a concentration of low skills, high unemployment, or high incarceration rates.¶ To put these numbers in perspective, it is often noted that in the current recession the US economy will fall roughly $1 trillion short of its output potential. By that measure, the international achievement gap is imposing on the US economy an invisible yet recurring economic loss that is greater than the output shortfall in what has been called the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. In addition, the racial, income, and system achievement gaps all impose annual output shortfalls that are greater than what the nation experienced in the recession of 1981–82, the deepest downturn in the postwar period until now. In other words, the educational achievement gaps in theUnited States have created the equivalent of a permanent, deep recession in terms of the gap between actual and potential output in the economy.

### Internal link – tech innovation improves the economy

#### Tech innovation key to US economy growth, history shows

Moritz, rewire web editor, 17, (Katie Moritz, “How Does Technology Affect the Economy, rewire, February 13, 2017, <http://www.rewire.org/our-future/technology-advances-economy/>, July 14, 2017) GDI AC

Looking back at human history, technological advancements serve as mile markers for where we were as people: the invention of the wheel, the telephone, the dial-up modem. These developments changed the world and how we interact with it. But how do innovations from technology companies affect the economy?∂ [A new study](https://www.gsb.stanford.edu/insights/tech-disruption-good-economy?utm_source=facebook&utm_campaign=stripes&utm_medium=social&utm_content=02062017&utm_source=FBPAGE&utm_medium=Social&utm_campaign=Insights&Date=20170206&linkId=34104013) of more than a million patents issued over the past 100 years shows that not only do technological advancements have a positive impact on the economy, they actually expand it. Eras marked by technological innovation, such as the 1920s, 1960s and 1990s, pushed industries to produce more, actually growing the economy and improving the country’s financial health.∂ “If innovation were only about McDonald’s getting ahead of Burger King, we wouldn’t really care,’’ said Amit Seru, a professor of finance at the Stanford University Graduate School of Business and co-author of the study, to the university. “But our study shows that something more important is happening. When firms innovate, they are expanding the pie, and we see increased aggregate growth.”∂ Researchers from Stanford, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Northwestern University and Indiana University looked at 1.8 million patents granted to publicly traded companies from 1926 to 2011. They measured how much a company’s stock price was impacted by news that it had been issued a new patent.∂ They found that a new patent had a measurable impact on the stock price of a company a day or two after it was announced. They also found a correlation between the pace of a company getting new patents and how much that company grew and competed with other firms. The more game-changing patents they racked up, the bigger they grew and the better their edge was over others.∂ The top 10 most innovative companies grew between 1 and 3 percent faster in the following five years than companies that innovated at the average pace. The growth of companies that trailed behind their industry’s average innovative pace slowed by as much as 2.5 percentage points, the research team found.∂ But how much does innovation actually grow the size of the economy? The researchers found by looking at the data that a boom in technologically innovative products actually correlated to a boost of the annual U.S. economic output by between 0.6 and 6.5 percentage points. Considering the U.S. economy’s average growth since 1947 is [less than 3.5 percent](http://www.tradingeconomics.com/united-states/gdp-growth) per year, that nudge can make a big difference.∂ So if you’re choosing where to invest your money, technology is a safe bet for growth. And if you have an idea for a product that would push the innovation boundaries, you could be sitting on something that could impact not just your own bottom line, but the entire country’s economy.

#### technology helps the economy – multiple reasons

**Kvochko**, manager at world economic forum, **13** (Elena Kvochko, “5 ways technology can help the economy”, weforum, April 11, 2013, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2013/04/five-ways-technology-can-help-the-economy/>, July 14, 2017) GDI AC

At a time of slowed growth and continued volatility, many countries are looking for policies that will stimulate growth and create new jobs. [Information communications technology](http://www.weforum.org/gitr) (ICT) is not only one of the fastest growing industries – directly creating millions of jobs – but it is also an important enabler of innovation and development.∂ The number of mobile subscriptions (6.8 billion) is [approaching global population figures](http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Documents/facts/ICTFactsFigures2013.pdf), with 40% of people in the world already online. In this new environment, the competitiveness of economies depends on their ability to leverage new technologies. Here are the five common economic effects of ICT.∂ 1. Direct job creation∂ The ICT sector is, and is expected to remain, one of the largest employers. In the US alone, computer and information technology jobs are expected to grow by 22% up to 2020, creating 758,800 [new jobs](http://www.bls.gov/ooh/About/Projections-Overview.htm). In Australia, building and running the new super-fast National Broadband Network will support 25,000 [jobs](http://www.minister.dbcde.gov.au/media/media_releases/2009/022) annually. Naturally, the growth in different segments is uneven. In the US, for each job in the high-tech industry, [five additional jobs](http://www.ifn.se/wfiles/wp/wp914.pdf), on average, are created in other sectors. In 2013, the global tech market will grow by [8%](http://blogs.forrester.com/andrew_bartels/12-01-06-forresters_latest_global_it_market_forecast_shows_slower_growth_of_5_in_2012_with_better_growth_in_), creating jobs, salaries and a widening range of services and products. ∂ 2. Contribution to GDP growth∂ Findings from various countries confirm the positive effect of ICT on growth. For example, a 10% increase in broadband penetration is associated with a [1.4% increase](http://broadbandtoolkit.org/1.3) in GDP growth in emerging markets. In China, this number can reach 2.5%. The doubling of mobile data use caused by the increase in 3G connections boosts GDP per capita growth rate [by 0.5%](http://www.gsma.com/publicpolicy/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/gsma-deloitte-impact-mobile-telephony-economic-growth.pdf) globally. The Internet accounts for [3.4%](http://www.mckinsey.com/features/sizing_the_internet_economy) of overall GDP in some economies. Most of this effect is driven by e-commerce – people advertising and selling goods online.∂ 3. Emergence of new services and industries∂ Numerous public services have become available online and through mobile phones. The transition to cloud computing is one of the key trends for modernization. The government of [Moldova](http://www.egov.md/index.php/en/communication/news/item/89-the-moldovan-government-employs-cloud-computing-technology#.UVHcMRyyC9s) is one of the first countries in Eastern Europe and Central Asia to shift its government IT infrastructure into the cloud and launch mobile and e-services for citizens and businesses. ICT has enabled the emergence of a completely new sector: the app industry. [Research](http://www.rhsmith.umd.edu/digits/pdfs_docs/research/2011/AppEconomyImpact091911.pdf) shows that Facebook apps alone created over 182,000 jobs in 2011, and that the aggregate value of the Facebook app economy exceeds $$12 billion.∂ 4. Workforce transformation∂ New “microwork” platforms, developed by companies like oDesk, Amazon and Samasource, help to divide tasks into small components that can then be outsourced to contract workers. The contractors are often based in emerging economies. Microwork platforms allow entrepreneurs to significantly cut costs and get access to qualified workers. In 2012, [oDesk](https://www.odesk.com/blog/2012/07/visualizations-of-odesk-oconomy/) alone had over 3 million registered contractors who performed 1.5 million tasks. This trend had spillover effects on other industries, such as online payment systems. ICT has also contributed to the rise of entrepreneurship, making it much easier for self-starters to access best practices, legal and regulatory information, marketing and investment resources.∂ 5. Business innovation∂ In OECD countries, more than [95% of businesses](http://www.oecd.org/sti/ieconomy/internet-economy-outlook-2012-highlights.pdf) have an online presence. The Internet provides them with new ways of reaching out to customers and competing for market share. Over the past few years, social media has established itself as a powerful marketing tool. ICT tools employed within companies help to streamline business processes and improve efficiency. The unprecedented explosion of connected devices throughout the world has created new ways for businesses to serve their customers.

### Impact – Poverty

#### Poverty leads to higher crime, lower health outcomes, worse education, financial insecurity, and decreased social mobility

**Kneebone,** Fellow, Metropolitan Policy Program, Brookings Institution, **and Holmes,** Research Analyst and Associate Fellow, Metropolitan Policy Program, Brookings Institution, **2016**

(Elizabeth and Natalie, “U.S. concentrated poverty in the wake of the Great Recession”, Brookings Institution, March 31, 2016, https://www.brookings.edu/research/u-s-concentrated-poverty-in-the-wake-of-the-great-recession/, accessed 7/14/17, GDI-JG)

The Great Recession may have ended in 2009, but despite the subsequent jobs rebound and declining unemployment rate, the number of people living below the federal poverty line in the United States remains stuck at recession-era record levels.∂ The rapid growth of the nation’s poor population during the 2000s also coincided with significant shifts in the geography of American poverty. Poverty spread beyond its historic urban and rural locales, rising rapidly in smaller metropolitan areas and making the nation’s suburbs home to the largest and fastest-growing poor population in the country. Yet, even as poverty spread to touch more people and places, it became more concentrated in distressed and disadvantaged areas.∂ The intersection between poverty and place matters. Poor neighborhoods come with an array of challenges that negatively affect both the people who live in those neighborhoods—whether they themselves are poor or not—as well as the larger regions in which those neighborhoods are located.1 Residents of poor neighborhoods face higher crime rates and exhibit poorer physical and mental health outcomes. They tend to go to poor-performing neighborhood schools with higher dropout rates. Their job-seeking networks tend to be weaker and they face higher levels of financial insecurity.∂ The many barriers imposed by living in a poor neighborhood make it that much harder for residents to move up the economic ladder, and their chances of doing soonly diminish the longer they live in such neighborhoods. Moreover, in regions where the poor are more segregated into poor places, the dampening effect on mobility extends beyond distressed neighborhoods to lower economic mobility for the region as a whole.∂ The concept of concentrated poverty reflects the fact that while pockets of deep neighborhood poverty can affect the well-being of all residents, they are especially troubling for poor families who already face burdens associated with their low incomes, and who may have fewer housing and neighborhood choices available to them. These challenges disproportionately fall to people of color, and, while they have long been particularly pronounced in inner cities, as poverty has spread beyond the urban core, so too has concentrated disadvantage.

#### Poverty disproportionately affects children- hinders childhood development and damages future chances

Edelman, Children's Defense Fund president and founder, 16 (Marian Wright, "Ending Childhood Poverty in America", Children's Defense Fund, April 2016, www.academicpedsjnl.net/article/S1876-2859(16)00063-2/pdf, 7-14-17, GDI-EC)

Sarah and Bryce (not their real names) are far from alone. Hunger is only one of the dangerous risks of growing up poor in rich America. Despite 6 years of economic recovery, children remain the poorest group in America and the younger they are the poorer they are. The United States has the second highest child poverty rate among 35 industrialized countries despite having the largest economy in the world. More than 1 in 5 children in America (21.1%) were living in poverty in 2014, compared with 13.5% of people ages 18 to 64 years and 10% of those aged 65 years and older. Nearly 1 in 4 children younger than the age of 5 years (23.8%) are poor during some of the years of greatest brain development. Seventy percent of the 15.5 million poor children in America were children of color—who already constitute most of our nation’s youngest children and will be the majority of all the children in our nation by 2020.

Poverty hurts children, creates opportunity gaps that can last a lifetime, and hurts the nation’s economy. The toxic stress of early poverty stunts children’s emotional and physical development and increases the likelihood of poor academic achievement and dropping out of high school, which then increases the likelihood of unemployment, economic hardship, and involvement in the criminal justice system as an adult. These effects cost the nation at least half a trillion dollars a year in lost productivity and increased health and crime costs. Letting a fifth of our children grow up poor prevents them from having equal opportunities to succeed in life and robs the nation of their future contributions.

#### Poverty associated with higher mortality rates- exacerbates prior conditions

Kimmel, National Institutes of Health Division of Kidney Urologic and Hematologic Diseases, et al, 16 (Paul L., Chyng-Wen, Social & Scientific Systems, Inc., Kevin C., National Institutes of Health Division of Kidney Urologic and Hematologic Diseases, Jonathan, Paul, "Racial disparities in poverty account for mortality differences in US medicare beneficiaries", Elsevier, 2-24-16, ac.els-cdn.com/S2352827316000100/1-s2.0-S2352827316000100-main.pdf?\_tid=322160d6-6905-11e7-abc8-00000aab0f01&acdnat=1500085849\_2cb5276eba822495442b8d299269d4df, 7-14-17, GDI-EC)

Poverty is a critical problem, associated with impaired health and increased mortality, both US and worldwide (Isaacs & Schroeder, 2004). Poverty, ill health and mortality combine to form a vicious cycle harming a substantial proportion of the population. Currently intense debate exists regarding best approaches to alleviating US and worldwide poverty and its deleterious effects on health. Previous studies demonstrated elderly and younger US Blacks consistently have higher mortality rates than Whites. Reasons suggested to explain this disparity include differences in health status (Hernandez & Pressler, 2014), access to care (Schoenbaum, Schoen, Nicholson, & Cantor, 2011), insurance coverage (Van Der Wees, Zaslavsky, & Ayanian, 2013), and biologic characteristics including prevalence of acute and chronic illnesses, as well as genetic variation (Rosenberg et al., 2010). All these factors may be exacerbated by poverty.

The higher mortality risk among Black Medicare beneficiaries was attenuated by accounting for several variables. Black beneficiaries had demonstrably worse health status, measured by Charlson score and ESRD prevalence. Adjusting for these factors together reduced the racial death rate disparity considerably. Black beneficiaries also had twice the rate of prior disability, accounting for further disparity reduction. However, it was poverty, measured by the State Buy-in indicator for the poor and near-poor, that had the greatest impact on accounting for the disparity between the two groups. The addition of this individual level variable essentially equalized the groups’ adjusted mortality rate. Secondary analyses showed inclusion of individual level poverty alone could account for the age-gender adjusted mortality difference between Black and White aged Americans (Fig. 2, Panel B).

### Impact – income inequality

#### Empirical association between income inequality and mortality- research proves

Palloni, University of Wisconsin-Madison Professor of Sociology, et al, 16 (Alberto, Sebastian, University of Wisconsin-Madison Center for Demography and Ecology, Ezekiel, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, "Income Inequality, Social Mobility and Mortality in the U.S.", University of Wisconsin-Madison Center for Demography and Ecology, 6-17-16, www.ssc.wisc.edu/cde/cdewp/2016-02.pdf, 7-14-17, GDI-EC)

There is a large body of research on the relation between income inequality and health and mortality (Pickett and Wilkinson 2015; Subramanian and Kawachi 2004; Wagstaff and vanDoorslaer 2000; Wilkinson and Pickett 2006, 2010; Kawachi et al. 1997; Wilkinson 1992). Empirical evidence from country data as well as from small areas (even individuals) suggests the existence of an association between levels of aggregate inequality and aggregate indicators of health and mortality (Daly and Wilson 2013). In the most recent contribution primarily aimed at sizing the effects of income on mortality, Chetty and colleagues (Chetty et al. 2016) confirm the existences of an empirical association, albeit modest, that follows the expected pattern - higher inequality is associated with higher mortality - among sub-populations at the bottom of the income distribution. Furthermore, the relation is stronger among those at the top of the income distribution. Thus, as conjectured by some scholars, higher levels of inequalities appear to be damaging for all (Subramanian and Kawachi 2006; Pickett and Wilkinson 2009; Wilkinson and Pickett 2010, 2009).1

#### Income inequality harms economy – multiple reasons

Schrager, reporter, 16, (Allison Schrager, “Is income inequality always a bad thing?” , Quartz, December 16, 2016, <https://qz.com/836927/is-income-inequality-always-a-bad-thing/>, July 14, 2017) GDI AC

Income inequality is [on the rise](https://qz.com/844037/if-the-worlds-wealthiest-1-had-a-members-club-it-would-look-like-this/). Many [economists](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/ben-bernanke/2016/10/19/are-americans-better-off-than-they-were-a-decade-or-two-ago/) and analysts [take it as given](https://blog-imfdirect.imf.org/2016/05/24/reducing-inequality-in-asia-sharing-the-growth-dividend/#more-12847) that inequality does economic harm. But for something that has become conventional wisdom, there is surprisingly little evidence to make a definitive case that income inequality is bad for the economy.∂ First, the facts: Income inequality has worsened significantly in both the US and UK since the 1980s. In macroeconomic terms, this was hardly a period of great stagnation. But could it have been even better if incomes were distributed more equally? For their part, researchers from the IMF believe that income inequality is bad for the economy, and published a series of papers to prove it. Most rely on data from [poor countries](https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/sdn/2011/sdn1108.pdf), while others use [smaller samples of richer countries](https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/sdn/2015/sdn1513.pdf) to identify a correlation between inequality and growth. But these regressions don’t include factors that could have caused the increase in inequality; the exclusion of these factors makes it hard to establish causality between inequality and growth. There just isn’t any conclusive evidence on what inequality means for long-term growth. But there are several theories why it’s bad for the economy.∂ Reduced spending power∂ Poorer people spend more of their income, so if they get less of the pie that implies lower consumption and a weaker economy. (Put another way, the savings rate rises, since richer people save more of their incomes.) This argument takes a static view of the economy—savings are what provide the foundation for long-term economic growth, not spending. Also, it is at odds with the fact that the recent deterioration in income equality accompanied a fall in the savings rate.∂ Lower social mobility∂ A more compelling argument is that inequality [undermines meritocracy](https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/The-US-Labor-Market.pdf), so the most talented don’t rise to the top. Instead, the children of the elite remain in positions of power, and the economy grows less innovative and productive as a result. Inequality may also discourage people from putting in effort to climbing the ladder, undermining work and effort.∂ This may all be true, but it is hard to prove with data. As income inequality rose in the last few decades, statistics also showed the odds of [moving up the economic class ladder](http://www.equality-of-opportunity.org/assets/documents/mobility_trends.pdf) stayed the same.∂ Political instability∂ Up until recently, people who worried about inequality argued it would [concentrate power](https://www.amazon.com/Price-Inequality-Divided-Society-Endangers-ebook/dp/B007MKCQ30?tag=quartz07-20) to the hands of the elites. But if a large enough share of the population feels left behind by economic forces, they will vote in anti-establishment, populist policies that could harm growth—not just for the elites, but for everyone. That may explain, to some extent, the Trump and Brexit victories; although the economic implications of those votes remain murky, there are plausible scenarios in which the poor are hurt hardest by rising inflation, lower growth, and protectionist policies.∂ It is hard to know if the resentment of voters choosing to rebuke the status quo is related to rising inequality, stagnating incomes, or some combination of the two (among other non-economic factors). Some economists have developed a theoretical model that suggests people feel a [natural aversion to inequality](http://www.res.org.uk/details/mediabrief/4387871/Inequality-Aversion-In-A-Variety-Of-Games--An-Indirect-Evolutionary-Analysis.html).

#### Increasing inequality prevents economic growth

Sherman, forbes contributor, 14, (Erik Sherman, “Income Inequality Hurts Economic Growth”, Forbes, December 9, 2014, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/eriksherman/2014/12/09/income-inequality-hurts-economic-growth/#47e27f3b591a>, July 14, 2017) GDI AC

There's a continuing debate as to the broader impact of income inequality. Some claim that while it hurts those who experience it, there's not a wider effect. On the other side of the issue are the theories that with more concentration of wealth in fewer hands, there's an impact on the economy overall.∂ According to a new study from the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, the latter are right. There is and has been a [reduction of economic growth because of the growing concentration of income](http://www.oecd.org/els/soc/Focus-Inequality-and-Growth-2014.pdf) among a smaller portion of the global population.∂ According to the OECD, the gap between the richest and poorest in most member countries is at its highest in the last 30 years. In addition, a broader measure of inequality called the Gini constant (0 when everyone has the same income and 1 when a single person has all income) has been on the rise. The U.S. is at the top of the scale except for Mexico, which has by far the worst income inequality of the OECD states.∂ The new OECD analysis found a "negative and statistically significant" correlation between income inequality and economic growth. Specifically, the 3 Gini point rise in inequality that was the average for OECD states over the last 20 years meant 0.35 percent less economic growth per year for the same time, or a total 8.5 percent GDP loss in that period. Here's a graph that shows the hit various national economies have taken as a result, along with an explanation of the impact.∂ Even at 6 points, that would be a 0.3 percent hit to U.S. GDP every year for the last 20.∂ The inequality problem is not one of the poorest of the poor in a country. It's the bottom 40 percent by income, according to the OECD study, which makes sense if you consider the rationale behind why inequality can hurt an economy. Growth happens when lots of people spend money. In the U.S., for example, the small number of people at the top of the economic ladder can't consume and spend at the rate that the broader population can. And the distribution of income means that there are many more in the bottom 40 percent by income than there are in the top 40 percent by income. Unless a policy addresses lower incomes, and not just official poverty, it won't succeed in helping the economy.∂ The OECD said that certain types of income redistribution -- specifically, high-value services like good education and healthcare -- increase, and not decrease, economic growth if effectively targeted without inefficiency and waste.

### Impact – economic downturn increases racism

#### Bad economies and inequality fuel racism, great recession proves

**Parramore**, senior economic research analyst, **15**, (Lynn Parramore, “A bad economy fuels racism”, AljazeeraAmerica, March 19, 2015, <http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2015/3/a-bad-economy-fuels-racism.html>, July 14, 2017) GDI AC

But is it? Perhaps not when you consider how racial tension and economic hardship feed off each other. According to a [Brookings Institution report](http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/the-avenue/posts/2014/08/15-ferguson-suburban-poverty), Ferguson, like so many communities in America, has been hit with multiple economic shocks in recent years, including a skyrocketing unemployment rate, average earnings falling by a third and increased concentrations of poverty in poor neighborhoods. These trends have been driven by policies of austerity and deregulation that have created economic instability in the U.S., resulting in more severe and frequent economic downturns that suck public coffers dry, increase inequality and heighten insecurity — all of which tend to stoke racism.∂ Researchers have recently shown just how a bad economy can exacerbate racial biases. New York University psychology professor David Amodio and his colleagues set out to study whether economic hardship affects how people perceive race. They ran experiments in which whites responded to images of faces that ranged in color from very light to very dark and [found](http://www.pnas.org/content/111/25/9079.full) something disturbing: When people think about economic scarcity, they are more likely to see African-American faces as darker and more “stereotypically black.” That’s exactly the kind of subconscious bias that heightens discrimination. In the Amodio study, scenarios in which white participants were asked to divide money between a white and a person of color resulted in less money being given to the individual perceived as darker.∂ It’s not difficult to imagine how this kind of phenomenon might influence decisions made in policing, policymaking, hiring and so on. Sure enough, since the Great Recession, we’ve seen plenty of alarming signs that suggest heightened biases: Schools have been resegregating in many areas, citizens of color face undue hurdles to vote, and affirmative action policies [have been rolled back](http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/supreme-court-reverses-decision-that-tossed-out-michigans-ban-on-racial-preferences/2014/04/22/44177ad6-9d8f-11e3-9ba6-800d1192d08b_story.html). An all-out war against public-sector jobs, mounted in the name of austerity, has [disproportionately affected](http://www.epi.org/publication/bp339-public-sector-jobs-crisis/) African-Americans. In 2010 black men were [more than six times as likely as white men to be incarcerated](http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2013/08/22/chapter-3-demographic-economic-data-by-race/), yet little has been done to address this. These factors have synergistic effects that, collectively, shackle African-Americans from access to political and economic power. One recent study showed, for example, that for African-Americans who have been incarcerated, even for a brief period, the probability of voting [declined 22 percent](https://veslaweaver.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/weaverlerman2010.pdf). Politicians who play on public fears by brandishing their tough-on-crime credentials find their ploy rewarded at the ballot box. This results in more harassment and arrest for African-Americans, which, in turn, contributes to reduced political interest and greater poverty.∂ Ferguson is in the news, but it is no anomaly in the U.S. Racializing crime to fill municipal and state coffers emptied by the Great Recession has been happening across the country. The ACLU has highlighted cases from [Georgia](https://www.aclu.org/criminal-law-reform-racial-justice/thompson-v-dekalb-county) to [Michigan](https://www.aclu.org/files/assets/InForAPenny_web.pdf#page=30) in which poor people, disproportionately African-American, are subjected to fines and draconian punishments meant to extract fees. In the town of Ferndale, Michigan, an ACLU study reveals that African-Americans accounted for [60 percent of traffic stops](http://www.dailytribune.com/general-news/20140930/ferndale-denies-possible-racial-profiling-of-motorists-charge-by-aclu), even though they make up less than 10 percent of the town’s population. Poor people of color are finding themselves targeted for the pettiest of offenses, such as failure to mow a lawn, and the pattern is the same: Stop, ticket, fine, jail, rinse, repeat.∂ Obviously, correctives such as reforming the courts and reducing fines and jail sentences for people who can’t pay them are urgently needed. But the dysfunctional economics that contribute to these abuses also demand action.∂ Any politician in America who professes to care about racism needs to be asked a few simple questions: Will you demand that America’s wealthy and large corporations pay their fair share of taxes? Will you work to end harmful austerity programs that drain city and state budgets? Do you support serious penalties for Wall Street fraudsters who have [plundered public finances](http://www.alternet.org/economy/wall-street-and-municipal-fraud) and hoodwinked taxpayers into handing over billions to bankers? Would you recommend fiscal policies to create jobs, offer educational opportunities and repair deteriorating infrastructure? Will you push for better financial regulation?∂ If these actions are not taken, inequality will continue to [widen along racial and ethnic lines](http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2014/12/12/racial-wealth-gaps-great-recession/), and ultimately the whole economy will suffer, because victims of discrimination can’t contribute to the economy and their diminished earning capacity costs the U.S. [billions of dollars per year](http://www.finalcall.com/artman/publish/National_News_2/article_100979.shtml). Social unrest will surely escalate.∂ If we want less racism, we need less talk and more economic justice.

### Impact – US economic growth good

#### U.S. economic strength is key to the global economy—increased growth is key to international stability

Goodman, Miller, and Conley, all senior fellows at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), 2016

[Mathew P., Scott, Heather A., “What global economic risks do we face?,” CSIS Global Forecast report, December 15, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/what-global-economic-risks-do-we-face>, GDI - TM]

GOODMAN: The United States remains an “indispensable nation” in global economic affairs. Our position as the world’s largest market and a leading source of technology and capital gives us unparalleled leverage in encouraging pro-growth policies and championing an open, rules-based global economic order. You can see this at play in G20 meetings, where most countries play a passive role and wait for the United States to propose a course of action. Of course Washington doesn’t always get what it wants, and needs support to solve most global economic challenges, but without U.S. leadership the global economic order would be far less stable, predictable, and successful than it has been for the past 75 years. MILLER: The wave of “globalization” that began in the late-1980s was initiated by U.S. technological, political, and military leadership. Its expansion was supported by an economic architecture created and sustained by the United States and key allies. Millions were lifted out of poverty, yet no economy benefited more than our own, with its relative openness, strong institutions, and adaptive, entrepreneurial people. Globalization has now entered a new phase, but I am confident that, if anyone can figure out how to make it work in a mutually beneficial manner, it is the American people, driven by their ingenuity, sense of fair play, and drive to make things better. CONLEY: As the largest Western economy, the United States must lead the way to regaining lost confidence. A strong American economy will strengthen Europe’s economy. When political paralysis in the United States finally gives way, this will send a positive and powerful message to other advanced countries that they can overcome their crises. Western confidence can be restored, but for the moment, populism and anxiety are in the ascendancy and Western confidence is in retreat.

#### US economic growth moral imperative – solves laundry list of impacts

Noell, Professor of Economic and Business at Westmont College and Ph.D. in Economic from Lousiana State University and Smith, Professor of Economic and Business at Gordon College and Ph.D. in Economic from Stanford University, 13

(Edd S. and Stephen L.S., “Want A Better World? Let's Work On Boosting Economic Growth,” *Forbes*, April 23, 2014, http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/04/23/want-a-better-world-lets-work-on-boosting-economic-growth/, GDI – TM)

If we as a society want to live in a better world, we must start taking economic growth seriously. It’s easy for economists to understand why growth is so important—but too often, economists fail to explain why it matters. With increased economic growth, the lives of millions of people around the world—in countries both rich and poor—can be transformed. Both authors of this column have witnessed growth’s power in person. One grew up in 1960s Hong Kong. While today Hong Kong is a wealthy financial capital, in the early 1960s it was engulfed in poverty. His earliest memories include images of the flood of over one million refugees into his city from Mao’s China. But by the time he reached high school much had changed. Children born in shanty towns now lived in apartments with electricity and running water. Each morning, crossing Victoria Harbor with its glittering view of Hong Kong’s burgeoning skyline, he could see the trade, construction, and growth that provided jobs, increased wealth, and lifted families out of poverty. Since then, in our frequent professional travel to Asia, we have both seen first-hand the fantastic poverty reduction triggered by growth in Korea, China, and much of Southeast Asia. The immense power of economic growth is easy to see in dramatic surges like Hong Kong’s, but the transformative power of growth is not limited to poor countries. In wealthy countries like the United States growth and the prosperity that it brings allow us, as a society, to afford to do many good things. It is quite remarkable that someone such as the climate activist Bill McKibbin argues that growth is “the one big habit we finally must break.” When he looks at growth, he sees a malevolent force driving our desires to consume ever more fossil fuels. We could not disagree more. With greater growth our economy can afford to buy green products, offset our carbon footprint, and conserve and replenish the renewable natural resources we consume. Growth means, literally, the increase in the production of goods and services in an economy. Since production of goods and services requires that workers and firms’ owners be paid, the value of production is basically the same as the value of households’ income. So growth measures the increases in a country’s ability to take care of itself. With growth, families are better able to purchase goods and services. A cynic may only think of the purchase of another 80” TV, but economists understand that the “goods” a society gets from growth go far beyond the ones you can pick up at Best Buy. With greater growth we could invest even more in basic research to help find cures for diseases like Alzheimer’s and Parkinson’s. Greater growth would allow us to avert the coming intergenerational fight over how to pay for trillions of dollars of entitlement promises we have made to the needy among us, and to our parents and grandparents in the form of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. These are profoundly moral concerns. In short, the supporters of growth—who usually make their case in economic terms, about tax and spending policies—are on to something. They understand growth’s potential to ease economic problems. Right now the United States is growing at about two percent per year—but to get the U.S. unemployment rate down to a healthy level (under six percent) within four years will take approximately four percent growth per year. That is not just a number on a press release—it’s the dignity of a paycheck and the security of an income for millions of families across America. So if you care about long-term human wellbeing—in rich and poor countries alike—you must care about economic growth. Before we as a society can consider how to achieve such growth, we must recognize that getting growth right matters. Not every instance of economic growth in every country is beneficial. But time and again, hard data documents its positive impact on the things that ultimately matter: education, environmental care, physical health, political freedom, and healthy culture. Failure to realize the transformative power of growth would be a failure of our moral imaginations. We would risk leaving a world for our children in which diseases persist, rivers remain polluted, and the elderly and sick receive inadequate care. Growth must not be sold short. Growth is not just morally defensible; it is a moral imperative for achieving lasting human flourishing.

#### Economic growth helps the environment – no correlation with emissions

Johnson, energy expert Foreign Policy, 2015 (Keith, “There’s Hope for Tackling Climate Change After All,” Foreign Policy, June 15, 2015, http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/06/15/theres-hope-for-tackling-climate-change-after-all/, GDI – TM)

The challenge, as ever, at the economy. Now, the International Energy Agency thinks there is a way to square that circle and put the world on track to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. In a new report, the IEA said that for the first time in modern history, the world is showing that economic growth and emissions need not go together. With a little more effort, especially to phase out fossil fuels and invest in clean energy, countries such as the United States, China, and India could lock in those promising developments. With such a “bridge plan” in place, the world’s energy-related greenhouse-gas emissions could peak as soon as 2020, the IEA said, much earlier than currently expected. That alone would not be enough to limit temperature increases to 2 degrees Centigrade, the world’s official target, but would help make it possible. The IEA’s note of optimism contrasts with the agency’s gloom just a few years ago, and comes right as the issue is gaining fresh urgency. Countries around the world are preparing their own national plans for reducing emissions over the next decade, laying the groundwork for the big Paris conference. And Pope Francis on Thursday will release an eagerly awaited papal encyclical highlighting the world’s need to rise to the climate challenge. (An Italian magazine published on Monday what the Vatican called a draft version of the 192-page call to action.) The IEA, the energy think-tank of the rich-country club Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in Paris, underscored the importance of the apparent break between growth and emissions, which had in decades past been inexorably linked. OECD countries — the industrialized West, Japan, and South Korea — grew almost 2 percent last year, while their emissions fell 2 percent; even developing countries such as China are getting in on the act. “The signs of a decoupling between energy-related emissions and economic growth in some parts of the world are encouraging — for the first time in 40 years, a halt or reduction in total global emissions has not been associated with an economic crisis,” the IEA noted. Right now, the world is on track to keep increasing global emissions until at least 2030. Some countries, including the United States, Russia, and those in the European Union, have already submitted to the U.N. their formal national climate pledges through 2025. Others, such as China, have outlined their energy and climate policies over the same period. Taken together, they are simply not enough to move the needle: Emissions reductions expected to be made by the United States, Europe, and Japan, for example, will be offset by increased emissions from India and China, the IEA estimated. That’s why the agency is urging participants at the Paris conference to lock in the structural changes in the global economy and finish the job of separating growth from pollution. The IEA laid out a short-term policy “bridge” that could carry the world from today’s dirty energy mix to one that delivers the same economic growth with a lot fewer emissions. It would require extra effort in five areas: more energy efficiency, removing subsidies for fossil fuels, phasing out old, inefficient coal plants, investing more in renewable energy, and curbing methane emissions. That would lead to emissions cuts 8 percent greater than what’s already expected, and would mean that energy sector’s greenhouse-gas emissions “would peak and then begin to decline around 2020.” Best of all, the IEA says, those environmental gains would not reduce global economic growth one bit. Locking in that cleaner economy is especially important for China, the world’s biggest emitter of greenhouse gases. In recent years, driven by concerns over choking air pollution, Beijing has made huge strides at cleaning up its economy. One recent study suggested China could stop increasing emissions within a decade, ahead of the Chinese government’s own timetable. Crucially, in 2014, the Chinese economy grew at a healthy clip while emissions did not. That might indicate that the Chinese economic rebalancing away from heavy industry to services is paying dividends. Or it might just be the fruits of a very wet year, in which hydroelectric power supplanted dirty coal. The IEA says its five-step program could ensure that kind of cleaner growth is a feature, not a bug. Embracing the policies, it says, would keep China on track for the next decade at least, “enabling a near doubling of the economy with an almost flat emissions trajectory.”

#### Growth and fighting climate change are not incompatible – you can have growth and benefit the environment

Krugman, distinguished professor in the Graduate Center Economics Ph.D. program and distinguished scholar at the Luxembourg Income Study Center at the City University of New York and professor emeritus of Princeton University’s Woodrow Wilson School, 2014

(Paul, “Errors and Emissions: Could Fighting Global Warming Be Cheap and Free?,” The New York Times, September 18, 2014, <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/09/19/opinion/paulkrugmancouldfightingglobalwarmingbecheapandfree.html>, accessed 2/2/17, JCP AV)

This just in: Saving the planet would be cheap; it might even be free. But will anyone believe the good news? I’ve just been reading two new reports on the economics of fighting climate change: a big study by a blue-ribbon international group, the New Climate Economy Project, and a working paper from the International Monetary Fund. Both claim that strong measures to limit carbon emissions would have hardly any negative effect on economic growth, and might actually lead to faster growth. This may sound too good to be true, but it isn’t. These are serious, careful analyses. But you know that such assessments will be met with claims that it’s impossible to break the link between economic growth and ever-rising emissions of greenhouse gases, a position I think of as “climate despair.” The most dangerous proponents of climate despair are on the anti-environmentalist right. But they receive aid and comfort from other groups, including some on the left, who have their own reasons for getting it wrong. Where is the new optimism about climate change and growth coming from? It has long been clear that a well-thought-out strategy of emissions control, in particular one that puts a price on carbon via either an emissions tax or a cap-and-trade scheme, would cost much less than the usual suspects want you to think. But the economics of climate protection look even better now than they did a few years ago. On one side, there has been dramatic progress in renewable energy technology, with the costs of solar power, in particular, plunging, down by half just since 2010. Renewables have their limitations — basically, the sun doesn’t always shine, and the wind doesn’t always blow — but if you think that an economy getting a lot of its power from wind farms and solar panels is a hippie fantasy, you’re the one out of touch with reality. On the other side, it turns out that putting a price on carbon would have large “co-benefits” — positive effects over and above the reduction in climate risks — and that these benefits would come fairly quickly. The most important of these co-benefits, according to the I.M.F. paper, would involve public health: burning coal causes many respiratory ailments, which drive up medical costs and reduce productivity. And thanks to these co-benefits, the paper argues, one argument often made against carbon pricing — that it’s not worth doing unless we can get a global agreement — is wrong. Even without an international agreement, there are ample reasons to take action against the climate threat. But back to the main point: It’s easier to slash emissions than seemed possible even a few years ago, and reduced emissions would produce large benefits in the short-to-medium run. So saving the planet would be cheap and maybe even come free. Enter the prophets of climate despair, who wave away all this analysis and declare that the only way to limit carbon emissions is to bring an end to economic growth. You mostly hear this from people on the right, who normally say that free-market economies are endlessly flexible and creative. But when you propose putting a price on carbon, suddenly they insist that industry will be completely incapable of adapting to changed incentives. Why, it’s almost as if they’re looking for excuses to avoid confronting climate change, and, in particular, to avoid anything that hurts fossil-fuel interests, no matter how beneficial to everyone else. But climate despair produces some odd bedfellows: Koch-fueled insistence that emission limits would kill economic growth is echoed by some who see this as an argument not against climate action, but against growth. You can find this attitude in the mostly European “de-growth” movement, or in American groups like the Post Carbon Institute; I’ve encountered claims that saving the planet requires an end to growth at left-leaning meetings on “rethinking economics.” To be fair, antigrowth environmentalism is a marginal position even on the left, but it’s widespread enough to call out nonetheless. And you sometimes see hard scientists making arguments along the same lines, largely (I think) because they don’t understand what economic growth means. They think of it as a crude, physical thing, a matter simply of producing more stuff, and don’t take into account the many choices — about what to consume, about which technologies to use — that go into producing a dollar’s worth of G.D.P. So here’s what you need to know: Climate despair is all wrong. The idea that economic growth and climate action are incompatible may sound hardheaded and realistic, but it’s actually a fuzzy-minded misconception. If we ever get past the special interests and ideology that have blocked action to save the planet, we’ll find that it’s cheaper and easier than almost anyone imagines.

#### Growth good – helps produce what a country need - solves laundry lists of impacts.

Reich, Chancellor’s Professor of Public Policy at the University of California at Berkeley and Senior Fellow at the Blum Center for Developing Economies, 10 (Robert, “Why Growth is Good”, RobertReich, Aug 17, 2010, http://robertreich.org/post/968048444, GDI – TM)

Economic growth is slowing in the United States. It’s also slowing in Japan, France, Britain, Italy, Spain, and Canada. It’s even slowing in China. And it’s likely to be slowing soon in Germany. If governments keep hacking away at their budgets while consumers almost everywhere are becoming more cautious about spending, global demand will shrink to the point where a worldwide dip is inevitable. You might ask yourself: So what? Why do we need more economic growth anyway? Aren’t we ruining the planet with all this growth — destroying forests, polluting oceans and rivers, and spewing carbon into the atmosphere at a rate that’s already causing climate chaos? Let’s just stop filling our homes with so much stuff. The answer is economic growth isn’t just about more stuff. Growth is different from consumerism. Growth is really about the capacity of a nation to produce everything that’s wanted and needed by its inhabitants. That includes better stewardship of the environment as well as improved public health and better schools. (The Gross Domestic Product is a crude way of gauging this but it’s a guide. Nations with high and growing GDPs have more overall capacity; those with low or slowing GDPs have less.) Poorer countries tend to be more polluted than richer ones because they don’t have the capacity both to keep their people fed and clothed and also to keep their land, air and water clean. Infant mortality is higher and life spans shorter because they don’t have enough to immunize against diseases, prevent them from spreading, and cure the sick. In their quest for resources rich nations (and corporations) have too often devastated poor ones – destroying their forests, eroding their land, and fouling their water. This is intolerable, but it isn’t an indictment of growth itself. Growth doesn’t depend on plunder. Rich nations have the capacity to extract resources responsibly. That they don’t is a measure of their irresponsibility and the weakness of international law. How a nation chooses to use its productive capacity – how it defines its needs and wants — is a different matter. As China becomes a richer nation it can devote more of its capacity to its environment and to its own consumers, for example. The United States has the largest capacity in the world. But relative to other rich nations it chooses to devote a larger proportion of that capacity to consumer goods, health care, and the military. And it uses comparatively less to support people who are unemployed or destitute, pay for non-carbon fuels, keep people healthy, and provide aid to the rest of the world. Slower growth will mean even more competition among these goals. Faster growth greases the way toward more equal opportunity and a wider distribution of gains. The wealthy more easily accept a smaller share of the gains because they can still come out ahead of where they were before. Simultaneously, the middle class more willingly pays taxes to support public improvements like a cleaner environment and stronger safety nets. It’s a virtuous cycle. We had one during the Great Prosperity the lasted from 1947 to the early 1970s. Slower growth has the reverse effect. Because economic gains are small, the wealthy fight harder to maintain their share. The middle class, already burdened by high unemployment and flat or dropping wages, fights ever more furiously against any additional burdens, including tax increases to support public improvements. The poor are left worse off than before. It’s a vicious cycle. We’ve been in one most of the last thirty years. No one should celebrate slow growth. If we’re entering into a period of even slower growth, the consequences could be worse.

# Education Quality internals and impacts

## Internal link – achievement gap

### Students with disabilities

#### Despite recent reforms, the achievement gap remains high—especially for people with disabilities

**Pazey,** Assistant Professor, Department of Special Education and Department of Educational Administration, The University of Texas at Austin, **et al. 2016**

(Barbara L., “Incorporating Quality of Life Concepts Into Educational Reform: Creating Real Opportunities for Students With Disabilities in the 21st Century”, Journal of Disability Policy Studies, Hammill Institute on Disabilities, 2016, Vol. 27(2) 96–105, accessed 7/6/17, GDI-JG)

Over the last two decades, educators and policymakers have grappled with ways to better prepare students for suc- cess in a highly competitive, rapidly changing, and tech- nology-driven economy. Manifesting in what are deemed 21st-century skills, public education has been tasked with the responsibility of developing the knowledge and apti- tude in America’s next generation that is necessary for suc- cessful entry into the adult world. A special focus has been placed on college and career readiness to ensure our gradu- ates can compete on a world stage. Indeed, newly intro- duced curriculum standards and learning outcomes for students in public schools reflect this concern (Achieve, 2013a; Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2010; Bruett, 2006; Equity and Excellence Commission, 2013; P-16 Council, 2012; Partnership for 21st Century Skills [P21], n.d.; Plotner & Mazzotti, 2014; Salpeter, 2003; Trilling & Fadel, 2009).∂ Educational policy and related legislation has created a complex machinery of incentives, backed by punitive sanc- tions to secure support of the reform movement (see, for example, Blueprint for Reform, U.S. Department of Education [USDOE], 2010; Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act [IDEA], 2004; No Child Left Behind [NCLB] Act, 2002). Although the articulated intention and rhetoric of these changes may support success for all, research shows that the achievement gap between students who suc- ceed and those who have been traditionally marginalized in public schools continues to grow (Cole, 2006; McLaughlin, 2010). Many students are still not performing to the standards desired, and for some, the hope of graduating prepared for the challenges of 21st-century living is far from being realized. This shortcoming is particularly apparent for students with disabilities. Despite a strong push to graduate every student college and career ready (Fulton, Gianneschi, Blanco, & DeMaria, 2014; USDOE, 2010), equipped with the necessary 21st-century skills, there has been little discussion regarding how these initiatives can be incorporated to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

## Internal Link – funding gap

#### Federal funding key to equal education op – DOEd writing specific rules to implement ESEA

**Knight,** Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. <http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/_Files/docs/papers/CERPS_Working_Paper_2016_2.pdf> accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

Changes to federal education policy included in the recently enacted Every Student ∂ Succeeds Act∂ (ESSA) could dramatically alter school district finance and resource allocation. ∂ The law is the most recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ∂ initially passed during the 1960s War of Poverty. Since the original law was enacted∂ , the federal ∂ government has provided most of its funding through a program called Title I, which targets ∂ funding to the nation’s most impoverished schools.∂ 1∂ Although federal funding accounts for only ∂ about 8% of total K∂ -∂ 12 spending, one in ten districts receives over 15% of their funding through ∂ federal sources (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2014). Federal funding for education thus plays a vital role in promoting equal educational opportunity in U.S. schools. ESSA altered key policies regulating Title I funding allocation. The Department to Education is now tasked with writing the specific rules for how ESSA should be implemented in states and districts, and how districts can use Title I funding.

## Internal Link – low resources [racial composition]

#### Racial composition of schools correlates with resources – increasing disparities in education opportunities and outcomes

Reardon, Stanford University Graduate School of Education professor, et al, 17 (Sean F., Demetra, Stanford Center for Education Policy Analysis research associate, Ken, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia with expertise in Educational Theory, Educational Policy, Econometrics, "The Geography of Racial/Ethnic Test Score Gaps", January 2017, http://cepa.stanford.edu/wp16-10, 7-8-17, GDI-EC)

While the top two boxes at the right of Figure 1 describe potential out-of-school influences on racial achievement gaps, the bottom two describe potential school-related influences. These are divided into within- and between-school factors. The key to both is that achievement gaps may be caused, in part, by racial differences in school experiences and opportunities. These differences in experiences and opportunities may result from students attending different schools (between-school segregation) or they may occur even among students attending the same school. Between-school segregation is a necessary (though not sufficient) condition for between-school differences in educational experiences and opportunities to contribute to achievement gaps; if black, Hispanic, and white students are equally represented in each school, then each group will experience the same average level of (and the same variation in) school quality. In the presence of segregation, however, if school racial composition is correlated with school resources (which affect the ability to attract and retain skilled teachers; teacher/student ratios; the quality of instructional materials, equipment, and facilities; the availability of support staff; and less tangible factors like school climate), then black and Hispanic students will, on average, experience fewer opportunities for learning than their white peers. Although the effects of school segregation are difficult to estimate, the best available research suggests that school segregation tends to widen racial educational disparities in achievement and educational attainment, as well as adult income (Ashenfelter, Collins and Yoon 2005; Card and Rothstein 2007; Guryan 2004; Johnson 2011; Reardon 2016).

#### Black students face educational disparities during formal schooling—statistics prove

**Cook,** Data Editor, U.S. News, **2015**

(Lindsey, “U.S. Education: Still Separate and Unequal”, U.S. News, January 28, 2015, https://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/data-mine/2015/01/28/us-education-still-separate-and-unequal, accessed 7/11/17, GDI-JG)

Once formal schooling begins, inequalities continue. More than 140,000 students were held back in kindergarten in the 2011-2012 school year. Black students are more likely to be held back, despite mounting research showing that holding back children doesn’t benefit them socially or academically and makes them more likely to drop out later on. Retention rates for students hit a high in ninth grade, when 34 percent of students held back are black. While 12 percent of black students are held back in ninth grade, just 4 percent of white students are, according to the U.S. Department of Education's Civil Rights Data Collection. When all grade levels are combined, black students are nearly three times more likely to be held back as their white peers. They’re also more likely to drop out before earning a high school diploma.∂ As with retention, disparities in test scores start early, in kindergarten. Black students entering kindergarten for the first time score lower than their white counterparts in reading, mathematics, science, cognitive flexibility and approaches to learning — every category tested. The gaps persist throughout schooling, at fourth, eighth and 12th grades, according to a report from the Forum on Child and Family Statistics. On the SAT, black students had a mean score of 428 for critical reading and 428 for math, compared with mean scores for white students of 527 for critical reading and 536 for math.∂ The elephant in the room when talking about racial disparities in American schools is the school-to-prison pipeline, another disparity that begins early.∂ Disparities in discipline begin in preschool and continue through every level of schooling. While blacks make up 18 percent of students in preschool, they account for 42 percent of students with an out-of-school suspension and 48 percent of students with multiple out-of-school suspensions.∂ Black Americans are suspended and expelled at three times the rate of white students. They make up 16 percent of school enrollment, but account for 32 percent of students who receive in-school suspensions, 42 percent of students who receive multiple out-of-school suspensions and 34 percent of students who are expelled. Black students are arrested more and are referred to law enforcement more. The disparities in punishment even reach to black students with disabilities, who are more likely to receive out-of-school suspensions or to be subjected to mechanical restraint than their white peers.

## Internal link – low resources [SES]

#### Low income schools reflect more teacher attrition and lower teacher quality

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

In contrast, teacher experience gaps exist both across schools in the same state and across schools in the same district. The coefficient for elementary schools of -0.079 in the first row of Panel C, Column 4 (of Table 4) suggests that, comparing schools in the same district, each 10% increase in the percent of FRL students is associated with a 0.79 percentage point decrease in the proportion of teachers with three or more years of experience. Elementary schools with 75% FRL students have, on average, 79.8% of teachers with three or more years of experience, whereas lower-poverty elementary schools with 25% FRL have 83.8% of teachers with three or more years of experience on average, a gap of about 4.0 percentage points. As demonstrated by the coefficients for middle and high schools in Column 4 of Panel C, experience gaps in middle and high schools are even greater. Based on the predicted values, the within-district experience gaps for middle and high schools are 6.5 and 6.1 percentage points, respectively (based on comparisons between schools with 25% FRL and 75% FRL in the same district). Teacher experience gaps are even greater for students of color (see appendix Table A2). These findings comport with other statewide analyses of teacher attrition (e.g., Hanushek et al., 2004; Goldhaber et al., 2015) – low-income students and students of color disproportionately attend schools with the least experienced teachers within school districts.

## Internal Link – LEA underinvestment

#### High poverty schools receive less funding per student, teachers per students, and greater proportion of inexperienced teachers

**Knight,** Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. <http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/_Files/docs/papers/CERPS_Working_Paper_2016_2.pdf> accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

We find that on average nationally, higher-poverty schools receive less funding per student for teacher salaries, have fewer teachers per student, and have greater proportions of inexperienced teachers, compared to lower-poverty schools, even when controlling for district level cost factors and comparing schools within the same state. The same findings hold for students who identify as an underrepresented minority (Black, Latina/o, Native American, Pacific Islander/Hawaiian native, or more than one race) and when comparing Title I schools to non-Title I schools.

#### Lack of funding for title 1 schools for teacher quality – teacher salaries not comparable from title 1 to non title 1

**Knight,** Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. <http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/_Files/docs/papers/CERPS_Working_Paper_2016_2.pdf> accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

Due to a lack of wide scale data on school expenditures, most school finance studies compare educational expenditures across districts (e.g., Baker & Corcoran, 2012; Imazeki & Reschovsky, 2001; Knight, 2016). Some researchers have conducted in-depth case studies of school districts based on their own collected data (e.g., Haxton, de los Reyes, Chambers, Levin & Cruz, 2012; Roza, 2008; Roza & Hill, 2004; Roza, Miller & Hill, 2005). The districts sampled in these studies generally meet the Title I requirement of providing the same number of instructional staff per pupil; however, the clustering of less experienced teachers in higher poverty schools (the “teacher experience gap”) causes schools serving more disadvantaged populations to receive less funding per student for teacher salaries. Given the limited number of districts included in these analyses however, the studies do not shed light on how pervasive this problem is nationally, or what district characteristics are associated with resource and teacher experience gaps between high- and low-poverty schools.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 included funding to collect, for the first time, national data on school-level expenditures (all prior national school finance data were district-level or based on samples of schools). The DOE subsequently released a report finding that over 40% of Title I schools had lower state and local personnel expenditures per pupil than non-Title I schools in the same district and grade level (Heuer & Stullich, 2011).

Similarly, about half of higher-poverty schools received less state and local funding than lower- poverty schools in the same district and grade level. These findings comport with other studies drawing on the same data (Government Accountability Office, 2011; Hanna et al., 2015; Spatig- Amerikaner, 2012). In each study, the authors argue that the DOE should strengthen the Comparability requirement within Title I to require districts to allocate equal state and local funding for teacher salaries across Title-I and non-Title I schools (or across high- and low- poverty schools).

## Internal Link – SNS loophole

### Current SNS undermines resources, increases inequality

#### Supplement not supplant leads to pull-out instruction—stigmatizing students and preventing proper education

**Gordon,** Associate Professor, Georgetown University, McCourt School of Public Policy, **and Reber,** Associate Professor, University of California, Los Angeles, Luskin School of Public Affairs, **2015**

(Nora and Sarah, “The Quest for a Targeted and Effective Title I ESEA: Challenges in Designing and Implementing Fiscal Compliance Rules”, The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences, Volume 1 Issue 3, December 2015, <http://www.rsfjournal.org/doi/full/10.7758/RSF.2015.1.3.07>, accessed 7/8/17, GDI-JG)

The supplement not supplant requirement is perhaps the most confusing and influential of the three fiscal rules. Historically, it has aimed to prevent districts from buying things for students not participating in Title I with state and local funds, and using Title I funds to buy those same things for Title I students, hence supplanting the services that should have been funded with state and local dollars. When Title I students are in a school with other students, these regulations rule out many things schools might want to do with their funds (for example, buy anything potentially accessed by an entire school, such as curriculum or certain technologies, or support teachers in any way that might benefit non–Title I students). Even if Title I and other students were perfectly segregated by school, supplement not supplant rules out district-wide initiatives. This requirement puts pressure on districts to find standalone activities to fund with Title I, and led to widespread use of “pull-out” instruction, whereby students are pulled out of their regular (core) classroom to receive Title I services. This mode has been criticized on many fronts: it may stigmatize students, pull-out services were typically provided by paraprofessionals rather than teachers, and pull-out services take students away from the regular instructional program.

## Internal link – teacher quality

#### Access to high-performing teachers benefit students- studies prove

Partelow, Center for American Progress director of teacher policy, 16 (Lisette, "Education Is Still Inequitable", U.S. News and World Report, 12-2-16, <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/knowledge-bank/articles/2016-12-02/equal-teacher-quality-doesnt-mean-equal-outcomes-for-low-income-kids>, 7-10-17, GDI-EC)

Many will use this research as evidence that we need to address some of the factors outside of school that affect student learning, such as by increasing wraparound services and expanding access to full-service community schools. These strategies are certainly part of the solution, and they are valuable because they improve low-income students' health and quality of life. However, research indicates that they work best when combined with high quality schools and instruction. Giving low-income students more access to those teachers at the top of the distribution, then, is another important strategy for improving their outcomes. Embedded deep within Mathematica's report is some good news: Most of the districts participating in the study (which skewed toward large urban districts) were already employing at least some strategies for giving low-income students greater access to high-performing teachers. While it is unclear whether or not these strategies account for the study's overall findings, it is heartening to know that by the end of the study period, many districts were implementing a variety of policies designed to encourage excellent teachers to teach in high-needs schools. For example, 13 of the 26 study districts were giving bonuses to teachers for teaching in high-needs schools, 12 were giving high-need schools early teacher hiring timelines or preference and 15 were providing new teachers with comprehensive induction programs. An interesting follow-up to the Mathematica report, then, would be to determine whether these policies had an effect on the equitable distribution of teachers among high- and low-income students. If we were to find that these policies had an impact on how teacher quality is distributed across districts, we should expand upon these policies. The end goal of such policies would be making teaching in high-needs schools the most prestigious, sought after teaching job a teacher could obtain, with pay and working conditions commensurate with such prestige. This would include comprehensive high-quality induction, professional compensation, relevant and effective professional learning opportunities and adequate time for teachers to plan and collaborate together in order to provide higher quality instruction. Incentivizing districts and school leaders to place their best teachers at the highest-needs schools while also providing these teachers with needed supports could make a huge difference for students and teachers alike.

#### Increased teacher quality helps disadvantaged students the most and help accumulates over time - studies prove

Goldhaber, University of Washington, Bothell Center for Education Data & Research Director, 16 (Dan, "In Schools, Teacher Quality Matters Most", Education Next, Spring 2016, educationnext.org/in-schools-teacher-quality-matters-most-coleman/, 7-10-17, GDI-EC)

Beyond the headline finding about the impact of schooling overall, the report contains a fair amount of nuance on which school characteristics do (and, importantly, which do not) predict student achievement. The primary analytical technique used involved assessing the proportion of the variation in student achievement explained by different factors. Across grades and different student subgroups, the Coleman study found that most of the variation in student achievement is within rather than between schools, but a larger share of the variation is found between schools in earlier grades and among more disadvantaged subgroups. Regarding teacher quality specifically, one of the key conclusions is that the quality of teachers shows a stronger relationship [than school facilities and curricula] to pupil achievement. Furthermore, it is progressively greater at higher grades, indicating a cumulative impact of the qualities of teachers in a school on the pupil’s achievements. Again, teacher quality seems more important to minority achievement than to that of the majority.

The finding that “teacher quality is one of the few school characteristics that significantly affects student performance” is quite consistent with more-recent research. Also in line with current studies is the report’s finding that “for any groups whether minority or not, the effect of good teachers is greatest upon the children who suffer most educational disadvantage in their background, and that a given investment in upgrading teacher quality will have most effect on achievement in underprivileged areas.” Recent studies, for instance, find that higher funding levels, smaller classes, and more-qualified teachers all have larger effects on disadvantaged students than on other students.

## Internal link – teacher inexperience

#### Experienced teachers eliminate achievements gaps – multiple studies

Powers, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics research economist, and Flint, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics former economist, 16 (Susan G. and Steven, "Labor productivity growth in elementary and secondary school services: 1989–2012", Bureau of Labor Statistics, June 2016, https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2016/article/labor-productivity-growth-in-elementary-and-secondary-school-services.htm, 7-10-17, GDI-EC)

We begin with three studies conducted shortly after 2000 that influenced the economics of education considerably. In the first study, Hanushek and Kimko come to two central conclusions.67 First, countries that have students who score high on international tests in science and mathematics also have higher rates of economic growth. Second, immigrants to the United States who come from countries with higher scores also earn more in the United States. These results suggest that these countries produce high-quality human capital and are thus able to grow more quickly. Such evidence is also consistent with an emphasis on science and technology education.

In a second study, Hanushek shows that, in most contexts, more resources devoted to education do not lead to better results.68 A few exceptions to this general rule exist, mostly among young children and disadvantaged groups. For example, Hanushek remarks that if disadvantaged students were fortunate enough to have strong teachers, at the 85th percentile, for 5 consecutive years, such a boost in itself would be sufficient to eliminate the entire gap between mainstream and disadvantaged students.69 What stands out most strongly from this study is how additional resources generally do not lead to improved results. Findings such as these have led scholars to conclude that, since added resources do not work, educators will have to fundamentally change the structure of schools and their incentives to produce better outcomes.

In the final study, Rivkin, Hanushek, and Kain studied the value added of learning of students in Texas schools.70 “Value added” is a measure of a student’s learning in a given year, and it is measured by the increase from the previous year’s test scores. The value-added measure reflects the “gain” in a student’s test scores compared with previous years’ scores and controls for family, neighborhood, and school influences on a student. This value-added approach makes adjusting for individual student differences in learning capability possible. Teacher evaluation by year-to-year gains in student achievement then become a useful additional measure of teacher effectiveness.

Teacher effects are generally found to be consistent over time: Teachers with high value-added scores within a given year tend to have similar scores in other years; teachers with low value-added scores tend to have similar scores in other years. This result has been the basis for a renewed emphasis on measuring and rewarding good teachers.

After the Rivkin et al. study and other similar work showed that teacher value added could be estimated, further work analyzing education in terms of teacher value-added data then exploded. New teachers were found to have below-average teacher scores in their earlier years, particularly in their first year.71 Many teachers with especially low scores in their early years soon left the profession. Having shown that low income and minority students are taught more frequently by beginner teachers and experience higher teacher turnover rates, Rivkin et al. and others argued for implementing policy incentives such as higher pay to retain more experienced, qualified teachers for disadvantaged students.72 Teacher scores were uncorrelated with many factors often used in teacher pay, such as the presence of a graduate degree.73

#### Teacher experience key element in disparity in quality of education, funding not key

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

We also find that despite district efforts to equalize learning opportunities by providing equitable funding across schools, novice teachers are clustered in higher-poverty and higher- minority schools within districts nationally. While districts typically have direct control over class size and teacher-pupil ratio policies – and many staff higher-poverty schools with more teacher per student – districts have far less control over the distribution of teacher experience (Darling-Hammond, 2004; Loeb & Strunk, 2007). As a result, districts allocate more funding to their higher-poverty schools by lowering class sizes, rather than having more experienced teachers in those schools. At the same time, these broad averages mask substantial variation in teacher resource gaps. Many districts actually provide less funding per student for teacher salaries in schools with the highest percent of low-income students and student of color, while other districts have equal to or more experienced teachers in their highest need schools. In contrast to teacher resources, most of the variation in teacher resource gaps is across districts in the same state.

#### Less access to experienced teachers and lower resourced teacher undermine underserved minority students’ education performance

Resmovits, Senior Education Reporter, The Huffington Post, 2k14 (Joy, “American Schools Are STILL Racist, Government Report Finds”accessed 7/04/17 published 3/21/14 www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/03/21/schools-discrimination\_n\_5002954.html GDI-XRL)

Black students are suspended or expelled at triple the rate of their white peers, according to the U.S. Education Department’s 2011-2012 Civil Rights Data Collection, a survey conducted every two years. Five percent of white students were suspended annually, compared with 16 percent of black students, according to the report. Black girls were suspended at a rate of 12 percent — far greater than girls of other ethnicities and most categories of boys.

At the same time, minority students have less access to experienced teachers. Most minority students and English language learners are stuck in schools with the most new teachers. Seven percent of black students attend schools where as many as 20 percent of teachers fail to meet license and certification requirements. And one in four school districts pay teachers in less-diverse high schools $5,000 more than teachers in schools with higher black and Latino student enrollment.

Such discrimination lowers academic performance for minority students and puts them at greater risk of dropping out of school, according to previous research. The new research also shows the shortcomings of decades of legal and political moves to ensure equal rights to education. The Supreme Court’s landmark 1954 Brown v. Board of Education ruling banned school segregation and affirmed the right to quality education for all children. The 1964 Civil Rights Act guaranteed equal access to education.

## Internal link – teacher resources

#### Lower per pupil spending associated with lower teacher resources – proves resource allocation key determinant of teacher quality and statistically significant

**Knight**,Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/\_Files/docs/papers/CERPS\_Working\_Paper\_2016\_2.pdf accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

Our primary finding – that per-pupil funding is associated with lower teacher resource gaps – could result from a variety of reasons. Above, we argued that more resources help districts maintain supportive working conditions in their higher-need schools. Alternatively, districts that receive more funding may differ in some other way that is correlated with both district funding and lower teacher resource gaps. For example, holding constant district poverty rate, districts with less segregated student populations may receive higher funding and also have lower teacher resource gaps. To explore this issue further, we confirm our results are consistent when adding controls for district segregation by race and income level (taken from Reardon et al., 2016 and described in Reardon & Firebaugh, 2002). In models predicting income-based gaps in all three teacher resources (teacher salary spending per student, teacher-student ratios, and the percent of experienced teachers), controls for student segregation by income are insignificant and do not change the main results.15 For models predicting resource gaps between schools with the highest and lowest percent of underrepresented minority students, results are also largely unchanged when adding controls for student segregation by race/ethnicity level. Finally, when we add interactions between measures of segregation and district funding, we see that in general, district per-pupil funding has a stronger relationship with narrowing of teacher resource gaps in more segregated districts. In short, resources may be even more important for closing teacher resource gaps in districts that have more segregation across schools, but the degree of district segregation does not appear to bias our results.

#### Racial minorities receive fewer education resources than white peers, treated unequally

Hsieh, news editor, 14, (Steven Hsieh, “14 Disturbing Stats About Racial Inequality in American Public Schools”, Moyers, March 24, 2014, <http://billmoyers.com/2014/03/24/14-disturbing-stats-about-racial-inequality-in-american-public-schools/>, July 14, 2017) GDI AC

Comprehensive data [released Friday](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/data.html?src=rt/) by the US Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights offers a striking glance at the extent of racial [inequality](http://www.thenation.com/section/inequality?lc=int_mb_1001) plaguing the nation’s education system.∂ Analysts found that black, Latino and Native American students have less access to advanced math and science courses and are more likely to be taught by first-year instructors than white students. Black and Native American students are also suspended and expelled at disproportionate rates.∂ For the first time in history, the Education Department also examined school discipline at the pre-K level, finding that black students as young as 4 years old are already facing unequal treatment from school administrators.∂ The Education Department released four papers with the data, analyzing inequality in [school discipline](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/crdc-discipline-snapshot.pdf), [early learning](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/crdc-early-learning-snapshot.pdf), [college readiness](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/crdc-college-and-career-readiness-snapshot.pdf) and [teacher equity](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/crdc-teacher-equity-snapshot.pdf) (PDFs). Here’s a breakdown of some of the key findings, taken straight from those papers. During the 2011–12 school year:∂ Black students accounted for 18 percent of the country’s pre-K enrollment, but made up 48 percent of preschoolers with multiple out-of-school suspensions.∂ Black students were expelled at three times the rate of white students.∂ American Indian and Native-Alaskan students represented less than 1 percent of students, but 3 percent of expulsions.∂ Black girls were suspended at higher rates than all other girls and most boys.∂ American Indian and Native-Alaskan girls were suspended at higher rates than white boys or girls.∂ Nearly one in four boys of color, excepting Latino and Asian American students, with disabilities received an out-of-school suspension.∂ One in five girls of color with disabilities received an out-of-school suspension.∂ A quarter of the schools with the highest percentage of black and Latino students did not offer Algebra II.∂ A third of these schools did not offer chemistry.∂ Less than half of American Indian and Native-Alaskan high school students had access to the full range of math and science courses, which consists of Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II, calculus, biology, chemistry and physics.∂ Black and Latino students accounted for 40 percent of enrollment at schools with gifted programs, but only represented 26 percent of students in such programs.∂ Black, Latino and Native American students attended schools with higher concentrations of first-year teachers (3-4 percent) than white students (1 percent).∂ Black students were more than three times as likely to attend schools where fewer than 60 percent of teachers meet all state certification and licensure requirements.∂ Latino students were twice as likely to attend such schools.∂ The Department of Education’s civil rights survey examined all 97,000 public schools in the US, representing 49 million students. Explore the datasets, organized by school, state and district, at [Ed.gov](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/data.html?src=rt/).

## Internal link - educational inequality key to economy

#### Educational inequality makes it impossible to meet future high-skilled job demand—fixing the gap is key to economic competitiveness

Parmley and Smith, Smith is a Senior Fellow with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2016

[Kelli and Marshall, “Memo: Improving and equalizing high school and college graduation rates for all students,” Brookings Institute, December 15, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2016/12/15/memo-improving-and-equalizing-high-school-and-college-graduation-rates-for-all-students/>, GDI - TM]

Economists estimate that by 2020 more than two-thirds of jobs in the United States will require some form of postsecondary education or training. However, at the current rate of higher education completion, the nation will fall nearly 20 million degrees short of meeting that need. According to The Pell Institute, in 2014 only 35 percent of 25-34 year olds had a bachelor’s degree or higher, placing the United States around the middle of 43 developed nations. Achieving economic competitiveness demands a national response to increase the number of people earning four-year degrees or credentials. Moreover, the degree attainment rate masks pernicious inequities. According to the Pell Institute, more than half of all 24-year-olds with bachelor’s degrees are from families in the top 25 percent of the income bracket, while individuals from the bottom quarter accounted for only 10 percent of four-year degrees. Moreover, according to the Digest of Educational Statistics, Asians (57 percent) and whites (40 percent) are roughly twice as likely to hold a bachelor’s degree as African Americans (27 percent) and Hispanics (20 percent). Despite recent improvements in college-going rates, the overall degree completion rates, combined with disparities in educational attainment for low-income and underrepresented populations, will impede our nation’s efforts to develop a flourishing, inclusive economy. The “leaky student pipeline” metaphor, which characterizes the transition points in our educational system where students are lost, provides a powerful framing for identifying how to increase graduation rates. At each transition, some students fall by the wayside, especially black and Hispanic students and those from low-income families. While every transition point is important from a policy and practice perspective, improving student success at three critical junctures would have the greatest impact: (1) high school graduation, (2) pre-college remediation, and (3) college graduation. The U.S. has made progress over the last 15 years in improving on-time high school completion. A recent GradNation report describes how high school graduation rates began to rise in 2002, after flat-lining for 30 years, and have climbed sharply since 2006. The national graduation rate reached 82.3 percent in 2014—a gain of more than 10 percentage points since 2002. Gains by black and Hispanic students have been the key drivers with both of these student subgroups exceeding the national rate of improvement between 2013 and 2014 (0.9 points), and with yearly gains averaging more than 1.3 percentage points since 2011. Even with these gains, however, there is much to do to reach GradNation’s goal of having 90 percent of students graduate on time by 2020. The opportunity gap remains one ongoing challenge. The overall increase in high school graduation rates notwithstanding, substantial racial and economic variation persist. For example, while 88 percent of white students graduate, only 73 percent of African American and 75 percent of Hispanic Americans leave school with a diploma. That means one-quarter of African and Hispanic American students have little chance of obtaining a reasonably well paying job and are effectively shut out of college.[1]

#### Closing the achievement gap boosts income and overall economic output—outweighs the costs of fixing education inequality

The New York Times, 2015

[Patricia Cohen, “Closing Education Gap Will Lift Economy, a Study Finds,” February 2, <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/03/business/economy/closing-education-gap-will-lift-economy-study-finds.html>, GDI - TM]

Study after study has shown a yawning educational achievement gap between the poorest and wealthiest children in America. But what does this gap costs in terms of lost economic growth and tax revenue? That’s what researchers at the Washington Center for Equitable Growth set out to discover in a new study that concluded the United States could ultimately enrich everybody by improving educational performance for the typical student. When it comes to math and science scores, the United States lags most of the other 33 advanced industrialized countries that make up the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, ranking 24th, far behind Korea, Poland and Slovenia. Moving up just a few notches to 19th — so that the average American score matched the O.E.C.D. average — would add 1.7 percent to the nation’s gross domestic product over the next 35 years, according to estimates by the Washington Center, a nonpartisan, liberal-leaning research group focused on narrowing inequality. That could lead to roughly $900 billion in higher government revenue, more than making up for the cost of such an effort. If Americans were able to match the scores reached in Canada, which ranks seventh on the O.E.C.D. scale, the United States’ gross domestic product would rise by an additional 6.7 percent, a cumulative increase of $10 trillion (after taking inflation into account) by the year 2050, the report estimated. Robert G. Lynch, an economist who wrote the Washington Center report, explained why he took the trouble to make these what-if calculations. “One of the main goals was to see how we could promote more widely shared and faster economic growth,” said Mr. Lynch, who teaches economics at Washington College in Chestertown, Md. In the three decades that followed the end of World War II, almost all Americans, no matter where they fell on the earnings scale, enjoyed at least a doubling of their real incomes. But that balanced growth has evaporated. While those at the top have continued to experience robust income increases, everyone else’s income has either stalled or dropped. The average income of the bottom 20 percent of households sank by more than 8 percent from 1973 to 2013, while the inflation-adjusted incomes of the top 20 percent grew by about 60 percent, according to the report. The top 5 percent enjoyed an 80 percent jump. One point of this exercise, Mr. Lynch explained, is to show that the added cost of improving educational achievement at the bottom would be more than made up for by the rise in economic output and tax revenue. The study used math and science scores from the 2012 Program for International Student Assessment, a test widely used around the world for measuring and comparing educational achievement. The average combined score for the United States is 978, while the O.E.C.D. average is 995. The Canadian average is 1,044. Eliminating the achievement gap in America would require raising the country’s average to 1,080, so that it would rank third behind South Korea (with an average score of 1,092) and Japan (with a 1,083 average). That stunning improvement, according to the center, would raise the total output in the United States by another 10 percent. Lifetime earnings of the poorest quarter would jump by 22 percent in this event. The income gap is an outgrowth, at least in part, of the education gap. An analysis by the O.E.C.D. released last fall showed that the United States greatly lagged nearly every advanced industrial nation on measures of educational equality. Only one in 20 Americans age 25 to 34 surpassed the educational level of their parents, for example. For the 20 richest member nations, that average was one in four.

## Impact – educational inequality leads to environmental destruction

#### Educational and income inequality increases environmental degradation and intensifies climate change

Holmberg, political economist, 17, (Susan Holmberg, “Inequality is Toxic: How Economic and Social Disparities Drive Climate Change”, rooseveltinstitute, May 8, 2017, <http://rooseveltinstitute.org/inequality-toxic-how-economic-and-social-disparities-drive-climate-change/>, July 14, 2017) GDI AC

The People’s Climate March in April reminds me how far we’ve come in understanding that climate change is deeply tied to another ominous 21st threat: economic and social inequality. Even in the U.S., one of the largest contributors of greenhouse gas emissions, we are beginning to recognize that there are and will be vast climate disparities. In inner cities, Native reservations, and rural farming communities, the poorest groups in America, many of color, are experiencing the worst effects of climate change but have the least ability to cope with and adapt to it.∂ At least on the left, many also recognize that, despite the massive job creation and other economic benefits that will come from moving to a clean fuel economy, there will be significant short-term costs. For example, fossil fuel workers will need a just, economically viable transition into new industries. There are also [strong ideas](https://www.thenation.com/article/heres-how-states-and-cities-can-fight-climate-change-and-inequality-in-the-trump-era/) being put forward to help low-income people with the rising energy prices that would result from a much-needed carbon tax.∂ Yet, as I write in my new report, “[Boiling Points](http://rooseveltinstitute.org/boiling-points/),” one key topic that is still overlooked is how environmental degradation and climate change are themselves the toxic byproducts of our inequality problem.∂ This may sound counterintuitive: But there is a spate of research showing a clear and positive relationship between environmental damage and economic and social inequality.∂ For example, economist James Boyce conducted a [study](https://www.umass.edu/economics/publications/2010-05.pdf) in the early 1990s with colleagues from the Political Economy Research Institute, which compared industrial air pollution across U.S. metro areas. The authors looked at the distribution of air pollution impacts across income levels and racial groups and found that, in cities where the gaps in pollution exposure between people of color and whites are larger, there tends to be much more pollution in general.∂ A second [study](http://econpapers.repec.org/article/eeeecolec/v_3a29_3ay_3a1999_3ai_3a1_3ap_3a127-140.htm) Boyce conducted, with another group of colleagues, looked at environmental quality across the 50 states and asked why it’s better in some states than others. It again turns out that these variations have much to do with differences in wealth and power. “Where income inequalities were greater, where educational inequalities were greater, where the fairness of fiscal policy in terms of both the tax system and access to services like Medicaid was better, you tended to find differences in environmental degradation.” More equal distributions of wealth and power were associated with better environmental outcomes.∂ Economist Jungho Baek and his coauthors also [find](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301421513007404) that more equal income distribution in the U.S. results in better environmental quality in both the short and long run. Similarly UK geographer, Danny Dorling conducted a [study](http://www.dannydorling.org/wp-content/files/dannydorling_publication_id1828.pdf) of the world’s 25 richest countries, looking at behaviors like consumption of meat, water use, production of waste, flights, and overall effects on ecology. He found that “in all these affluent countries there are inequalities, and in those where inequalities are the greatest it is now becoming evident that people, on average, pollute much more.”∂ How do we make sense of these and other studies with similar results? Is inequality actually causing environmental damage? Or is this merely a correlation, whereby societies that have high inequality levels are also likely to pollute their environments more?∂ I argue that it’s both. First, we can imagine how the causes of inequality are also separately doing environmental harm. For example, take the rise of corporate short-termism since the 1970s. Many economists, including myself, argue that public companies that only prioritize next-quarter share prices—and pump up those share prices through stock buybacks—are an enormous driver of inequality. Corporate short-termism, by its very definition, is bad for the environment because the same shareholder incentives that skew companies away from investing in workers, capital, and innovation discourage them from investing in, for example, green retrofitting of existing buildings, sustainable production practices, and even compliance with environmental regulations.∂ Second, there are mechanisms by which inequality itself is an environmental toxin. For example, Boyce [argues](https://www.e-elgar.com/shop/the-political-economy-of-the-environment?___website=uk_warehouse)that, because wealth ultimately converts into political power, a society with high levels of wealth and income inequality leaves those at the bottom less able to resist the powerful interests that benefit from pollution. This increases environmental “bads” because the magnitude of environmental harm is a function of the magnitude of inequality. (These explanations just scratch the surface. See [the report](http://rooseveltinstitute.org/boiling-points/) to delve more into these ideas.)∂ What is the potential of these findings? Can we think of financial regulation, progressive tax policy, and entitlements as climate change policy? They will not directly pull carbon out of the atmosphere, which we need to do urgently, but these kinds of progressive economic policies may be a necessary foundation for a sustainable society. Recognizing that solving inequality is actionable climate policy builds on the foundation of climate justice exhibited at actions like the People’s Climate March, providing an incredibly strong framework for designing good policy and mobilizing an even stronger, multi-interest climate movement.

## Impact – education inequality = racism

### Inequality education = segregation

#### Racial and Class Segregation Damages Democracy and Social Mobility – education avenue to solve

Childress, FRONTLINE senior reporter, 14 (Sarah “Does Integration Still Matter in Public Schools?” FRONTLINE 7-15-2014 http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/does-integration-still-matter-in-public-schools/ 7-14-2017 GDI-JIJD)

[question]New studies have found that in some places, public schools are as segregated as they were in 1968. Does that matter?[/question]¶ To my mind, it’s hugely significant. If you think about the two fundamental purposes of public education, it’s to promote social mobility so that a child, no matter her circumstances, can, through a good education, go where her God-given talents would take her. The second purpose is to strengthen our democracy by creating intelligent and open-minded citizens, and related to that, to build social cohesion.¶ Because we’re a nation where people come from all corners of the world, it’s important that the public schools be a place where children learn what it means to be an American, and learn the values of a democracy, one of which is that we’re all social equals. Segregation by race and by socioeconomic status significantly undercuts both of those goals.¶ So on the academic achievement, social mobility side, there is research going back a half century to suggest that separate schools, particularly for rich and poor, are very rarely equal. It’s a disadvantage to be born into a poor family on average. It’s a second disadvantage to attend a school where there are high concentrations of poverty. And this intersects very closely with race, because African-American and Latino kids are much more likely to be in high-poverty schools than white students.¶ And indeed there is some evidence that middle class African-American families live in neighborhoods with higher poverty than low-income whites. So it’s highly racialized. To my mind this issue of segregation, which gets talked about very little, is central to undermining the twin rationales for public schooling in the first place.

### Racism Health Impacts

#### Racial bias increases heart problems – for both whites and blacks

**Savchuk, 2017**

(Katia “Racism Might Be Bad for Your Heart Whether You’re Black Or White “ California-magazine May 16, 2017

<http://alumni.berkeley.edu/california-magazine/just-in/2017-05-16/racism-might-be-bad-your-heart-whether-youre-black-or-white> accessed GDI -TM)

Racism hurts the heart. Both black and white residents of counties where whites reported more racist attitudes were more likely to die from heart disease than those in areas with lower racial bias, according to a recent study from Berkeley psychology researchers. The relationship between whites’ racial bias and death rates was more pronounced for blacks, according to the study, which appeared in the journal Psychological Science last fall.

“The results are correlational, not causational, but they suggest that both harboring bias and being targeted by bias may be risk factors for circulatory disease. However, being targeted may be an even stronger risk factor,” said Jordan Leitner, the paper’s lead author, who was a postdoctoral research fellow in UC Berkeley’s psychology department for the past three years.

The study also found that blacks in more racially biased counties reported lower access to health care relative to whites. “This speaks to one potential pathway in the link between racial bias and death rate,” Leitner says.

#### Racial bias increases death rates from heart disease

**Savchuk, 2017**

(Katia “Racism Might Be Bad for Your Heart Whether You’re Black Or White “ California-magazine May 16, 2017

<http://alumni.berkeley.edu/california-magazine/just-in/2017-05-16/racism-might-be-bad-your-heart-whether-youre-black-or-white> accessed GDI -TM)

The research drew on data from the Centers for Disease Control and Project Implicit, a nonprofit that has measured racial bias among millions of respondents over more than a decade with an online survey and test. The nonprofit measured both explicit bias (how warmly participants reported feeling towards black people) and implicit bias (their degree of automatic negative associations with black people). Leitner and his colleagues acknowledge that the nonprofit’s data is imperfect because participants were self-selected. But they argue that its strength is in providing a massive pool of geocoded data on racial bias. They also weighted the data based on the number of participants in a county and their ages to avoid skewing the results.

Explicit and implicit bias among whites were both linked with higher death rates and reduced health care access, but explicit racism had a stronger effect, the study showed. “This suggests that living in a community where people are openly racist is more strongly correlated to these health outcomes than living in a place where people may have racist associations in their minds but don’t openly express them,” says Leitner, whose research was funded by the National Science Foundation.

In a [second study](http://econpapers.repec.org/article/eeesocmed/v_3a170_3ay_3a2016_3ai_3ac_3ap_3a220-227.htm), published in the journal *Social Science and Medicine* in October 2016, Leitner and his colleagues looked at the racial attitudes of blacks as well as whites. They concluded that counties where blacks harbored more implicit bias toward whites were also more likely to die of heart disease. “It adds to the evidence that harboring bias might be stressful, and we know chronic stress influences circulatory health,” Leitner says.

#### Holding constant for other factors – racial bias decreases access to health care and increase deaths

**Savchuk, 2017**

(Katia “Racism Might Be Bad for Your Heart Whether You’re Black Or White “ California-magazine May 16, 2017

<http://alumni.berkeley.edu/california-magazine/just-in/2017-05-16/racism-might-be-bad-your-heart-whether-youre-black-or-white> accessed GDI -TM)

In a paper now under review, Leitner and his colleagues examined the relationship between racism and actual — rather than perceived — access to health care. They found that states in which whites expressed more racism toward blacks spent less per enrollee on Medicaid, a program that disproportionately benefits African Americans. Previous research has shown that blacks who feel discriminated against have worse health outcomes. Leitner says he wanted to go beyond subjective perceptions of bias to measure the effects of actual racism on deaths from heart disease, which kills black Americans at higher rates than whites. The researchers adjusted for socioeconomic variables such as population size, black-to-white ratio, education, income and segregation levels, but Leitner says it’s always possible some other undetermined variable is driving correlations. The team also created an interactive map showing measures of bias and circulatory death rates by county.

#### Racism kills – disproportionate impact on health of racial and ethnic minorities

**Miller, 2016**

(Jake “Health Disparities - Talk explores the unhealthy truth about racism” Harvard Medical School October 20, 2016 <https://hms.harvard.edu/news/health-disparities-0> accessed GDI - TM)

Racism makes people sick. In the United States, blacks, Latinos, native Americans and other minority groups have greater risks of diseases like tuberculosis and coronary heart disease than whites, as numerous studies by sociologists, public health researchers, epidemiologists and physicians have found. Once they are sick, researchers say, minorities tend to receive lower quality health care than whites. As a result, minorities can expect to die at a younger age than whites. At the latest 2016 HLC Diversity Dialogue, featured speaker David Williams, the Florence Sprague Norman and Laura Smart Norman Professor of Public Health at the Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, discussed the historic and current state of health disparities in the U.S. and explored some possible solutions. One key reason for the lack of health equity is the health risks that are associated with the lower social and economic status of minorities, said Williams, who is also professor of African and African American studies and of sociology at Harvard University and director of the Lung Cancer Disparities Center at the Harvard Chan School. Blacks and Latinos in the U.S. experience lower income and wealth and have reduced access to high quality health care and nutritious food, Williams said, so it’s not surprising that they experience higher rates of mortality than people in this country who are better off economically. But it’s not just about economics. “The deeply embedded racism in our culture has consequences for health,” Williams said, citing growing bodies of research that show the perils of prejudice. When researchers correct for factors such as education and income—comparing white high school dropouts with black high school dropouts, for example—there are still significant differences in the health risks and outcomes between races. Ongoing research is shedding light onto why that happens and how policy changes and medical training can help solve the problem. Williams noted that numerous studies have shown that people who experience discrimination are more likely to have elevated stress hormones, increased inflammation, high blood pressure, cognitive impairments and poor sleep.

#### Racism leads to embodied inequality

**Silverstein, 2013**

(Jason, “How Racism Is Bad for Our Bodies” The Atlantic Mar 12, 2013

<https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2013/03/how-racism-is-bad-for-our-bodies/273911/> accessed GDI – TM)

A growing literature shows discrimination raises the risk of many emotional and physical problems. Discrimination has been shown to increase the risk of stress, depression, the common cold, hypertension, cardiovascular disease, breast cancer, and mortality. Recently, two journals -- The American Journal of Public Health and The Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race -- dedicated entire issues to the subject. These collections push us to consider how discrimination becomes what social epidemiologist Nancy Krieger, one of the field's leaders, terms "embodied inequality."

#### Stressors of racism lead to unhealthy habits that compound physical effects of racism

**Silverstein, 2013**

(Jason, “How Racism Is Bad for Our Bodies” The Atlantic Mar 12, 2013

<https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2013/03/how-racism-is-bad-for-our-bodies/273911/> accessed GDI – TM)

A new study by Kathryn Freeman Anderson in Sociological Inquiry adds evidence to the hypothesis that racism harms health. To study the connection, Anderson analyzed the massive 2004 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, which includes data for other 30,000 people. Conceptually, she proposes a simple pathway with two clear steps. First, because of the prevalence of racial discrimination, being a racial minority leads to greater stress. Not surprisingly, Anderson found that 18.2 percent of black participants experienced emotional stress and 9.8 percent experienced physical stress. Comparatively, only 3.5 and 1.6 percent of whites experienced emotional and physical stress, respectively.

Second, this stress leads to poorer mental and physical health. But this is not only because stress breaks the body down. It is also because stress pushes people to cope in unhealthy ways. When we feel stressed, we may want a drink and, if we want a drink, we may also want a cigarette. But discrimination is not just any form of stress. It is a type of stress that disproportionately affects minorities.

Here we see how racism works in a cycle to damage health. People at a social disadvantage are more likely to experience stress from racism. And they are less likely to have the resources to extinguish this stress, because they are at a social disadvantage.

## Impact – School and economic Integration good

#### Educational inequality and segregation promotes racial exclusion

**James,** Professor of Law, University of Miami School of Law, **2015**

(Osamuida, “Soapbox: Racial segregation in schools, no matter how unintended, should be illegal”, Miami Herald, February 19, 2015, http://www.miamiherald.com/news/local/community/miami-dade/coral-gables/article10679735.html, accessed 7/11/17, GDI-JG)

A popular magazine recently asked its readers whether racial segregation is still legal, even if it is not deliberate. The answer depends on what we mean to oppose when we oppose racial segregation. If we mean to merely prevent formal and intentional acts of discrimination, then the answer is yes — unintended racial segregation is legal. If we mean to actually end racial exclusion, marginalization, and isolation in pursuit of substantive equality, then the answer is no — racial segregation, no matter how unintended, should be illegal.∂ Failure to commit to substantive racial equality continues to forestall attempts to achieve racial integration in our communities and schools. In Miami, for example, “unintended” residential racial isolation today is actually the product of intentional local, state, and federal policies that broadened access to safe, stable communities for some, while simultaneously denying home ownership, quality education, and public services to others. One need only examine neighborhood maps of Miami during the early 1930s that used racial composition to designate — for investment purposes — areas like Coral Gables as “best,” and certain parts of Coconut Grove as “hazardous,” to get a sense of this intentional government discrimination.∂ Although this sort of blatant racism has long been outlawed, enduring racial and economic segregation in our city is a direct byproduct of intentional decisions to deny access to mortgages and other forms of community investment and development on the basis of race. Moreover, our still-segregated communities have resulted in segregated learning environments.∂ Current debates about controlled choice in the city of Coral Gables implicate this very issue. When asked whether their government has any obligation to counteract school segregation, many parents might respond ‘no’ if it means that they cannot attend their neighborhood school. After all, they might argue, school segregation is an historical artifact no longer in operation.∂ As members, however, of a broader community still impacted today by the intentional racial discrimination of yesterday, we have a duty to consider factors other than convenience, comfort, and our own ideal schooling arrangements when evaluating controlled choice.∂ We have a duty to also consider the value of school integration in helping us achieve our goal of substantive equality. We have a duty to weigh that value just as heavily as we weigh benefits of attending school close to home, and to reject the false dichotomy that the formality of “intent” creates. We have a moral imperative to actively embrace a commitment to racial inclusion in our schools and neighborhoods, and to reject school assignment plans that result, intentionally or unintentionally, in racial exclusion and segregation instead.

# Democracy Internals and Impacts

## Link – educational inequality undermines democracy

#### Educational equality is essential to U.S. democracy—sets up citizens with common knowledge and future resources to participate in politics

Chen, PhD candidate at Saint Louis University, publishing in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal, 2015

[Amy Yun-Ping, “Educational Inequality: An Impediment to True Democracy in the United States,” Sociology Study, Vol.5 No.5, May, <http://www.davidpublisher.org/Public/uploads/Contribute/55f62bc2bf7b8.pdf> accessed GDI -TM]

The fundamental concept of democracy aims to offer equal access to all members of society and to ensure that they are empowered to make a good life for themselves and establish the public good for the country. Quality education is a method to eliminate poverty and encourage the engine of shared prosperity for generations of Americans. When education improves the preparation and productivity of young members of the community, it increases the wealth of the country and leads many people to their American dreams. Nevertheless, the persistent and long-standing educational inequalities are an obstacle for the United States becoming a nation with true democracy and equal liberty. Thus, democracy becomes a superficial aspect and a beautiful bubble, and it is not realized in practice. The Collapse of Political Responsibility Hochschild and Scovronick (2003) stated, “Education also powerfully affects people’s involvement with politics and their community, thereby creating another link between the nested structure of inequalities in schooling and the American dream” (Hochschild and Scovronick 2003: 24). Well-educated members of the community largely understand their obligation as participants in a democratic society, and they likely know current political facts and participate in political activities. The virtue of education in a democracy is that it tends to prepare children for citizenship and to foster in them the knowledge necessary for them to function in a civic society. But today in the United States, only some Americans fully exercise their political rights, and these are often citizens with high incomes, high socioeconomic statuses, and high levels of formal education. According to the American Political Science Association Taskforce (2005): In 1990, nearly nine out of 10 individuals in families with incomes over $75,000 reported voting in presidential elections, while only half of those in families with incomes under $15,000 reported voting. Fifty-six percent (56%) of those with incomes of at least $75,000 reported participating in political campaign activities, compared with a mere 6% among Americans with incomes under $15,000. (American Political Science Association Taskforce 2005: 80-81) The evidence indicates that there is a significant correlation between income status and the practice of citizenship. Americans with higher socioeconomic status usually enjoy not only higher educational achievement and salaries, but also have greater resources and skills to engage in politics and organizations. Education provides opportunities for Americans to acquire knowledge of democracy and to recognize their duty as members of a democratic society. Nevertheless, educational inequalities can lead to disparities in resources and skills between privileged and unprivileged people. The situation demolishes the goal of promoting democracy. The voices of U.S. citizens are heard unequally, and collective decisions respond much more to the privileged than to people of average means. The gap of inequality will increase. Instead of making progress, U.S. politics will continue to involve exclusion and unfairness, which strongly distorts the primary framework of democracy.

#### Equitable and integrated education is key to democracy—increases tolerance and educational attainment that equalizes democratic participation

Kahlenberg and Janey, Kahlenberg is a senior fellow at the Century Foundation, Janey is a contributor to the Century Foundation, 2016

[Richard D. and Clifford, “Putting Democracy Back into Public Education,” The Century Foundation, November 10, <https://tcf.org/content/report/putting-democracy-back-public-education/>, GDI- TM]

Providing Students Equitable Access to Educational Opportunity Do students see that classmates of all races and economic backgrounds have access to the best schools and the most academically advanced tracks or do race and class appear to be highly predictive determinants of opportunity? Does the assignment of students to schools and academic tracks send the message that in a democracy, people of all backgrounds are equally valued, or that some are more worthy than others? School Integration in Cambridge, Massachusetts; Rochester, New York; and Elsewhere. The socioeconomic and racial integration of schools is important to the health of a democracy for three distinct reasons: (1) integrated schools underline the democratic message that in America, we are all political equals; (2) integrated schools promote tolerance and acceptance and make demagogic appeals that scapegoat minorities less likely to be effective; and (3) the opportunity to attend integrated schools raises educational attainment, which, in turn, is directly correlated with democratic participation rates. One key principle undergirding American democracy is that we all have not only an equal vote in elections but also an equal right to feel a part of the nation’s democratic heritage. Because Americans are bound not by blood but by a set of democratic ideals, everyone—no matter what race or national origin or religion or length of time in this country—can lay equal claim on the ideas of Jefferson and Madison and Washington.114 Of course, American history is riddled with examples of these ideals being trampled for certain groups, which is why it is important that we as a nation remain vigilant in the fight to preserve these ideals for all Americans. When American schoolchildren are educated in what are effectively apartheid schools—divided by race and class—the democratic message of equal political rights and heritage is severely undermined. Likewise, demagogues can more effectively inflame passions against those they deem as “others”—Muslims, Mexican immigrants, or African Americans—when there are large audiences who do not personally know many members of these groups, partly because they were raised in communities and schools that were almost exclusively white and Christian. The profound lesson of the gay rights movement, for example, is that only when gay Americans openly came out as neighbors, coworkers, and classmates did efforts to demonize homosexuals lose their potency. So too, a large body of research finds that integrated schools can reduce prejudice and racism that stems from ignorance and lack of personal contact.115 As Thurgood Marshall noted in one case, “Unless our children begin to learn together, then there is little hope that our people will ever learn to live together.”116 Providing an excellent, integrated education also promotes democracy by improving educational attainment, which increases political participation. Controlling for family socioeconomic status and academic achievement, a 2013 longitudinal study found that students attending socioeconomically integrated schools are as much as 70 percent more likely to graduate high school and enroll in a four-year college than those attending high-poverty schools 117 Political philosopher Danielle Allen has suggested that denying an adequate education to low-income and minority students, as we routinely do, is another form of “voter suppression,” given the strong correlation between educational attainment and voter participation. In 2012, Census data show that 72 percent of adults with a bachelor’s degree or more voted, compared with less than 32 percent of those with less than a high school education.118

#### Equal public education strengthens democracy—allows children to acquire crucial skills despite their differences

**Chen,** PhD candidate at Saint Louis University, publishing in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal, **2015**

(Amy Yun-Ping, “Educational Inequality: An Impediment to True Democracy in the United States,” Sociology Study, Vol.5 No.5, May 2015, <http://www.davidpublisher.org/Public/uploads/Contribute/55f62bc2bf7b8.pdf>, accessed 7/10/17, GDI-JG)

The core principles of U.S. education are supposed to include quality of educational opportunity and establishment of an equitable outcome. The principles should not advocate for a Race to the Top, a competition, or be a matter of individual choice with privileged sectors. U.S. education consistently needs to ensure the delivery of reliable, dependable, and equitable public services. The goal of the United States as a democratic society should be to provide an equal quality education to all children, so each of them has an equal chance to succeed in the world and promote the common good for the country.∂ Current educational reforms emphasize only high-stakes testing, test-based accountability, individual competition, and school choice, which all create a sense of crisis for racial segregation and class discrimination and lead to growing injustice in regard to educational opportunity. U.S. democracy is an ideal dream that offers possibilities for each citizen according to achievement and ability, free from racism, classism, and discrimination. Public education has been a primary mechanism for U.S. democracy, and it is also a reflection of society. Inferior education will eventually ruin our children, society, and nation. Nevertheless, education is the long-term solution for supporting social justice and fighting inequality. Children need to be equipped with adequate knowledge, critical thinking and judgment skills, and a sense of obligation and ethics. Both the government and the people share responsibility to give an equal chance and quality education to future generations, regardless of whether the child is from a wealthy or poor family or whether the child is White or Black. Education is a universal means of achieving other relative human rights, the protection of which is a core element of democracy. It can empower a country’s economy and society. Preventing racial and class inequality in social and educational sectors is of utmost importance. True democracy always opposes educational inequality.

## Income inequality – key to democracy

#### And, income inequality hurts democracy by giving the wealthy disproportionate power over policies that hurt the rest of the country

Nelson, reporter for Vox, quoting Nobel Prize winner Angus Deaton, Professor of Economics and International Affairs Emeritus at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs and the Economics Department at Princeton University, 2015

[Libby, “Read 2015 Nobel Economics Prize winner Angus Deaton's amazing take on inequality,” Vox, October 12, <https://www.vox.com/2015/10/12/9508423/angus-deaton-income-inequality>, GDI – TM]

Angus Deaton, who won the Nobel Prize for Economics today, is best known for his detailed work on consumption and poverty for individuals. But in his 2013 book The Great Escape: Health, Wealth, and the Origins of Inequality, Deaton made a short, compelling, and clear case for why income inequality in society as a whole is a threat to democracy — and why worrying about it isn't just class warfare or resentment: The political equality that is required by democracy is always under threat from economic inequality, and the more extreme the economic inequality, the greater the threat to democracy. If democracy is compromised, there is a direct loss of wellbeing because people have good reason to value their ability to participate in political life, and the loss of that ability is instrumental in threatening other harm. The very wealthy have little need for state-provided education or health care… They have even less reason to support health insurance for everyone, or to worry about the low quality of public schools that plagues much of the country. They will oppose any regulation of banks that restricts profits, even if it helps those who cannot cover their mortgages or protects the public against predatory lending, deceptive advertising, or even a repetition of the financial crash. To worry about these consequences of extreme inequality has nothing to do with being envious of the rich and everything to do with the fear that rapidly growing top incomes are a threat to the wellbeing of everyone else. In other words, worrying about income inequality doesn't mean being jealous of wealth. It's about the effect on the rest of society when the wealthy are rich enough that they can effectively drive political outcomes so they line up with their unusual policy preferences.

## Internal link – inequality education key to civic participation

#### Educational inequality undermines democracy—spurs unequal civic participation

**Chen,** PhD candidate at Saint Louis University, publishing in a peer-reviewed scholarly journal, **2015**

(Amy Yun-Ping, “Educational Inequality: An Impediment to True Democracy in the United States,” Sociology Study, Vol.5 No.5, May 2015, <http://www.davidpublisher.org/Public/uploads/Contribute/55f62bc2bf7b8.pdf>, accessed 7/10/17, GDI-JG)

Hochschild and Scovronick (2003) stated, “Education also powerfully affects people’s involvement with politics and their community, thereby creating another link between the nested structure of inequalities in schooling and the American dream” (Hochschild and Scovronick 2003: 24). Well-educated members of the community largely understand their obligation as participants in a democratic society, and they likely know current political facts and participate in political activities. The virtue of education in a democracy is that it tends to prepare children for citizenship and to foster in them the knowledge necessary for them to function in a civic society. But today in the United States, only some Americans fully exercise their political rights, and these are often citizens with high incomes, high socioeconomic statuses, and high levels of formal education. According to the American Political Science Association Taskforce (2005):∂ In 1990, nearly nine out of 10 individuals in families with incomes over $75,000 reported voting in presidential elections, while only half of those in families with incomes under $15,000 reported voting. Fifty-six percent (56%) of those with incomes of at least $75,000 reported participating in political campaign activities, compared with a mere 6% among Americans with incomes under $15,000. (American Political Science Association Taskforce 2005: 80-81)∂ The evidence indicates that there is a significant correlation between income status and the practice of citizenship. Americans with higher socioeconomic status usually enjoy not only higher educational achievement and salaries, but also have greater resources and skills to engage in politics and organizations. Education provides opportunities for Americans to acquire knowledge of democracy and to recognize their duty as members of a democratic society. Nevertheless, educational inequalities can lead to disparities in resources and skills between privileged and unprivileged people. The situation demolishes the goal of promoting democracy. The voices of U.S. citizens are heard unequally, and collective decisions respond much more to the privileged than to people of average means. The gap of inequality will increase. Instead of making progress, U.S. politics will continue to involve exclusion and unfairness, which strongly distorts the primary framework of democracy.

## Impact – US democracy key

#### Robust American democracy is a crucial model for global democracy—multiple reasons now is key

Diamond, a Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution and at the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies at Stanford University, 2016

[Larry, “Democracy After Trump,” Foreign Affairs, November 14, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/world/2016-11-14/democracy-after-trump> GDI -TM]

CITY ON A HILL Perhaps the most ominous trend, however, has been the increasingly manifest problems of democracy within the advanced nations of Europe and the United States. A crucial factor in the success of the third wave of democratization was the unparalleled power of a seemingly successful U.S. democratic model—which U.S. President Ronald Reagan, channeling American colonial governor John Winthrop, called a “shining city on a hill”—to inspire admiration and emulation around the world. Of course, democracy in the United States has always had many scars and imperfections. But during the 1980s and 1990s, the world saw it as economically dynamic, politically functional, morally self-confident, and militarily supreme. The fall of the Berlin Wall and then of the Soviet Union left the United States as the lone superpower at a time when its democratic allies in the EU were attempting to unify the continent in a common market based on liberal values and institutions. In the post–Cold War era, democratic values became universal—in the sense that they appealed to large swaths of humanity in virtually every region of the world—while all ideological rivals were in retreat or, like Iran, geographically contained. With financial and political support from Europe and the United States during these two decades, freedom flourished, markets expanded, civil societies grew, representative institutions strengthened, and democracy became, for the first time in human history, the most common form of government in the world. During this third wave, democracy gained durable footholds in Africa and Asia and became pervasive in Latin America, but its high quality and unquestioned stability in the West remained the foundation of its global success. Europe and the United States provided both an end state toward which emerging democracies could move, and support to help them get there. It was thus possible to imagine the turn of the millennium as the dawn of a new democratic century. That vision has now begun to unravel. There is no consensus on what we are witnessing, but what is beyond dispute is that populism and illiberalism have been surging in the West. Recent events in Europe have been particularly worrisome—across the continent, populist parties have sought to mobilize “the people” against allegedly corrupt elites. In Hungary and Poland, right-wing populist governments have subverted the independence of the judiciary, civil service, and media. Antidemocratic parties have won significant vote shares in Hungary and the Czech Republic, while illiberal, anti-immigrant ones, such as France’s National Front and Germany’s Alternative für Deutschland, have achieved impressive electoral gains in a number of West European democracies.

## Impact – democracies less war

#### Democracies less violent, more protective of human rights and less prone to war

**Diamond,** Senior Fellow, Hoover Institution, and Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies, Stanford University, **2016**

(Larry, “Democracy in Decline: How Washington Can Reverse the Tide”, Foreign Affairs, Jul/Aug 2016, Volume 95, Issue 4, pages 151-159, accessed via ProQuest, GDI-JG)

Although democracy promotion may have fallen out of favor with the U.S. public, such efforts very much remain in the national interest. Democracies are less violent toward their citizens and more protective of human rights. They do not go to war with one another. They are more likely to develop market economies, and those economies are more likely to be stable and prosperous. Their citizens enjoy higher life expectancies and lower levels of infant and maternal mortality than people living under other forms of government. Democracies also make good allies. As Michael McFaul, the former U.S. ambassador to Russia, has written, "Not every democracy in the world was or is a close ally of the United States, but no democracy in the world has been or is an American enemy. And all of America's most enduring allies have been and remain democracies."∂ Authoritarian regimes, by contrast, are inherently unstable, since they face a central dilemma. If an autocracy is successful-if it produces a wealthy and educated population-that population will construct a civil society that will sooner or later demand political change. But if an autocracy is unsuccessful-if it fails to generate economic growth and raise living standards-it is liable to collapse.

## Impact – democracy key to economic development

#### Democracy spurs economic growth and social development—historical success of democracies proves

**Radelet,** holds the Donald F. McHenry Chair in Global Human Development, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, **2015**

(Steven, “THE RISE OF THE WORLD’S POOREST COUNTRIES”, Journal of Democracy, October 2015, Volume 26, Number 4, accessed via ProQuest, accessed 7/14/17, GDI-JG)

Since the end of the Cold War, the pattern has changed: Most of the developing countries that have been making steady economic and social progress have been democracies. While there are important exceptions such as China, Ethiopia, Rwanda, and Vietnam, increasingly they are exactly that-exceptions. Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Liberia, Moldova, Mongolia, the Philippines, Poland, Senegal, South Africa, South Korea, Tunisia, Turkey, and dozens of other developing countries are showing that democracy and development progress go hand in hand. The relationship between the two is one of both cause and effect. Democratic governments are more responsive to citizen needs and thus have the political motivation to create more opportunities for economic and social progress. At the same time, progress tends to create greater pressures for increased political participation, political accountability, and democracy.∂ Although the benign-dictator argument continues to have appeal (especially in light of China's success), it has several weaknesses. From a simple strategic point of view, signing up with a dictator is a risky proposition. Though you may desire a "benign" Lee Kuan Yew or Deng Xiaoping, you are far more likely to end up with a not-so-benign Robert Mugabe, Mobutu Sese Seko, Jean-Claude Duvalier, Anastasio Somoza, or Islam Karimov. While there are a few exceptions, most autocrats just get nastier over time, and economic performance deteriorates. And then you are stuck with political repression and economic disaster.∂ In addition, for most people around the world freedom and selfgovernment are critically important in and of themselves. Amartya Sen made this case persuasively in his 1999 classic Development as Freedom. I lived in Indonesia for four years in the early 1990s during the Suharto regime, and I regularly heard elites argue that Indonesians just wanted economic development and did not care much about democracy. But then the Asian financial crisis erupted, and citizens seized the opportunity to rise up, at great personal risk, and to throw Suharto out. Contrary to the old argument, it turned out that Indonesians wanted both democracy and development. Today, that is what they are getting, as they are well into more than a decade of vibrant (though imperfect) democracy alongside rapid (though imperfect) development.∂ Moreover, the argument that authoritarian governments have achieved better economic performance is increasingly hard to sustain, especially over the long run. The growth rate for the developing-country democracies since 1995 has averaged 3 percent per person, while for the nondemocracies, it has averaged 2.9 percent-essentially identical on average, but the nondemocracies have much greater variance. (As per capita growth rates, both of these are high by historical standards.) Sure, China, Rwanda, Vietnam, and several other countries have recorded rapid growth in recent years. But so have some democracies, including Botswana, Chile, the Dominican Republic, Georgia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Latvia, Mauritius, Mongolia, Panama, and many others. Perhaps their growth rates have not been quite as spectacular as China's, but by any global historical standard they have been extremely good. Meanwhile, many authoritarian governments have presided over disastrous economies with negative growth rates.∂ Recent research suggests that, overall, democracies outperform nondemocracies, especially in the long term. That has been the pattern in sub-Saharan Africa since the mid-1990s. John Gerring and his associates found that democracy-particularly if it endured and strengthened-added about 0.7 percentage points to annual growth rates over time. Similarly, Daron Acemoglu and his coauthors have concluded that countries that democratize tend to increase their GDP per capita by about 20 percent over twenty to thirty years.10

## 

## Impact – uniqueness democracy eroding/authoritarianism on the rise

#### Rises in populism and illiberalism currently hamper democracy—democracy empirically solves peace, market expansion, and civil society

**Diamond,** Senior Fellow, Hoover Institution, and Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies, Stanford University, **2016**

(Larry, “Democracy After Trump”, Foreign Affairs, November 14, 2016, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/world/2016-11-14/democracy-after-trump?cid=sso-link>, accessed 7/10/17, GDI-JG)

Perhaps the most ominous trend, however, has been the increasingly manifest problems of democracy within the advanced nations of Europe and the United States. A crucial factor in the success of the third wave of democratization was the unparalleled power of a seemingly successful U.S. democratic model—which U.S. President Ronald Reagan, channeling American colonial governor John Winthrop, called a “shining city on a hill”—to inspire admiration and emulation around the world. Of course, democracy in the United States has always had many scars and imperfections. But during the 1980s and 1990s, the world saw it as economically dynamic, politically functional, morally self-confident, and militarily supreme. The fall of the Berlin Wall and then of the Soviet Union left the United States as the lone superpower at a time when its democratic allies in the EU were attempting to unify the continent in a common market based on liberal values and institutions. In the post–Cold War era, democratic values became universal—in the sense that they appealed to large swaths of humanity in virtually every region of the world—while all ideological rivals were in retreat or, like Iran, geographically contained. With financial and political support from Europe and the United States during these two decades, freedom flourished, markets expanded, civil societies grew, representative institutions strengthened, and democracy became, for the first time in human history, the most common form of government in the world. There is no consensus on what we are witnessing, but what is beyond dispute is that populism and illiberalism have been surging in the West.∂ During this third wave, democracy gained durable footholds in Africa and Asia and became pervasive in Latin America, but its high quality and unquestioned stability in the West remained the foundation of its global success. Europe and the United States provided both an end state toward which emerging democracies could move, and support to help them get there. It was thus possible to imagine the turn of the millennium as the dawn of a new democratic century.∂ That vision has now begun to unravel. There is no consensus on what we are witnessing, but what is beyond dispute is that populism and illiberalism have been surging in the West. Recent events in Europe have been particularly worrisome—across the continent, populist parties have sought to mobilize “the people” against allegedly corrupt elites. In Hungary and Poland, right-wing populist governments have subverted the independence of the judiciary, civil service, and media. Antidemocratic parties have won significant vote shares in Hungary and the Czech Republic, while illiberal, anti-immigrant ones, such as France’s National Front and Germany’s Alternative für Deutschland, have achieved impressive electoral gains in a number of West European democracies.∂ In June, a further shock was delivered by Brexit—the stunning vote by the United Kingdom to leave the European Union. For the 52 percent of the British electorate that voted out, the referendum was the essence of democracy: a reassertion of national sovereignty and individual dignity against elites in London and Brussels, who had grown distant from common people and unresponsive to their concerns. But for more upwardly mobile and cosmopolitan British people, as well as for the bulk of Europeans looking at the vote from the continent, Brexit was a turn away from inclusion, integration, and a liberal democratic Europe. ∂ On November 8—last Tuesday—voters in the United States delivered an even more stunning upset by electing the populist Trump to the presidency, in a shocking turn of events that Trump himself had correctly predicted would be “Brexit, plus, plus, plus.” In fact, the core constituencies that delivered the Brexit vote and the Trump presidency were stunningly similar: working class white voters with limited skills and education, who feel culturally displaced and economically threatened by immigration, globalization, and racial and cultural diversity. Both votes pitted culturally diverse cities against predominantly white rural areas, small towns, and decaying post-industrial rust belts. Both campaigns left their countries more polarized than before. And both have deepened worries about the future of the liberal democratic order.

#### US Democracy not as stable as it seems—backslide to authoritarianism under Trump possible

Mickey et al, Associate Professor, Political Science, University of Michigan, 2017 [Robert, “Is America Still Safe for Democracy?” Accessed 7/14/17, Published February 2017, Journal of Foreign Affairs Vol 96 No. 3 GDI-MJR]

The election of Donald Trump as president of the United States—a man who has praised dictators, encouraged violence among supporters, threatened to jail his rival, and labeled the mainstream media as “the enemy”— has raised fears that the United States may be heading toward authoritarianism. While predictions of a descent into fascism are overblown, the Trump presidency could push the United States into a mild form of what we call “competitive authoritarianism”—a system in which meaningful democratic institutions exist yet the government abuses state power to disadvantage its opponents.∂ If democratic backsliding were to occur in the United States, it would not take the form of a coup d’état; there would be no declaration of martial law or imposition of single-party rule. Rather, the experience of most contemporary autocracies suggests that it would take place through a series of little-noticed, incremental steps, most of which are legal and many of which appear innocuous. Taken together, however, they would tilt the playing field in favor of the ruling party.∂ It may be tempting to assume that the United States’ centuries-old democracy is impervious to democratic erosion, but such confidence is misplaced. In fact, liberal democracy—with full adult suffrage and broad protection of civil and political liberties—is a relatively recent development in the United States. By contemporary standards, the country became fully democratic only in the 1970s.∂ But American authoritarianism has not been just a southern phenomenon. From the time the fbi, the cia, and the National Security Agency were created, presidents used them to monitor White House staff , journalists, political opponents, and activists. Between 1956 and 1971, the fbi launched more than 2,000 operations to discredit and disrupt black protest organizations, antiwar groups, and other perceived threats. It even provided Dwight Eisenhower with derogatory information about Adlai Stevenson, his Democratic rival in the 1952 election. Likewise, the Nixon administration deployed the U.S. Attorney General’s Office and other agencies against its “enemies” in the Democratic Party and the media. And congressional investigations into alleged subversion further threatened civil rights and liberties. Like southern authoritarianism, the abuse of federal intelligence and law enforcement agencies largely ended in the 1970s, in this case after the post- Watergate reforms.∂ American democracy remains far from ideal. Ex-felons, who are disproportionately black, are often prohibited from voting; many states are experimenting with an array of new voting restrictions; and the concentration of campaign donations among the wealthy raises serious concerns about how representative U.S. democracy truly is. Still, the United States has been a bona fide multiracial democracy for almost half a century.∂ Yet just as the United States fulfilled its democratic promise, the foundations of the system began to weaken. Ironically, the very process of democratization in the South generated the intense polarization that now threatens American democracy.

# Case Answer to Answer Blocks

## AT: no solvency – ESSA plans

#### Hiccups in initial submissions fixed – won’t stop approval of the ESSA plans

**Reyna, S*enior Associate at Education Strategy Group,* 2017**

(Ryan, “Goldilocks and the "ambitious" ESSA goals” Edexcellence July 5 2017

<https://edexcellence.net/articles/goldilocks-and-the-ambitious-essa-goals?utm_source=Fordham+Updates&utm_campaign=0726a3ca57-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2017_07_04&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_d9e8246adf-0726a3ca57-71494877&mc_cid=0726a3ca57&mc_eid=50947fba94> accessed GDI –TM)

Fortunately, the Department and states—equally—have time to address this issue. The Secretary and her team are under tremendous pressure to deliver feedback to states on a quick timeline, and some initial stumbles are to be expected as they navigate this new process. Based on the recently released second batch of feedback letters, it appears the Department has learned its lesson and is working to correct this issue. Gone are questions of ambition; in its place are questions for additional detail. This is the right strategy. The Department should defer to state goals, so long as a state can defend them using data.

And states have work to do as well. When resubmitting plans, or submitting new plans in Round Two, every state should provide more detail and data to explain their rational in choosing ambitious goals. Not only will this help in the review process, but it will also provide valuable information to the state’s stakeholders.

Like Goldilocks, this story can end happily ever after.

## AT: Plan Results in decrease

#### **gradual implementation solves best – eliminates loss of state funding through hold harmless provision**

Boser & Brown, 15, Vice President of Education Policy at American Progress [Ulrich & Catherine; 7-7-2015, American Progress "5 Key Principles to Guide Consideration of any ESEA Title I Formula Change," Center for American Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/07/07/116696/5-key-principles-to-guide-consideration-of-any-esea-title-i-formula-change/> ; RJC]

5. Ensure that states and districts do not lose funds in the transition from the old to the new formula

While the formula is unfair and has for generations shortchanged some states, districts, and schools, an abrupt funding cut could be devastating to any community that has come to rely on its Title I allocation.

Therefore, as part of any fix to the Title I funding formula, there must be a gradual transition plan that ensures that no state loses money. Specifically, there should be a hold-harmless provision, which would keep states at their current funding allocation level and dedicate new funding to states that have been shortchanged in prior years and are now on track to receive a fair allocation. Under this proposal, no state would suddenly lose resources, and more equitable funding levels will be reached gradually.

Districts should also be held harmless from the negative impact of a funding fix. There is a hold-harmless provision in current law, and it is something that clearly needs to be included in any sort of formula reform. Without such provisions, low-income children whose schools have long-received Title I money would lose funding, and districts that have long depended on federal funds would suddenly be short-changed, which would force them to lay off teachers and make other dramatic cuts. Any approach that causes schools to lose substantial funds abruptly is bad policy, and Congress should ensure that the switch from the old formulas to the new formula is smooth, predictable, and does no harm.

The Title I funding formula has been in the place for 15 years. There is a great need to rework the formula to make it clearer, to eliminate the bias against rural areas and wealthier states, and to clearly incentivize states and districts to invest in education overall and to invest more in providing educational opportunities for students from low-income backgrounds. A better funding formula is the foundation for ensuring that every student, particularly those growing up in poverty, has an equal shot at the American dream.

## AT: comparability only solves in district differences

#### Closing the “Comparability Loophole” Will Only Help Students in High Poverty Schools

Klein, Education weekly reporter, 17 (Alyson Klein “As Congress Rewrites NCLB, Arne Duncan Highlights 'Title I Comparability Loophole'” Education Week - Politics K-12 7-14-2017 http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/campaign-k-12/2015/03/can\_an\_nclb\_rewrite\_close\_the\_.html 7-13-2017 GDI-JIJD)

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, of which the NCLB law is the most current edition, requires that states and districts ensure they are providing "comparable" (essentially the same) level of services to both Title I schools (which serve disadvantaged students) and wealthier schools using their own state and local money, before they can tap federal Title I funding (which is supposed to be extra money aimed at the poorest students.)¶ The "loophole" part? When it comes to the biggest expenditure (teachers' salaries), states and districts have some wiggle room. As long as all the schools in a district are on the same salary schedule—which usually means that teachers with the same level of experience and education get the same wages—and as long as the high-poverty schools have the same proprotion of teachers as the low-poverty schools, then the staffs are considered "comparable." That's true even if a high poverty Title I school has a high number of lower-paid, novice teachers, and a wealthier school that doesn't qualify for Title I has a high percentage of experienced educators who make significantly more money. And there are other problems with ESEA's comparability provision, civil rights advocates say. ¶ About 4.5 million students attend inequitably funded Title I schools, according to a report on the loophole produced by the Center for American Progress, a left-leaning think tank, earlier this week. And those schools get about $1,200 less per student, on average, than wealthier schools in their districts, CAP found. ¶ So what's the most recent pitch? Duncan and Morial will highlight U.S. Department of Education data from the 2011-12 school year that shows which states are shortchanging poor and minority kids the most. (More on what this state level data has to do with the comparability loophole below.)¶ So which states have the biggest disparities? They include Alabama, Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming.¶ The biggest offender on that list is Pennsylvania, where high-poverty districts spend 33 percent less than lower-poverty districts. High-poverty districts in Vermont spend 18 percent less than lower poverty districts, and high-poverty districts in Illinois, Missouri, and Virginia spend 17 percent less than the lower-poverty districts. ¶ What's more, districts serving high proportions of minority kids spend markedly less than other districts in Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, West Virginia, and Wyoming.¶ Nevada has the most persistent problem in that grouping. High-minority districts there spend 30 percent less per student than districts serving a lower percentage of minorities. And in Nebraska, high-minority districts spend 17 percent less per student than lower-minority districts. In Arizona, higher-minority districts spend 15 percent less than lower-minority districts. ¶ That's not to say the problem is persistent everywhere. In fact, high-poverty districts in Indiana, Minnesota, New Jersey, and South Dakota spend more than the lower-poverty districts. ¶ True edu-budget-geeks may be confused here. After all, the comparability loophole only effects intradistrict funding (meaning how much one school in a district spends compared to another). And these state level numbers compare different districts in the same state. So why use these particular numbers if you're trying to make the argument that closing the comparability loophole is good policy?¶ The department, however, contends that leaving the loophole open compounds the problem of fiscal inequality, so closing it will only help the poor and minority kids who are losing out, even if it won't totally solve the problem they're illustrating with the data. (State level inequities are mostly the result of state funding formulas, and there's not much the feds can really do about those.)

## AT: SES only causes achievement gap/too many factors can’t solve

#### Socioeconomic conditions mutually reinforcing of the achievement gap – but education resources can ameliorate the impact of SES

Reardon, Stanford University Graduate School of Education professor, et al, 17 (Sean F., Demetra, Stanford Center for Education Policy Analysis research associate, Ken, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia with expertise in Educational Theory, Educational Policy, Econometrics, "The Geography of Racial/Ethnic Test Score Gaps", January 2017, http://cepa.stanford.edu/wp16-10, 7-8-17, GDI-EC)

One of the central sets of questions in the sociology of education for the last 50 years—since the publication of the Coleman Report (Coleman, et al., 1966)—concerns the primary causes of racial and ethnic achievement gaps and disparities in educational outcomes more generally. To what extent are these disparities the result of racial/ethnic differences in socioeconomic family background and circumstances, and to what extent are they the result of racial/ethnic differences in school quality? Put differently, to what extent should racial/ethnic disparities in educational outcomes be attributed to institutional features of the US educational system—features that may be malleable through changes in organizational, institutional, and policy features of schooling—and to what extent should they be attributed to factors outside the school system’s control, such as racial/ethnic disparities in socioeconomic family and neighborhood conditions?

Framed this way—as if inequalities inside the school system are distinct from inequalities outside of schools—the question implies a false dichotomy. Differences in socioeconomic conditions are not fully separable from disparities in educational conditions. Socioeconomic inequality may lead to inequality between and within schools, as communities with greater resources are able to better fund their local schools (in taxes and other ways). Parents in such communities may also use their greater social capital to secure better educational opportunities (better teachers, smaller classrooms, for example) for their children than less advantaged children within the same schools. Moreover, school systems react to social inequalities in ways that may reduce or exacerbate these inequalities. In most states, for example, when federal, state and local revenues are added up, per pupil expenditures are greater, on average, in districts enrolling large proportions of low-income students than in districts enrolling few poor students. This may attenuate differences in out-of-school opportunities (Aud et al. 2010; National Center for Education Statistics 2012). Conversely, school systems may also reinforce social inequalities by segregating children from low-income families into less demanding academic programs and/or into high poverty schools or by providing fewer resources to the classrooms and schools that enroll low-income students.

## AT: Alt causes - teacher quality

#### High turnover and underqualified teachers prevalent at disadvantaged schools- studies prove

Le Floch, American Institutes for Research managing researcher, et al, 16 (Kerstin, Alicia, American Institutes for Research principal policy analyst, Catherine, American Institutes for Research principal technical assistance consultant, "Want to Improve Low-Performing Schools? Focus on the Adults", American Institutes for Research, March 2016, https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED571848, 7-10-17, GDI-EC)

There lies a central problem. Although we know that highly capable teachers and leaders are critical for school improvement, evidence that schools serving disadvantaged students employ the least-qualified teachers is ample (Clotfelter, Ladd, Vigdor, & Wheeler, 2007; Isenberg et al., 2013). Compounding this issue, rates of teacher and principal turnover in schools serving high proportions of high-poverty students and minority students are high. Federal data demonstrate that more than 20 percent of principals leave their schools each year—and even more leave schools with high-poverty students. A study of Texas administrative data concluded that principal-retention rates are related to both student achievement and student poverty levels, with higher turnover among low-achieving, disadvantaged schools (Fuller & Young, 2009). Many schools serving America’s neediest children lose more than half of their teaching staff every five years (Allensworth, Ponisciak, & Mazzeo, 2009; Hemphill & Nauer, 2009).

## AT: Alt cause - segregation

#### Funding problems increase incentives for housing segregation – creating inequality cycle

**Boser,** Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress, **and Baffour,** research associate, K-12 Education Policy, Center for American Progress, **2017**

(Ulrich and Perpetual, “Isolated and Segregated”, Center for American Progress, May 31, 2017, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2017/05/31/433014/isolated-and-segregated/>, accessed 7/5/17, GDI-JG)

School funding also contributes to economic segregation. Public schools receive federal, state, and local funds to operate their schools, but the local source of revenue often takes up the greatest share of that mix. About 40 to 60 percent of every school’s budget is dependent upon local funding, and these funds are raised through the neighborhood’s property tax base. Low-income families, who tend to reside in areas with low property values, raise fewer funds for their local schools. On the other hand, higher-income families, who tend to live in high-priced properties, can boast higher-quality schools since they have a richer tax base.65∂ Since public school finance systems make local areas heavily dependent on local funding, school districts are incentivized to create boundaries that exclude lower-income neighborhoods. As EdBuild puts it: “The way we fund schools in the United States creates incentives for communities to segregate along socioeconomic lines in order to preserve local wealth. In so doing, communities create arbitrary borders that serve to lock students into, or out of, opportunity.”66∂ Schools in low-wealth neighborhoods raise smaller amounts of local revenue due to the weaker tax base. These school districts are less able to build beautiful school facilities, attract high-quality staff, and design compelling school programming. It is a situation that fuels a cycle in which parents who can afford high-priced properties flood to those wealthier areas, and the neighborhood schools receive greater funding for programs, supports, and services.

# Topicality .5

### Formula reforms

#### We meet – Title I grant formula reforms alter regulations of Title I

#### Counter interp – regulations follow from statutes -- regulations are agency guidelines --- that precludes congress and the courts

Duhaime’s Law Dictionary, No date

(http://www.duhaime.org/LegalDictionary/R/Regulation.aspx)

A regulation is essentially a law but which draws its life not from the decision of a legislative assembly directly but indirectly. A regulation is often passed by the executive branch of government. For example, the federal cabinet meeting in session endorses a regulation. But a regulation has a unique feature: it must draw its authority from a statute. Every regulation must have some statute which enables it. In California Advocates, Justice Kline of the California Court of Appeal, building off a statutory definition, used these words to define regulation: "... every rule, regulation, order, or standard of general application or the amendment, supplement, or revision of any rule, regulation, order, or standard adopted by any state agency to implement, interpret, or make specific the law enforced or administered by it, or to govern its procedure.... "A regulation ... has two principal identifying characteristics. First, the agency must intend its rule to apply generally, rather than in a specific case. The rule need not, however, apply universally; a rule applies generally so long as it declares how a certain class of cases will be decided. Second, the rule must implement, interpret, or make specific the law enforced or administered by the agency, or govern the agency's procedure."

#### We provide better education – current state of federal funding is all about how the funding is regulated not about funding levels. Their interp would preclude title I discussions

Hess, Director of education policy studies, 15(Fredrick, a resident scholar and the director of Education Policy Studies at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), where he works on K–12 and higher education issues [http://www.aei.org/publication/the-rewrite-of-no-child-left-behind-is-a-compromise-but-a-principled-one//](http://www.aei.org/publication/the-rewrite-of-no-child-left-behind-is-a-compromise-but-a-principled-one/) . “The rewrite of No Child Left Behind is a compromise, but a principled one” 11-24-2015//7-4-2017/GDI/CH)

There are no spending cuts in ESSA. The new law leaves projected spending untouched, though it’s worth noting that GOP victories on domestic spending have dramatically flattened outlays on K–12 over the past decade. In any event, the bill only provides an “authorization” to spend in the future: What’s really at stake right now are the mandates and regulations that the bill does (or doesn’t) impose. The “authorized” spending amount is mostly meaningless. The time when spending fights really matter is when Congress is dealing with appropriations.

### Closing comparability loophole = regulation

#### Closing loopholes/strengthening enforcement of Title I is an increase in federal regulation- both expands the scope of federal regulations and their economic effect

Camera, education reporter at US News and World Report, Sept 1, 16 Lauren, covered education policy and politics for nearly a decade and has written for Education Week, The Hechinger Report, Congressional Quarterly, Roll Call, and the Chronicle of Higher Education, 2013 Spencer Education Fellow at Columbia University’s School of Journalism, “Halting the Quest for Equality,” <https://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016-09-01/an-ongoing-quest-to-equalize-education-funding>

Equally distributing education funding seems like an idea that wouldn't generate a lot of heated debate. But a new regulation released this week by the Department of Education aimed at doing just that was met with calls of government overreach and charges that it would "wreak havoc" on school systems. An attempt by the U.S. Department of Education to prod states and districts to distribute education funding more equitably received significant pushback Wednesday, as a broad coalition of education groups called foul on the secretary of education for overstepping his authority. "What the secretary is proposing is unprecedented and unlawful," said John Kline, R-Minn., chairman of the House education committee, in a statement. "We will not allow this administration to undermine these reforms with its own extreme, partisan agenda." At issue is a complicated spending policy known as "supplement not supplant," which ensures states and districts that receive federal money for their poor students through a program known as Title I don't use that money to displace the funding they would already be funneling to schools in need. It's a longstanding policy that's been part of the federal education law since 1969, when a landmark report revealed that some school districts were burning the money on things like swimming pools. Congress recently passed a new version of the law, called the Every Student Succeeds Act, and as part of implementing it, the Education Department is in the process of publishing regulations that define or provide more clarity on various part of the law for states. One of those regulations, the final version of which was proposed Wednesday, would require school districts to demonstrate that Title I dollars are truly supplemental by complying with one of four methodologies. The department argues the regulation would better equalize the amount of money going to schools with students of different socioeconomic backgrounds and prevent states and districts from shortchanging certain schools on their end. While the goal is to equalize funding, many fear that complying with the regulation would force districts to reallocate resources from some schools to others, resulting, among other things, in the forced transfer or even firing of some school staff. "For too long, the students who need the most have gotten the least," said Secretary of Education John King on a press call. "The inequities in state and local funding that we see between schools within districts are inconsistent not only with the words 'supplement-not-supplant' but with the civil rights history of that provision and with the changes Congress made to the law last year." Currently, schools receiving Title I funds educate more than two-thirds of low-income students and students of color, but about 5,750 Title I schools receive substantially less state and local funding than their non-Title I peers within the same school district. The proposed regulation, King added, could mean up to $2 billion in additional state and local funding for high-poverty schools if funding is increased rather than shifted from one place to another. But Kline and others argue the regulation would go beyond the scope of the law and that the Education Department is overreaching. "America's poorest neighborhoods will be hit the hardest as communities are forced to relocate teachers, raise taxes or both," Kline said, who framed the regulation as a "multi-billion dollar regulatory tax" that would "wreak havoc" on schools and students. The GOP lawmakers were backed by a broad coalition of education organizations Wednesday, including, notably, both national teachers unions. "These regulations attempt to circumvent congressional intent and create ripples that extend far beyond the regulations to which they pertain," said Lily Eskelsen Garcia, president of the 3-million-member National Education Association. Trying to prove the Title I funding is supplemental using one of the four options, she underscored, would have a devastating impact on schools. "Schools would be reduced to dollar signs, and people would be spending inordinate amount of time playing games with numbers just to make them come out right," she said. For example, she explained: "You have two school districts and one of them has a school nurse and the other one doesn't. Do you fire the school nurse so it makes your dollar signs equal out? So instead of helping kids, you hurt them? Instead of getting a school nurse for the school without one, you get rid of one at another school?" American Federation of Teachers president Randi Weingarten agreed, and emphasized that the only fair way to fix education funding discrepancies without penalizing some schools by taking money away is for states and districts to increase funding at under-resourced schools so that their funding levels match or exceed that of well-resourced schools. "As much as we agree with the intent, the proposed regulations, as drafted, are an unfunded mandate from Washington that exhorts districts to boost their investment in schools with disadvantaged children without identifying or compelling the resources to do so," Weingarten said in a statement. Groups representing governors, state education chiefs and school superintendents also took issue with the proposal final regulation. The National Governors Association called the regulation "an unfunded, prescriptive mandate well beyond the scope of ESSA."

#### Requirements for comparability are DOE regulations

Thomas Frank, CNN, January 17, 2017

“Obama Looks to Lock in $1 Billion to Schools with Low-Income Kids,” <http://www.cnn.com/2017/01/17/politics/obama-billion-schools-regulation/index.html>

Washington (CNN) The Obama administration is considering a major last-minute policy shift that could force hundreds of school districts to cut spending at well-financed elementary and secondary schools and move nearly $1 billion dollars to schools with large numbers of low-income students. The policy, written by the Department of Education, is under review by the White House budget office and has drawn fierce opposition from Republican lawmakers and school administrators. It was first proposed in September, but the department appears to have rushed to adopt it since Donald Trump won the presidential election. Adopting the regulation before Friday at noon would bind the incoming Trump administration unless Congress overturns it. Republicans on Capitol Hill have pledged to oppose many "midnight regulations" from the Obama White House, and the issue could also come up at the nomination hearing Tuesday for Donald Trump's secretary of education, Betsy DeVos. The regulation would dramatically increase federal control over spending at many of the nation's 14,000 school districts and force some districts to increase spending at low-income schools. Districts could achieve the increase by diverting money -- a total of $800 million nationwide -- from more-affluent schools, or by spending an additional $2.2 billion in state and local funds, the Education Department says. The regulation would apply only to school districts that have both low-income schools that get Title I federal funds and higher-income schools that are not eligible for the money. "If this were to be finalized, it would be a huge deal because it's saying how local and state money inside school districts is to be distributed across schools," said Nora Gordon, a school-finance expert at Georgetown University. Scott Sargrad, a former Education Department official, said the regulation "could significantly improve achievement for students" in low-income schools. "This is the federal government explicitly saying poor students need to have at least the same resources as their higher-income counterparts. That's a significant step for the federal government to say that," said Sargrad, who is now an education policy expert at Center for American Progress, a liberal Washington think tank.

# DA Answers

## Uniqueness – General

### U – Title I increasing funding

#### Continuing resolution increase Title I funding – but formula problems persist

**Ujifusa, 2017**

(Andrew Budget Deal for 2017 Includes Increases for Title I, Special Education, Edweek May 1, 2017 <http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/campaign-k-12/2017/05/budget_deal_2017_title_I_special_education_spending.html> accessed GDI – TM)

Federal lawmakers have agreed to relatively small spending increases for Title I programs to districts and for special education, as part of a budget deal covering the rest of fiscal 2017 through the end of September. Title I spending on disadvantaged students would rise by $100 million up to $15.5 billion from fiscal 2016 to fiscal 2017, along with $450 million in new money that was already slated to be shifted over from the now-defunct School Improvement Grants program. And state grants for special education would increase by $90 million up to $12 billion. However, Title II grants for teacher development would be cut by $294 million, down to about $2.1 billion for the rest of fiscal 2017. The bill would also provide $400 million for the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grant program, also known as Title IV of the Every Student Succeeds Act. Title IV is a block grant that districts can use for a wide range of programs, including health, safety, arts education, college readiness, and more. Total U.S. Department of Education spending, including both discretionary and mandatory spending covering K-12 and other issues, would fall by $60 million from fiscal 2016, down to $71.6 billion. Congress is expected to vote on this budget deal early this week, the Washington Post reported. The federal government has been operating on a resolution that kept fiscal 2017 funding at fiscal 2016 levels. This resolution was slated to expire on April 28, leading to the possibility of a government shutdown, but Congress passed a one-week extension late last week to provide time for a budget deal.

### U – increase fed oversight now

#### ESSA increase fed oversight

Hess, Director of education policy studies, 15(Fredrick, a resident scholar and the director of Education Policy Studies at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), where he works on K–12 and higher education issues [http://www.aei.org/publication/the-rewrite-of-no-child-left-behind-is-a-compromise-but-a-principled-one//](http://www.aei.org/publication/the-rewrite-of-no-child-left-behind-is-a-compromise-but-a-principled-one/) . “The rewrite of No Child Left Behind is a compromise, but a principled one” 11-24-2015//7-4-2017/GDI/CH)

ESSA allows for too much federal oversight. The new law would explicitly strip Washington of the right to micro-manage state accountability systems and school-improvement strategies, but it does leave too many vague federal guidelines and recommendations on this score. While an unfortunate concession to the White House and the civil-rights lobby, the requirements are so deferential to states and the provisions restricting the federal Department of Education are so stark that the result is acceptable, even though I’d have vastly preferred to see Congress simply excise these provisions.

### U-Devos increasing fed influence

#### ESSA rules enforcement increases Devos interventions with states

Green, The New York Times Education Reporter, 7/17 (Erica, “DeVos’s Hard Line on New Education Law Surprises States” New York Times, 7-7-17, www.nytimes.com/2017/07/07/us/politics/devos-federal-education-law-states.html 7-8-17, GDI-JIJD)

Education Secretary Betsy DeVos, who made a career of promoting local control of education, has signaled a surprisingly hard-line approach to carrying out an expansive new federal education law, issuing critical feedback that has rattled state school chiefs and conservative education experts alike. ¶ President Barack Obama signed the Every Student Succeeds Act in 2015 as the less intrusive successor to the No Child Left Behind law, which was maligned by many in both political parties as punitive and prescriptive. But in the Education Department’s feedback to states about their plans to put the new law into effect, it applied strict interpretations of statutes, required extensive detail and even deemed some state education goals lackluster. ¶ In one case, the acting assistant secretary for elementary and secondary education, Jason Botel, wrote to the State of Delaware that its long-term goals for student achievement were not “ambitious.” ¶ “It is mind-boggling that the department could decide that it’s going to challenge them on what’s ambitious,” said Michael J. Petrilli, the president of the conservative-leaning Thomas B. Fordham Institute, who worked in the Education Department under President George W. Bush. He called the letter “directly in opposition to the rhetoric and the promises of DeVos.” ¶ After more than a decade of strict federal education standards and standardized testing regimes, the Every Student Succeeds Act was to return latitude to the states to come up with plans to improve student achievement and hold schools accountable for student performance. ¶ It sought to relieve states from the federal pressures of its predecessor, which required that 100 percent of the students of every school reach proficiency on state tests or the school would face harsh penalties and aggressive interventions. Unlike No Child Left Behind, the new law does not set numerical achievement targets, nor does it mandate how a state should intervene if a school fails to reach them. The law does require that states set such benchmarks on their own. ¶ Proponents, especially congressional Republicans and conservative education advocates, believed that a new era of local control would flourish under Ms. DeVos, who pointed to the new law as illustrative of the state-level empowerment she champions. ¶ But her department’s feedback reflects a tension between ideology and legal responsibility: While she has said she would like to see her office’s role in running the nation’s public schools diminished, she has also said she will uphold the law. ¶ “All of the signals she has been sending is that she’s going to approve any plan that follows the law,” Mr. Petrilli said. “And when in doubt, she’s going to give the states the benefit of the doubt.” ¶ Mr. Botel defended the department’s feedback, saying it was measuring state plans against federal statutes — including a requirement that plans be ambitious. ¶ “Because the statute does not define the word ‘ambitious,’ the secretary has the responsibility of determining whether a state’s long-term goals are ambitious,” Mr. Botel said. ¶ In the department’s letter to Delaware — which incited the most outrage from conservative observers — Mr. Botel took aim at the state’s plan to halve the number of students not meeting proficiency rates in the next decade. Such a goal would have resulted in only one-half to two thirds of some groups of students achieving proficiency, he noted. ¶ The department deemed those long-term goals, as well as those for English-language learners, not ambitious, and directed the state to revise its plans to make them more so. ¶ So far, 16 states and the District of Columbia have submitted plans, and more states will present plans in the fall. Delaware, New Mexico and Nevada were the first three to be reviewed by Education Department staff and a panel of peer reviewers. ¶ State education officials in Delaware said they had spent a year engaging the community on their plan and would resubmit it with clarifications. ¶ But Atnre Alleyne, the executive director of DelawareCAN, an advocacy group that helped draft the plan, agreed with the department’s findings. ¶ He said that his group had challenged the state about accountability measures, such as setting firm goals and consequences for failing to meet them, and found that “there was a lot of fear about being bold or aggressive” after No Child Left Behind. ¶ “Ultimately this has to be about every student succeeding, so to say that one-third are going to be proficient in 10 years, the department is right to call that into question,” Mr. Alleyne said. “A lot of people thought it was just going to be a breeze. I was glad to see it was a push.” ¶ Since Ms. DeVos was confirmed, civil rights and education advocates have expressed concern that state plans would get assembly-line approval and states would be allowed to skirt responsibility for low-performing and historically underserved students. ¶ For all of its flaws, the No Child Left Behind Act was praised for holding schools accountable for performance data. Under the law, a school was considered failing if all of its student groups, including all racial and ethnic groups, English-language learners and students with disabilities, did not meet annual achievement targets. By the end of the law, more than half of the nation’s schools were considered failures. ¶ But even after the first round of feedback, the advocates would like the department to be more aggressive and reject any state plan that lacks specifics on how they will account for the performance of historically underperforming and underserved student populations. ¶ “Pushback and feedback in and of themselves are of no interest and of no value,” said Liz King, the director of education policy at the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights.

### U – Overall Education cuts now

#### UQ – Education cuts coming now from Trump’s budget, shift to school vouchers now

Johnson et. al 17

[By Stephenie Johnson, Neil Campbell, Kami Spicklemire, and Lisette Partelow Posted on March 17, 2017 “The Trump-DeVos Budget Would Dismantle Public Education, Hurting Vulnerable Kids, Working Families, and Teachers; “ need source title here <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/news/2017/03/17/428598/trump-devos-budget-dismantle-public-education-hurting-vulnerable-kids-working-families-teachers/>, Accessed 7-3-17 DWRS]

Yesterday, President Donald Trump released his devastating budget for the 2018 fiscal year. It would dismantle public schools through massive cuts to teacher training, after-school programs in public schools, and transfers of public funds to private school vouchers. Every budget is a statement of values and this one could not be more clear in the vision it presents: starve the public school system and privatize education.

The Trump budget would slash $9 billion—13 percent of the U.S. Department of Education’s funding—while investing $1.4 billion of new money in school choice, including private school vouchers, sending a clear signal that the Trump administration prioritizes ideologically driven voucher schemes over great public schools.

For such a draconian proposal, the budget is remarkably short on details. Although it cuts $9 billion in education, only about $7 billion of cuts are specifically mentioned, raising the question of what other cuts the Trump administration is planning to make. Is the federal investment in career and technical education at risk, for example? It mentions a $1 billion increase in Title I but provides virtually no details about this proposal and implies that the funding would not run through the Title I formula, which provides more resources to high-poverty districts.

Dismantling our nation’s public education system while investing in unproven schemes to incentivize private school vouchers that have no evidence of improving student achievement could have devastating consequences for students that could take decades to fix.

#### NO Trump civil rights enforcement in education – increase school choice under banner of school choice

Mann, 17, Brown Center on Education Policy [Elizabeth; "3 observations on Trump’s education budget," 6-7-2017, Brookings, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2017/06/07/3-observations-on-trumps-education-budget/> ; RJC]

The Trump budget proposes level funding for the Office of Civil Rights (OCR), which may have surprised Democrats who worry that OCR will play a diminished role in this administration. The joint repeal with the Department of Justice of the Obama administration’s guidance on bathroom access for transgender students, for example, signaled a retreat from the previous administration’s approach in this arena. Since her confirmation hearing, DeVos has not offered much clarity on how she views the Department of Education’s role in enforcing civil rights laws. Recently, in both the House and Senate hearings on the budget, Democrats have pressed her to affirm her commitment to protecting students’ civil rights, particularly in the context of school choice programs.

This level funding proposal might reflect an awareness that decreasing the OCR budget would only provide additional fodder for Democrats to criticize DeVos’s commitment to enforcing federal civil rights laws. Nonetheless, the department has sent mixed signals about its intentions regarding the direction of civil rights enforcement, and it remains difficult to say what DeVos’s philosophy is regarding what exactly this responsibility entails.

Budget proposal faces criticism from both Democrats and Republicans

While the scale of the proposed cuts is dramatic and perhaps surprising–a 13.5 percent reduction in funding overall–the budget reflects many of the priorities DeVos has articulated from early on in her tenure. In particular, a consistent theme is her emphasis on state flexibility. During her confirmation and in recent House and Senate committee hearings on the budget, DeVos frequently described a desire to grant states increased flexibility as the motivation for her department’s policy positions and budget proposals.

Democrats and Republicans alike embraced this concept in the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act, but judging by their questions during the recent budget hearings, Democrats are weary of DeVos justifying her agenda under the banner of flexibility. And although Republicans consistently champion state flexibility in the administration of public education and federal cost saving generally, the proposed cuts seem to be a bridge too far. Indeed, during the Senate subcommittee hearing on Tuesday, chairman Roy Blunt (R-Mo.) told DeVos: “This is a difficult budget request to defend.

### U- increased state school choice now

#### States increasingly employing school choice programs.

**Rios, Report at Mother Jones, 17** (Edwin. “The Battle Over School Choice Is Happening in Statehouses Across America”. Mother Jones. 3-8-17. <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2017/03/school-voucher-bills-across-country/>. Accessed 7-8-17, GDI-PM)

In last week’s speech before a joint session of Congress, President Donald Trump once again brought up the issue of school choice, signaling to lawmakers an interest in pursuing federal legislation that would divert taxpayer dollars to private school tuition. But the real action is already taking place in statehouses across the country.

Since 2010, when a Republican wave washed over the House, Senate, and governor’s mansions across the country, states have been steadily introducing voucher programs and voucher-like initiatives such as tax credits or education savings accounts. And 2017 is no different: 31 states have introduced bills to create or expand some private school choice program, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures.

So far, 22 states have bills dedicated toward tax credit scholarship programs, which, as my colleague Kristina Rizga pointed out last week, are increasingly popular among choice advocates like Education Secretary Betsy DeVos because they allow parents to receive tax credits for sending their kids to religious schools without governments technically transferring taxpayer money to religious organizations. Meanwhile, 20 states have legislation proposing education savings accounts, which allow families to use state money set aside in authorized accounts for education expenses, like private school tuition, homeschooling, or therapy.

Decades of research on voucher programs shows that they have little to no effect on academic achievement. In the past two years, research on newer programs in Louisiana and Ohio have mainly shown poorer academic outcomes. Last July, researchers at the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, a conservative think tank, concluded in a study about Ohio’s program that students who attended private schools on vouchers fared worse academically than those who attended public schools. “Let us acknowledge that we did not expect—or, frankly, wish—to see these negative effects for voucher participants,” researchers wrote.

Josh Cunningham, a senior education policy specialist at the National Conference of State Legislatures, cautioned that the Trump administration isn’t necessarily driving more legislation at the state level. “But if we see action out of the administration or out of Congress addressing school choice,” Cunningham says, “I’d imagine states would have to respond to that.”

## Federalism

#### DOE refusal of state plans smacks of fed overreach

Petrilli, Thomas B. Fordham Institute president, 17 (Michael J., "Betsy DeVos's team stumbles on ESSA", Thomas B. Fordman Institute, 6-15-17, https://edexcellence.net/articles/betsy-devoss-team-stumbles-on-essa, 7-7-17, GDI-EC)

Do the feds even have the authority to second-guess states on their goals? All ESSA says is that states shall establish ambitious State-designed long-term goals. That sort of vague statement is precisely the kind of language that usually gets embellished by regulations, which in this case might add clarity as to what it would take for states to meet the ambitious goals standard. (For example, states might be asked to explain how they came up with their goals. Were they informed by an analysis of the data?) But with the encouragement and signature of the President, Congress famously repealed the Obama Administration’s ESSA regs, and the Department hasn’t had the time or inclination to replace them. Federal agencies aren’t allowed to use policy letters like this one to shortcut the lengthy but necessary notice-and-comment process required for formal rulemaking.

Perhaps Secretary DeVos’s lawyers would argue otherwise—that she and her team have the authority to decide whether a state’s goals are ambitious enough. But this sure smacks of the executive overreach, and trampling of state decision-making, that many of us complained about when Arne Duncan was practicing it.

# CP Answers

## States CP Answers

### Solvency Deficit—Federal Action Key—Accountability

#### Federal action key to solve funding disparities—need for accountability proves

**Sargrad,** Managing Director, K-12 Education Policy, Center for American Progress, **2016**

(Scott, “The Feds Can Fix School Funding”, U.S. News, May 6, 2016, <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2016-05-06/the-federal-government-should-do-more-to-close-school-funding-gaps>, accesesd 7/6/17, GDI-JG)

On the second question, of the federal government's role in addressing school funding disparities, there are strong opinions on both sides. While some argue that the Department of Education should leave it to states and districts to address, others have urged the department to take on this issue and make sure that states and districts provide equitable funding to their low-income schools.∂ The federal government has always played the role of a backstop to protect the most disadvantaged students in the face of longstanding inequities. Why should this issue be any different? The department is simply interpreting a provision of the law that is designed to ensure that federal dollars are truly supplemental, not just filling state and local funding gaps. If the department doesn't insist that states and local school districts spend at least as much on their most needy students, it's far too easy for districts to use the federal funding to simply make up their shortfalls, rather than providing the additional resources that these schools and students need.∂ Of course, simply mandating something isn't always the best way to spur action or get results. Ultimately, more states and districts should move towards broader reforms of their school finance systems so that schools get their funding based on the actual students they serve, with more money going to schools with disadvantaged students. Fortunately, the new education law includes a new pilot program that will provide districts with new incentives to adopt these weighted student funding systems and break down some of the barriers to putting them in place. The department should do all it can to promote this program and provide maximum flexibility to districts that implement these more equitable systems.∂ With a new federal law, our country has the chance to rethink its approach to supporting the most struggling schools and students. The Department of Education should seize this opportunity to make sure that these schools and students get the resources they need to succeed.

#### State based democratic experimentalism allows for laissez-faire spending and harms local education leaders without motivation or capacity

**Gross,** Research Director, the Center on Reinventing Public Education, University of Washington Bothell, **and Hill,** Research Professor of Public Affairs, University of Washington Bothell and Founder, the Center on Reinventing Public Education, **2016**

(Betheny and Paul T., “The State Role in K--12 Education: From Issuing Mandates to Experimentation”, Harvard Law & Policy Review, Summer, 2016, accessed via LexisNexis, accessed 7/14/17, GDI-JG)

Deregulation, a key feature of a democratic experimentalism regime, comes with risks. The new federal education law, ESSA, eliminates requirements that states take specific actions on behalf of children in low-performing schools. This opens up the possibility that some or all states will adopt a laissez-faire approach toward local schools and dis-tricts. Given that low-performing schools are most likely to serve low-income and disadvantaged students, deregulation puts those students at risk. Compared to a rule-based system, which requires states do something to avoid charges of non-compliance and loss of federal subsidies, deregulation relies heavily on state-and local-level motivation and capaci-ty. Though the new federal policy is risky in these ways, democratic experimentalism neither causes nor exacerbates these hazards. Experimentalism ensures that states share their experiences and measure results.∂ Critics of democratic experimentalism contend that the certainty of mandates protects policies that might be vul-nerable to competing political interests. David Super, for example, argues that under a decentralized anti-poverty policy the nation failed to reach consensus on goals, left under-resourced government agencies in control of enforcement, and created lengthy negotiations and debates on policy that consumed the resources of anti-poverty advocates. n123 While we agree with Super's argument, it is not clear that a mandate-based regime would have been more effective without a very different political environment and a great deal more money. Nor is it likely that a mandate-based regime would have allowed the diversity of practice that could lead to innovation and long-term improvement. Topdown rights enforce-ment can reallocate money and access, but it cannot mandate the discovery of a solution to a heretofore unsolved prob-lem.∂ Local education leaders who lack capacity or motivation will also not make progress. States will differ in whether they have the leadership, intellectual capacity, and political support necessary to move intransigent localities. Such real-ities of a decentralized system are not caused by democratic experimentalism, which creates some transparency and pres-sure for improvement. Low-performing localities that refuse to experiment will be identifiable through the outcome data that states are still required to gather. But identifying such jurisdictions and overcoming high-inertia organizations takes time, and in the meantime, improvements in schooling for low-income and disadvantaged students might not happen.

### Perm solvency?

#### Compliance with Title I relies on SEAs – means that the plan can increase and the states can help enforce

**Gordon,** Associate Professor, Georgetown University, McCourt School of Public Policy, **and Reber,** Associate Professor, University of California, Los Angeles, Luskin School of Public Affairs, **2015**

(Nora and Sarah, “The Quest for a Targeted and Effective Title I ESEA: Challenges in Designing and Implementing Fiscal Compliance Rules”, The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences, Volume 1 Issue 3, December 2015, <http://www.rsfjournal.org/doi/full/10.7758/RSF.2015.1.3.07>, accessed 7/8/17, GDI-JG)

Early in the program's history, and in response to highly publicized and egregious misuses of funds, Title I's fiscal rules transformed it from something close to general aid into a much more restricted and closely monitored source of categorical aid for the disadvantaged. Observers soon noted that these restrictions hindered the ability of schools to best use their grants, and new rules soon emerged attempting to preserve the targeting of aid while simultaneously seeking to promote effective uses of funds by allowing some flexibility in the use of funds. That tension is the subject of this article: how successful are the fiscal rules governing Title I today and especially its schoolwide program option—both on paper and as perceived by program administrators—at striking this balance? We argue that many programs are schoolwide in name only, and more needs to be done to address these long-standing but low-profile issues.[†](javascript:popRef('fn1'))

In this article, we argue that though progress toward more effective use of Title I funds has been made, the problem is far from resolved. Our argument draws on three main categories of evidence: the policy history up to and including the fiscal rules in place today; interviews with school district Title I administrators, which provide information not only on how they spend their funds but also on how they understand the fiscal rules; and analysis of how Title I funds are spent in two large, highly disadvantaged districts.

In sum, we find that in many cases perceptions of the fiscal rules have not caught up with the legal reality for schools operating schoolwide programs. Many of these schools appear to still use Title I funds to pay for things that appear more extra or supplemental, as opposed to core, though it is difficult to assess just how integrated Title I expenditures are with the rest of a school's functioning from available data sources. This may be in part due to the fact that total Title I funding in many schools is not enough to finance substantial components of the core instructional program on its own, but we also find evidence of misperceptions about what is allowed on the part of administrators. The interviews also revealed that district Title I administrators rely on state administrators, more than federal documents or actors, for information about permissible uses of funds. Thus, any federal or other efforts to provide more transparent guidance on Title I rules should pay particular attention to the role of state education agencies in disseminating such information and to the variation in capacity across state education agencies.

#### Perms solves teacher salary differential

**Knight,** Center for Education Research and Policy Studies**, and DeMatthews ,** Educational Leadership and Foundations, **2016**

(David and David “Are ∂ school districts allocating resources equitably? ∂ Implications for Title I funding and the Every Student Succeeds Act” CERPS Working Paper 2016∂ -∂ 2∂ . ∂ University of ∂ Texas at El Paso, El Paso, TX. <http://www.utep.edu/education/cerps/_Files/docs/papers/CERPS_Working_Paper_2016_2.pdf> accessed 7-6-17 GDI - TM)

As noted earlier, because most districts allocate funding to schools based on student- staffing ratios and because teacher salaries are typically based on experience and standardized within school districts, the distribution of teacher experience across schools within districts has direct implications for how funding is distributed. A large body of research shows teacher experience, aptitude, and qualifications are all inequitably distributed across schools (Darling- Hammond, 2000; 2004; Clotfelter et al., 2006; Loeb et al., 2010; Peske & Haycock, 2006). More recent studies show that teacher effectiveness – as measured by value-added scores, which estimate teachers’ contribution to student achievement gains on test scores – is also distributed inequitably (e.g., Glazerman & Max, 2011; Isenberg et al., 2013; Sass, Hannaway, Xu, Figlio & Feng, 2010). Most of these studies use detailed administrative data from one or several districts. A small number of studies examine teacher experience / quality gaps in districts across an entire state (Clotfelter, Ladd, Vigdor & Wheeler, 2006; Goldhaber et al., 2015), but no recent studies examine teacher experience gaps in all states nationally.

Several factors contribute to the inequitable distribution of teacher experience within school districts (Boyd, Lankford, Loeb & Wyckoff, 2005; Ladd, 2011; Krieg, Theobald & Goldhaber, 2015; Scafidi, Sjoquist & Stinebrickner, 2007). Both the initial match of educators to schools and lower retention rates in high-need schools contribute to the teacher experience gap. Less supportive school administration, greater accountability pressure, and unprofessional work environments are all associated with higher teacher attrition within school districts (Boyd et al., 2011; Clotfelter, Ladd, Vigdor & Dias, 2004; Johnson, Kraft & Papay, 2012; Hanushek, Kain & Rivkin, 2004). Some researchers contend that restrictive teacher contracts contribute to inequitable access to experienced teachers (Anzia & Moe, 2014; Goldhaber et al., 2015), although others find no such evidence (e.g., Cohen-Vogel et al., 2013). Despite the many studies examining teacher attrition and inequitable distributions of teacher experience within school districts, no studies systematically assess district characteristics associated with larger teacher experience gaps.

A federal program to reduce district-level teacher quality gaps requires states education agencies to measure teacher quality gaps and identify potential root causes (State Plans to Ensure Equitable Access to Excellent Educators, DOE, 2015). The initiative lists primarily school-level issues as potential root causes of teacher quality gaps such as poor teacher recruitment strategies, school working conditions, and school leadership, but does not consider differences in state funding and teacher salary levels across districts (see Baker and Weber, 2016 for further discussion). Because state legislatures govern the district finance system, states education agencies are limited in their ability to alter teacher salaries or district funding levels.

### States bad

#### Reliance on states and local intermediaries part of the problem with Title I – increase that relationship worsens outcomes

**Moffitt,** Mary Tefft and John Hazen White Senior Assistant Professor of Political Science and Public Policy at Brown University, **2016**

(Susan L., “The State of Educational Improvement: The Legacy of ESEA Title I”, History of Education Quarterly, May 2016, Vol. 56, No. 2, accessed 7/3/17, GDI-JG)

Recall that the original ESEA sought to “provide financial assis- tance . . . to local educational agencies serving areas with concentra- tions of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs.”4 Considered relative to its original goal of “pro- viding financial assistance,” Title I delivered a steady funding stream allocated according to its formula grant. Title I contributed to state building, in part, by helping federal and state governments develop fis- cal accountability capacity to target those funds in the 1970s and 1980s and to ensure that Local Education Agencies met other fiscal account- ability criteria. Yet despite the development of fiscal accountability mechanisms such as “supplement not supplant” and “comparability and maintenance of effort,” Title I continued to layer on interstate, in- trastate, and intradistrict fiscal inequalities. Title I was a modest fiscal intervention relative to the scope of American inequality, in part, be- cause it spread its funds across all Congressional districts and 90 percent of school districts and did so building on unequal fiscal foundations.5 Considered relative to the goal to “expand and improve educational programs,” Title I purchased, on average, about thirty minutes of addi- tional instruction several days per week in reading or math for children who received Title I services during the late 1970s and 1980s. It did so relying largely on teachers’ extant practice, supplemented with help from teachers’ aides. On average, students receiving services displayed modest gains in reading and math, commensurate with Title I’s modest intervention in schools.6∂ However, Title I’s original mission to deliver financial resources, track how the money was spent, and provide marginal educational ser- vices came to seem too modest. As expressed in the No Child Left Behind Act, Title I became charged with twelve paragraphs of goals, not just one paragraph as in the 1965 ESEA. Among these include “en- suring that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education” and “closing the achievement gap.”7 Considered relative to these goals, Title I’s legacy is even more mixed, especially in terms of instructional improvement and in terms of its contributions to state building.∂ Herein lies the paradox of Title I’s form of state building. Rely- ing on intermediaries—state governments, professions, and nonstate service providers—helped the original Title I get off the ground and contributed to its modest intervention. However, this reliance has been problematic for Title I’s goal of achieving its more ambitious mission related to instructional improvement. In relying on subnational and nonstate intermediaries, Title I has done much less to refashion core aspects of teaching and learning, which has limited its ability to achieve its more recent goal of eliminating the achievement gap.

### Fed solves – standardization

#### Federal educational standardization of services can solve educational inequality and racial disparities—empirics prove

**Reed,** Associate Professor and Director of the Program in Education, Inquiry, and Justice at Georgetown University, **2016**

(Douglas S., “ESEA at Fifty: Education as State-Building”, History of Education Quarterly, May 2016, Vol. 56, No. 2, accessed 7/3/17, GDI-JG)

Desmond King and Marc Stears contend that the defining charac- teristic of the American state-building experience is the federal govern- ment’s efforts to standardize policy.6 For all the rational and Weberian reasons that states and state builders have, standardization offers many advantages: greater efficiency, greater ability to penetrate into social structures, and greater ability to pursue national, rather than particu- larized and local, policy goals. So whether it is uniform weights and measures, the gauges of railroad tracks, the voting age, or the treatment of racial minorities by public officials, standardization (and its near cousin, equalization) affords national state officials many advantages and typically augments their power.∂ In public education, we see this not only in the recent debate over educational standards but in the older efforts to ensure that different groups of students had access to roughly equal educational experiences. The processes of breaking down Jim Crow schooling in the South and promoting greater racial integration in the North were a form of stan- dardization that attacked the local patterns of distributing education un- equally by race. ESEA played a major role in that effort by using both fi- nancial carrots and sticks to promote greater racial equality in education. In fact, as Gerald Rosenberg has shown, Congressional actions under ESEA achieved far more racial standardization than judicial efforts be- gun by Brown v. Board of Education and a nearly twenty-year train of court decisions that culminated in Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg in 1971.7∂ Similarly, Congress began in the early 1970s to force school dis- tricts to educate special-needs students, at a time when many districts were only just beginning to recognize the needs of these students. Many states provided limited or no services to deaf or blind students in lo- cal districts but, instead, segregated them from the rest of the student population and often refused to provide any schooling for children with Down syndrome or other cognitive impairments.

# Ks

## Race Ks

### AT: Reforms fail

#### Reforms in education policy can redress segregation and unequal quality of school

Reardon, Stanford University Graduate School of Education professor, et al, 17 (Sean F., Demetra, Stanford Center for Education Policy Analysis research associate, Ken, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia with expertise in Educational Theory, Educational Policy, Econometrics, "The Geography of Racial/Ethnic Test Score Gaps", January 2017, http://cepa.stanford.edu/wp16-10, 7-8-17, GDI-EC)

The reason that the influence of out-of-school family socioeconomic disparities cannot be cleanly distinguished from the role of schooling policies and practices in producing achievement gaps is that school segregation is shaped by both factors (as well as by other forces, including housing policy, housing discrimination and preferences, and private school enrollment patterns). Moreover, the extent to which school segregation is linked to between-school racial disparities is dependent on educational policies and practices. If education policy were successful at achieving the “separate but equal” standard articulated in Plessy v. Ferguson, school segregation would not be linked to between-school differences in the quality of educational experiences. While there is no evidence that this has ever been, or is likely to be, achieved, education policy may nonetheless moderate the relationship between segregation and unequal school 9 quality. Policies that provide extra resources to schools serving large proportions of poor and minority students, for example, may weaken the link between school racial and socioeconomic composition and school quality. The effect of such policies is signified by the dashed line in Figure 1.