# Advantages answers

## Democracy Advantage

### Democratic Decline Alt Causes—General

#### No solvency—multiple alt causes to democratic decline the affirmative doesn’t resolve

**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)

In the decade following the Cold War, democracy flourished around the world as never before. In recent years, however, much of this progress has steadily eroded. Between 2000 and 2015, democracy broke down in 27 countries, among them Kenya, Russia, Thailand, and Turkey. Around the same time, several other global "swing states"- countries that, thanks to their large populations and economies, could have an outsize impact on the future of global democracy-also took a turn for the worse. In nearly half of them, political liberties, as measured by the U.S. nonprofit Freedom House, contracted.∂ Meanwhile, many existing authoritarian regimes have become even less open, transparent, and responsive to their citizens. They are silencing online dissent by censoring, regulating, and arresting those they perceive as threats. Many of them are attempting to control the Internet by passing laws, for example, that require foreign companies to store citizens' data within the home country's borders. Offline, states are also constraining civil society by restricting the ability of organizations to operate, communicate, and fundraise. Since 2012, governments across the globe have proposed or enacted more than 90 laws restricting freedom of association or assembly.∂ Adding to the problem, democracy itself seems to have lost its appeal. Many emerging democracies have failed to meet their citizens' hopes for freedom, security, and economic growth, just as the world's established democracies, including the United States, have grown increasingly dysfunctional. In China, meanwhile, decades of economic growth have proved that a state need not liberalize to generate prosperity.

#### Impact inevitable—democratic backslide already occurring—several reasons

**Plattner,** founding coeditor, Journal of Democracy, and vice-president for research and studies, the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), and cochair, Research Council, NED's International Forum for Democratic Studies, **2015**

(Marc F., “IS DEMOCRACY IN DECLINE?”, Journal of Democracy, January 2015, Volume 26, Issue 1, pages 5-10, accessed via ProQuest, accessed 7/14/17, GDI-JG)

This optimistic long-term scenario, however, presupposes that democracy remains the goal that countries are seeking. And this in turn is likely to depend on its being viewed both as the global standard of political legitimacy and as the best system for achieving the kind of prosperity and effective governance that almost all countries seek. What has changed most dramatically in recent years is that these presuppositions are increasingly being called into question. In my view, there are three chief reasons for this shift: 1) the growing sense that the advanced democracies are in trouble in terms of their economic and political performance; 2) the new self-confidence and seeming vitality of some authoritarian countries; and 3) the shifting geopolitical balance between the democracies and their rivals.∂ The first of these was generated by the 2008 financial crisis and its lingering economic consequences, including the recession and high unemployment rates that still plague much of Europe. That the advanced democracies suffered these reverses at a time when emerging-market countries were growing at a rapid clip undercut the notion that the institutions and policies of the West were worthy of emulation by "the rest." The political dysfunction that afflicted the advanced democracies as they sought to respond to the crisis further weakened their appeal. As Thomas Carothers notes in his essay on the changing global context of democracy promotion, "Democracy's travails in both the United States and Europe have greatly damaged the standing of democracy in the eyes of many people around the world."∂ The flip side of democracy's dwindling prestige has been the growing clout of a number of leading authoritarian regimes. Key among them is China, whose ability to make enormous economic strides without introducing democratic reforms has cast doubt on the notion that democracy is the only appropriate political system for wealthy countries. At the same time, as E. Gyimah-Boadi points out, China "is providing African governments with alternative non-Western markets, trade partners, and sources of military and development aid"-aid that is not tied to considerations of human rights or government accountability in the recipient states. Nor is China the only assertive nondemocratic power. Russia, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and Venezuela also have been learning from one another and even cooperating directly to thwart democracy's progress.∂ The essay on China in this issue by Andrew J. Nathan is the first in a series that the Journal of Democracy will be publishing in 2015 on what we have labeled the "authoritarian resurgence." It hurts to use this title; our first Journal of Democracy book, published in 1993, was called The Global Resurgence of Democracy. But today it does seem to be authoritarianism that has the wind at its back, even if it has not yet spread to many more countries. One sign of this is the headway that the authoritarians have made in the realm of "soft power," especially in major regional and multilateral organizations. The prodemocratic norms that the democracies helped to embed in organizations such as the OSCE, the Council of Europe, and the OAS in the 1990s are being weakened by antidemocratic nations represented in these bodies. Countries such as Russia and China also are ramping up their cultural diplomacy and international broadcasting while Western efforts in these fields have been unfocused and underfunded.∂ But it is not only in "soft-power" competition that the advanced democracies have fallen short. Increasingly, they are looking weaker in terms of hard power as well, shrinking their defense budgets even as authoritarian states spend more on arms. Over the past 25 years, the Journal of Democracy devoted little attention to issues of interstate relations or military affairs. In part, this reflected our sense of where the Journal enjoys a comparative advantage among world-affairs periodicals-most of them focus on security and foreign policy, while few study the domestic politics of non-Western countries. But we also felt that the internal developments accompanying or preceding struggles over democracy often were decisive in shaping the direction of international relations. Certainly that seemed true during the height of the third wave. Though the international context mattered, of course, the spark for change frequently came from internal grievances, movements, and conflicts, and by concentrating on these the Journal, in our view, was generally "ahead of the curve" in providing insight into how international developments would unfold.∂ We still think that the focus we have chosen is the right one for the Journal, but I have begun to wonder whether the period of the 1990s was atypical. Perhaps the "unipolar moment" of overwhelming dominance by the United States and its democratic allies had made it possible for internal prodemocratic struggles to take center stage, and without this favorable international environment democracy would not have prospered. This is certainly the interpretation suggested by Robert Kagan in this issue. As he puts it, "Geopolitical shifts among the reigning great powers, often but not always the result of wars, can have a significant effect on the domestic politics of the smaller and weaker nations of the world." Kagan asserts that the United States is in "a state of retrenchment" in the international arena, and that this is inflicting "collateral damage" on the fortunes of democracy.∂ In 2014, these trends became manifest. The rise of ISIS in Syria and Iraq, amid the disappointed hopes of the "Arab Spring" (outside Tunisia) and worries about Afghanistan, made it clear, as Tarek Masoud underlines, that Western efforts to impose some kind of order and to encourage democracy in the broader Middle East were not succeeding. Meanwhile, China's muscle-flexing in the East and South China Seas seemed to foreshadow a return to the use of force in Asia. And most important of all, Russia's brazen annexation of Crimea and stealth invasion of eastern Ukraine showed that the rules-based international order built by democratic powers could no longer be taken for granted. Moreover, if Lilia Shevtsova is right in her analysis of Russia's political system, "the Kremlin will henceforth approach the outside world in a militarist mode, with any compromises limited to the realm of tactics and not meant to be lasting."∂ If the liberal world order is indeed coming apart under pressure from the authoritarians, the future of democracy will be deeply affected. In a globe divided into spheres of influence and power blocs, a country's ability to follow a democratic path will be determined above all by its international alliances and its geography. As Alina Mungiu-Pippidi points out, it increasingly looks as if the fate of democracy in the countries of the postcommunist world will depend on which side of the emerging border between Russia and the EU they find themselves.∂ This new salience of geopolitics threatens to change the rules of the game. It may both limit the centrality of the internal balance of forces in shaping a country's regime choices and increase the chances that the imposition of external force will be decisive. Moreover, if the geopolitical balance appears to be tilting the authoritarians' way, they will seem much more attractive to the many individuals and nations that seek above all to be on the stronger side. Under these conditions, democracy would lose much of its luster. Where it broke down, there would be less demand to restore it. One could no longer be confident that time would still be on democracy's side.

#### Impact inevitable—democratic backsliding already occurring—stagnation of democracies proves

**Plattner,** founding coeditor, Journal of Democracy, and vice-president for research and studies, the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), and cochair, Research Council, NED's International Forum for Democratic Studies, **2015**

(Marc F., “IS DEMOCRACY IN DECLINE?”, Journal of Democracy, January 2015, Volume 26, Issue 1, pages 5-10, accessed via ProQuest, accessed 7/14/17, GDI-JG)

Larry Diamond, while not necessarily disputing Levitsky and Way's criticism of how these countries were rated in the early 1990s, finds other empirical evidence that the past decade has been "a period of at least incipient decline in democracy." He cites an increasing incidence of democratic breakdowns, the poor performance of new democracies according to various measures of good governance and rule of law, and democratic backsliding or stagnation in the biggest and wealthiest non-Western countries. There are strong arguments on both sides of this debate, but ultimately I do not think that analyses of the Freedom House (or other) numbers can settle the larger question.∂ Moreover, the broad contours of the trends revealed by the data are not really in dispute. Democracy began to make significant gains in the world in the years 1975-85. It then advanced at a prodigious rate in 1985-95. Its progress then began to slow, and only modest gains were achieved in the following decade, with scores peaking sometime in the early 2000s. Since then, the pattern has been one of stasis or very minor decline-certainly nothing like the "reverse waves" that Huntington identified in previous eras. The absence of democratic progress can be characterized negatively as "stagnation" or more hopefully as the conserving of prior democratic gains. But even if one discerns in the data a slight fall in the number of democracies, this cannot account for the perception of decline that has been spreading among democracy's friends, foes, and skeptics alike.

### Democratic Decline Alt Causes—International Stagnation

#### No solvency—affirmative can’t solve democratic decline overseas

**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)

As the United States has lagged behind, few other countries have stepped in. The most ambitious intergovernmental attempt to promote democracy-the Community of Democracies, a coalition established in 2000-lacks the resources and visibility to have much impact. Regional organizations are not doing much better. The eu, for example, has largely stood by as Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban has flouted democratic norms. And the union was so desperate to secure Turkey's help in stemming the flow of Syrian refugees that it agreed to revive membership talks with Ankara, even as Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan has accelerated his efforts to suppress dissent.∂ Although some European countries, such as Sweden and the United Kingdom, have continued to support significant bilateral programs to promote democracy and improve governance, the budget of the European Endowment for Democracy, established in 2013, reached just over $11 million last year. The United Kingdom's Westminster Foundation for Democracy currently has a public budget of just $5 million. Canada's International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development shut down in 2012. And developing democracies such as Brazil, India, and Indonesia have hesitated to contribute much, focusing instead on their own many problems.∂ Authoritarian leaders have capitalized on this vacuum by exporting their illiberal values and repressive technologies. Iran has been using its financial, political, and military influence to shape or destabilize governments in Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, and Yemen. Russia has used violence and intimidation and has funneled money to support separatist movements and to prop up pro-Russian, antireform political forces in Georgia and Ukraine. Moreover, Russia has built what the Internet freedom organization Access Now has termed a "commonwealth of surveillance states," exporting sophisticated electronic surveillance technologies throughout Central Asia. China, too, has reportedly supplied Ethiopia, Iran, and several Central Asian dictatorships- Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan-with Internet and telecommunications surveillance technology to help them repress and spy on their citizens.

#### No solvency—affirmative can’t solve failures of rising democracies or foreign authoritarian regimes

**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)

In the political science literature, democratization is generally thought to have occurred in waves. The largest and most recent of these, the “third wave” of global democratic expansion that began in the mid-1970s and crested in the 1990s, had already begun to subside as early as 2005. Since then, declines in freedom and political participation have come incrementally. But in the past year or two, several developments have intensified global anxieties about the health and future of democracy. ∂ The first is a trend toward authoritarianism that has popped up in several emerging democracies. In Turkey, which has been under a state of emergency since the failed military coup this July, President Recep Tayyip Erdogan has arrested some 32,000 alleged coup plotters and more than 100 journalists, while purging tens of thousands of other civil servants, military personnel, and police officers from the government. In August, Thailand’s military imposed a new constitution—by way of a referendum that was closed to opposition campaigning—that obstructs democracy by giving the military enormous de facto power. Meanwhile, since President Rodrigo Duterte’s inauguration in the Philippines in June, several thousand alleged drug traffickers have been killed without due process. Duterte has also cracked down on domestic opposition. Most recently, he removed his loudest critic from the leadership of a Senate committee investigating the murderous wave of police and vigilante violence. Reacting against international criticism, Duterte even compared himself favorably to Hitler, saying that while the German dictator had “massacred three million Jews,” he, Duterte, would be “happy to slaughter” the Philippines’ three million drug addicts. ∂ Another worrying development is that as democracies have stumbled, authoritarian regimes have become more aggressive in projecting anti-democratic norms onto the world stage, even as they stifle political pluralism in their own countries. Russia has been particularly dangerous in this regard, using highly sophisticated social media interventions to promote confusion, division, and doubt among democratic publics and intensify cynicism about democracy. Russia is also believed by U.S. intelligence agencies to be behind a number of hacks, such as that of Hillary Clinton campaign chair John Podesta’s e-mail account, designed to influence the U.S. election. At the same time, Russia and the world’s other most powerful autocracy, China, have been flexing their muscles in more conventional military, economic, and geopolitical ways.

### Alt causes – democracy erosion

#### Democracy promotion stagnating in the US now—lack of public support or government funding prove

**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)

One of the biggest challenges facing democracy today is that its biggest champion-the United States-has lost interest in promoting it. In a 2013 Pew survey, 80 percent of Americans polled agreed with the idea that their country should "not think so much in international terms" and instead "concentrate more on [its] national problems." Just 18 percent expressed the belief that democracy promotion should be a top foreign policy priority. It should thus come as no surprise that none of the current presidential candidates has made democracy promotion a cornerstone of his or her campaign.∂ Washington has continued to support some nongovernmental efforts. Congress increased its appropriation for the National Endowment for Democracy, a nonprofit that funds pro-democracy groups abroad, from $115 million in 2009 to $170 million in 2016. For the most part, however, as public support for democracy promotion has declined, funding for it has stagnated. During this same period, U.S. government spending on democracy, human rights, and governance programs (mainly through the U.S. Agency for International Development, or usaid) fell by nearly $400 million. Even excluding the decline in funding for Afghanistan and Iraq, funding for such programs in other countries stayed flat.

## Education Inequality Debate

### Achievement Gap

#### Alt-Causes to Achievement Gap

Morsy, UNSW School of Education, Senior lecturer, and Rothstien, Economic Policy Institute research associate, 15 (Leila and Richard, “Five Social Disadvantages That Depress Student Performance: Why Schools Alone Can’t Close Achievement Gaps Economic” Policy Institute 6-10-2015 http://www.epi.org/publication/five-social-disadvantages-that-depress-student-performance-why-schools-alone-cant-close-achievement-gaps/ 7-14-2017 GDI-JIJD)

That students’ social and economic characteristics shape their cognitive and behavioral outcomes is well established, yet policymakers typically resist accepting that non-school disadvantages necessarily depress outcomes. Rather, they look to better schools and teachers to close achievement gaps, and consistently come up short.¶ This report describes how social class characteristics plausibly depress achievement and suggests policies to address them. It focuses on five characteristics for purposes of illustration:¶ parenting practices that impede children’s intellectual and behavioral development¶ single parenthood¶ parents’ irregular work schedules¶ inadequate access to primary and preventive health care¶ exposure to and absorption of lead in the blood.¶ These are not the only characteristics that depress outcomes, nor are they necessarily the most important. This report makes no judgment about the relative importance of the many adverse influences on child and youth development. Parental unemployment and low wages, housing instability, concentration of disadvantage in segregated neighborhoods, stress, malnutrition, and health problems like asthma are among other harmful characteristics.

#### Variation between demographic and institutional factors influence achievement gap – no solvency

**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)

Racial and ethnic disparities in children’s academic performance are a stubborn feature of the US educational landscape. Though these achievement gaps are substantially smaller than they were 40 years ago, they remain quite large, on the order of two-thirds to three-quarters of a standard deviation (Neal 2006; Reardon, Robinson-Cimpian and Weathers 2015). They are large when children enter kindergarten and remain large through high school (Fryer and Levitt 2004; Hemphill, Vanneman and Rahman 2011; Phillips, Crouse and Ralph 1998; Reardon and Galindo 2009; Vanneman et al. 2009).

The size and trends of these gaps vary among states (Hemphill, Vanneman and Rahman 2011; Reardon 2015; Vanneman et al. 2009), though in no state are they near zero. National- and state-level patterns, however, may mask considerable variation in academic achievement patterns at smaller geographic scales. Metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs) and counties, for example, vary widely in demographic composition, patterns of racial socioeconomic inequality and racial segregation, and in the structure of their schooling systems. The roughly 14,000 school districts in the U.S. likewise differ substantially in their demographics, patterns of inequality and segregation, and educational resources. They also each have autonomy over some—but not all—important features of the schooling system, including their curricula, their student and teacher assignment policies, and how resources are distributed among and within schools. These demographic and institutional factors may lead to significant variation in the size of achievement gaps among both metropolitan areas and school districts.

#### Alt-Cause Psychological Impacts of Poverty Far Outweigh Teachers or Competitiveness Aspects of the Achievement Gap

Strauss, Washington Post Reporter 11 (Veronica “Public education's biggest problem gets worse” 9-14-2011 https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/post/public-educations-biggest-problem-gets-worse/2011/09/13/gIQAWGz2RK\_blog.html?utm\_term=.73da948c8184 7-14-2017 GDI-JIJD)

For too long, school reform efforts have focused almost exclusively on “bad teachers,” with billions of federal and private foundation dollars going into iffy schemes to ferrett out lousy teachers with standardized test scores of their children.¶ I’ve said before and will say it again: Of course there are bad teachers (there are) and of course progress in improving schools can be made without eliminating poverty.¶ But we need to face facts: Problems in schools would remain even if every teacher were magnificent (show me a profession where that is true about every practioner) because teachers are obviously enormously important, but they are not the only factor that goes into how well children succeed.¶ The current direction of school reform is making it even harder to fix broken schools and improve the ones that do well even if they suffer from 20th century design and resources.¶ Making teachers entirely responsible for a student’s academic progress — regardless of whether the child eats enough or sleeps enough or gets enough medical attention — is counterproductive. Pretending that these issues can be “factored out” in some kind of mathematical formula that can assess how much “value” a teacher has added to a student’s progress is near nutty. That’s not just me saying it. Leading mathematicians say it too.¶ The effects of poverty on children matter in regard to student achievement. That is not to say that efforts to improve teacher quality, modernize curriculum, infuse technology into the classroom where it makes sense and other reforms should not be pursued. But doing all of that while ignoring the conditions in which kids live is a big waste of time.¶ But reformers still can’t help themselves on this issue. The latest example: author and entrepreneur Steven Brill just wrote in part on the Council of Foreign Relations website:¶ “Here’s the bad news about making America’s next generation competitive in the global economy: Anything we do today to fix our failing public schools will take fifteen to twenty years to show significant results.¶ “Last year, the head of the Pittsburgh school system — who was engaged in a trailblazing reform effort — did the math for me this way: He knew from research done by various think tanks and education experts over the last decade that improving the effectiveness of teachers was the single most important factor in improving student outcomes. However, he calculated that if he could remove the 2 to 3 percent of his teachers that were least effective every year, it would still take him ten years to refortify a third of his staff. And in a public education world where the unions have typically been able to protect even the lowest-performing teachers, that kind of quality upgrade seemed doable only because the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation had offered the city a grant that required the union to cooperate in return for a huge injection of funds into the school system.¶ “The good news, however, is that, spurred in large part by President Obama’s Race to the Top federal education grant contest and supported by a burgeoning network of reformers, more efforts like Pittsburgh’s are now underway.”¶ Brill is wrong on a number of counts, including that research shows that improving teacher effectiveness is the most important factor in improving student outcomes. There is research that shows that to be the most important in-school factor, but that's not what he wrote.¶ So to be clear, here’s what the American Pyschological Association says are some of the consequences of living in poverty. Read them and tell them they can’t affect how well a child does in school.¶ With more children living in poverty, the problems of educating them will only be more difficult. We can ignore the problem all we want, but it isn’t going away by itself.¶ Poverty and academic achievement¶ Poverty has a particularly adverse effect on the academic outcomes of children, especially during early childhood.¶ Chronic stress associated with living in poverty has been shown to adversely affect children’s concentration and memory which may impact their ability to learn.¶ School dropout rates are significantly higher for teens residing in poorer communities. In 2007, the dropout rate of students living in low-income families was about 10 times greater than the rate of their peers from high-income families (8.8% vs. 0.9%).¶ The academic achievement gap for poorer youth is particularly pronounced for low-income African American and Hispanic children compared with their more affluent White peers.¶ Underresourced schools in poorer communities struggle to meet the learning needs of their students and aid them in fulfilling their potential.

### No fed solvency

**Federal oversight weakened – can’t help racial and ethnic minorities**

**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)

Civil Rights activists have been much more wary about ESSA and share many of my concerns. According to a coalition of civil rights groups, including the Southern Poverty Law Center and the New York chapter of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, federal oversight of education will be much too weak to ensure education for Black and Latino students in many of the “red states’ and ESSA does not address disparities in school discipline procedures and suspension policies that target minority boys. Gary Orfield, an education and law professor at the University of California-Los Angeles, who has documented increasing racial segregation in United States schools, charges that “Now we’re going to get something that’s much worse — a lot of federal money going out for almost no leverage for any national purpose.”∂ “Let’s be clear,” a catchphrase frequently used by President Obama, this is not a law that will improve education in the United States. It is a mishmash of compromises between political parties that agree on almost nothing. It rewrites bad laws that made things worse, but offers little that will make education better and hidden in the recesses of the 1061-page law are new toxic arrangements, some that may take years to completely emerge.∂ I am not a fan of Common Core and a big opponent of the high-stakes testing regime, but I suspect in the end ESSA will stand for Excusing States for Student Abandonment.

### Alt cause – segregation

#### Racial and economic segregation entrenches academic disparities, including 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)

Second, racial differences in family economic circumstances affect residential segregation patterns (though housing discrimination and racial preferences shape segregation patterns as well; for a review, see Lareau and Goyette 2014). This means that black and Hispanic children live, on average, in poorer neighborhoods than white children. In fact, black and Hispanic children live in much poorer neighborhoods, relative to white children, than would be expected based on their family income (Logan 2011; Pattillo 2013; Reardon, Fox and Townsend 2015; Sharkey 2014). Poorer neighborhoods typically have higher violent crime rates (Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997) and weaker non-school social institutions (such as availability of high-quality child care and pre-school programs; safe parks and playgrounds; and constructive afterschool activities, such as clubs and sports teams (Small 2006). These and other factors have long been hypothesized to affect schooling outcomes (Jencks and Mayer 1990; Leventhal and Brooks-Gunn 2000; Sampson 1998), and new evidence from the MTO experiment and other studies confirms that neighborhood conditions affect educational attainment (Burdick-Will et al. 2011; Chetty, Hendren and Katz 2015; Sampson, Sharkey and Raudenbush 2008; Sharkey 2010; Wodtke, Harding and Elwert 2011). This implies that residential segregation patterns may lead to disparities in educational outcomes (see, for example, Ananat 7 2009; Card and Rothstein 2007; Cutler and Glaeser 1997).

### Alt cause – school violence

#### No solvency—school violence inevitably hampers educational attainment by dividing classrooms and creating hostility

**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)

Violence in School. Violence in schools does not receive nearly as much attention as it deserves. It may be a major reason for students dropping out of high school. The KIPP School’s Benning Road Campus in Washington, D.C., found that unless they provided safe passage for their students between home and school, children would not come to school. So the school worked with local law enforcement to get drugs and crime off the local streets so students could walk to school safely and focus on their education.[42]∂ ∂ Unfortunately, gang violence dominates inner city schools, which further divides classrooms and creates hostility, a problem that particularly involves male students.∂ ∂ Parental concern over gang violence reached a new level recently in Chicago when the city closed almost 50 low-enrollment public schools. Students who had attended these schools were required to attend different schools and travel farther, and through different neighborhoods, to get to school. This would simply boil down to an inconvenience if not for the horrifying gang violence that followed. Despite the creation of Chicago’s “Safe Passage Zones,” which were meant to offer students a safe route to school, violence plagues Chicago’s youngsters and afflicts many neighborhoods. Last December, a 15-year-old girl was brutally beaten and raped about a half a block from a Safe Passage Zone. Chicago parents are increasingly concerned about the safety of their children, considering that “about 12,000 students are attending new schools this year because of the budget crisis, and many of them must walk through some of Chicago’s most violent neighborhoods.”[43] Safety is not just a problem that plagues Chicago. A survey of parents whose children are enrolled in the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program indicated safety as the number one factor they consider when choosing a school.[44]

### Alt causes – ESSA hurts quality

**ESSA undermines accountability standards and quality of education**

**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)

Major provisions of the ESSA include repeal of annual federal yearly progress reports that will be replaced by individual state-designed accountability systems. ESSA transfers responsibility to states to identify and provide support for struggling schools and prohibits the federal government from interfering in state and local decisions. There will be continuing annual, statewide assessments in reading and math in grades 3 through 8 and once in high school and science tests three times between grades 3 and 12, but states will develop their own standards and have greater “flexibility to develop and implement innovative assessments.” Basically, under ESSA states are free to develop pretend standards and assessments while the federal government kicks in dollars to support teacher development and improved education for at-risk students, but there will be minimal to no oversight how states spend the funds. I will be glad to see NCLB left behind and RTTT stopped, but I do not see how ESSA is a victory for education in the United States. Does anyone believe that low-funded poorly performing states like Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, New Mexico, and West Virginia will create meaningful accountability systems and tests that will expose the low quality public education they offer Black and Latino students?

### Studies on resource inequality flawed

#### Findings of inequality only reflect differences in funding across districts and states – not within districts

**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)

Results for research question 1 are shown in Tables 4 and 5. Panel A of Table 4 shows results for per-student teacher salary expenditures, Panel B shows teacher-pupil ratios, and in Panel C we report findings for teacher experience. As shown in the first row of column 1, we find that on average nationally, elementary schools receive $9.59 less per student in state and local funding for teacher salaries for each 1% increase in FRL students (equivalent to a $959 per- pupil gap between schools with 100% FRL and 0% FRL). That number reduces to about $2.64 when comparing schools in the same state and controlling for local district cost factors (shown in column 3). Funding for middle schools is even more inequitable, whereas funding for high schools is slightly more equitable compared to elementary schools (rows 2 and 3). The final column of Table 4 shows results for models that include district fixed effects, which allow for comparisons of schools within the same district. The relationship between poverty rates and teacher expenditures reverses when comparing schools in the same district – higher poverty schools receive more funding for teacher salaries, on average, than lower-poverty schools in the same district. Results for teacher-pupil ratios follow a similar pattern (Panel B). Our results are very similar for students who identify as an underrepresented minority and in comparisons between Title I and non-Title I schools (results shown in online appendix Table A2). These findings suggest that on average, the disparities observed in models 1-3 result primarily from inequitable funding across states and across districts within states, not from inequities within districts, as several studies have suggested (e.g., Roza & Hill, 2004).

## Racial disparity in education

#### Educational inequality doesn’t explain the racial wage gap and unemployment

**Kasperkevic,** reporter, Guardian US, **2015**

(Jana, “#BlackLivesMatter and so should the high unemployment rate”, The Guardian, August 6, 2015, https://www.theguardian.com/money/2015/aug/06/black-lives-matter-black-unemployment-rate, accessed 7/11/17, GDI-JG)

∂ The US unemployment rate is expected to hold steady at 5.3% on Friday – the lowest unemployment rate in seven years. Yet there is one group whose unemployment rate is still close to 10%: African Americans. The unemployment rate for black Americans has remained almost twice that of the general population for so long that experts believe it’s suffering from the “wallpaper effect” – no one notices anymore. That may be about to change.∂ ∂ Black unemployment has been about twice as high as that of white Americans since 1954, the earliest that the Department of Labor has unemployment rate by race. In June, the unemployment rate for black Americans was 9.5%. That’s more than twice the unemployment rate of white Americans, which was 4.6%.∂ Until recently, politicians have felt content to nod and say it’s always been this way. But as 2016 presidential campaigns get under way, Americans and specifically black Americans are letting their elected officials know that this answer is no longer good enough. Black lives matter and so should the black unemployment rate.∂ Status quo∂ The “wallpaper effect” is to blame for the lack of attention to African American unemployment, said Valerie Rawlston Wilson, director of the race, ethnicity and economy program at the Economic Policy Institute.∂“It is true that black unemployment has always been about twice as high as white unemployment – give or take a few tenths of a decimal. The lowest the ratio has ever been in any month is 1.7 and the highest is 2.8. The two rates have never even been close to being the same,” she said.∂ “It’s been that way for so long that people have come to expect it and even make excuses for it like blaming it on education or skills,” she said, pointing out that Latinos, who have lower education attainment rates than black people, also have a lower unemployment rate. “I think that until we own up to the fact that racism and racial bias – explicit or implicit, directly or indirectly – are a major part of this ongoing disparity and do something to directly address these issues that little or nothing will change.”∂ There are a handful of presidential candidates who are speaking out on the issue. In a number of interviews, Vermont senator Bernie Sanders has spoken about the need to address youth unemployment, especially among black Americans. Last week, Hillary Clinton once again spoke about racial inequality that contributes to the opportunity gap in America. ∂ Many voters have become disillusioned by persistent racial inequality even after the first black president took office in 2008. They feel the change and hope they were promised is nowhere in sight. As a result, 2016 presidential hopefuls are coming under pressure to explain in more detail how they hope to improve the lives of black Americans.

#### No solvency—affirmative doesn’t resolve multitude of factors in racial inequity

**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)

Part of the difference in educational outcomes likely stems from the different environments black and white children live in during their school years. Black children are far more likely to live in households that are low-income, extremely poor, food-insecure, or receiving longterm welfare support. Black children are less likely than white or Hispanic children to live in households where at least one parent has secure employment, and black children have the greatest rate of any race for families with children living in homeless shelters. Nearly 25 percent of black parents report their children live in unsafe neighborhoods, compared with 7 percent of white parents.∂ Black children are also more likely to have emotionally traumatic experiences impacting their childhood, such as abuse or neglect, the death of a parent or witnessing domestic violence. The child maltreatment rate (which signifies abuse or neglect of a child) was 14.2 per 1,000 black children and 8 per 1,000 for white children. More black high school students say they have been raped. Black youth at all age levels are more likely to be victims of violent crimes.∂ When a child doesn’t know where her next meal is coming from, when she is dealing with the loss of a parent or living in a household rife with substance abuse or neglect, it seems obvious that these home circumstances would impact her ability to concentrate at school. When a child is living in poverty, it’s easy to understand how lack of money for school supplies or lack of Internet or computer access would impede his ability to complete homework.∂ But it’s more than that. These factors — a mix of race, poverty and family structures — are associated with a plethora of other problems: lower math and reading achievement, behavioral problems, grade retention, obesity, risky sexual behavior, greater risk of illness, greater risk of interpersonal or self-directed violence. The list is endless and the issues continue through adulthood, creating a cycle that proves difficult to escape for many. For those that do, however, disparities don’t end with college enrollment.

## Teacher quality debate

### Experience gaps

#### Their studies are wrong – experience gaps not more significant in high poverty districts

**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 policy implication relates to understanding of the teacher labor market and school district achievement gaps. Despite recent efforts to understand the extent to which disadvantaged students have equitable access to experienced teachers, federal and state policymakers have little knowledge of the types of districts with larger teacher experience gaps. This gap in the literature is especially important given recent findings showing that district-level achievement gaps persist across the income distribution, in low-, middle- and higher-income districts nationally (Reardon, Kalogrides, & Shores, 2016). The findings from our study contradict prior statewide analyses in Washington and North Carolina, which found that higher- poverty districts have wider teacher experience gaps (Goldhaber et al., 2015; Clotfelter et al., 2005). We find that while experience gaps exist across the distribution of district poverty rates, teacher experience gaps are actually the smallest in the highest-poverty districts and largest in mid-poverty districts. Teachers who choose to work in high-poverty districts may also choose to work (and remain) in their district’s highest-poverty schools. The propensity for greater teacher retention in the highest poverty schools of high-poverty districts (compared to the highest- poverty schools of low-poverty districts) could be seen as an untapped asset for high-poverty districts that are struggling with teacher retention. In summary, the problem of inequitable access to experienced teachers is not limited to, or even concentrated in, high-poverty districts.

#### Within districts, teacher experience only deviation between Title I schools and non Title I schools – other funding comparable – means most effective federal intervention for teacher quality should occur at the state level

**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)

However, when we compare schools within the same district, we find a very different pattern. Districts spend more on teacher salaries per student and have more teachers per student in their higher-poverty and higher-minority schools, but have less experienced teachers, compared to more advantaged schools in the same district. In other words, districts make up for the fact that their most novice teachers are concentrated in higher-poverty schools by lowering average class sizes in those schools, and as a result, spend more per student on teacher salaries in higher need schools. Resource allocation patterns are similar for districts that have all Title I schools (and presumably face no federal comparability regulations), implying that this general pattern is not likely a response to the Comparability Rule. However, these averages mask substantial variation in district teacher resource gaps. Among districts with at least four elementary schools, for example, 20% have large teacher salary gaps (i.e., allocate at least 10% less teacher salary funding per student to their highest-poverty elementary schools compared to their lowest-poverty elementary schools). Finally, we find that greater levels of resources at the district level, as measured by per-pupil funding, average teacher salaries, or expenditures per pupil relative to other districts in the same state or county, are all associated with smaller teacher experience gaps and more equitable resource allocation patterns within districts.

The study has important policy implications at the federal, state, and local level. Because districts already provide more teachers per student even when they presumably face no federal comparability requirements, federal policies may be more effective if targeted at state, rather than district, finance systems. Moreover, as others have noted (e.g., Gordon, 2016), requiring that districts spend equal dollars across schools could lead them to (a) use forced teacher placements; (b) alter the number of Title I schools in their districts, or (c) continue lowering student-staffing ratios in high-poverty schools without addressing the underlying problem of high attrition in those schools. Overall, the findings suggest that the most effective approaches to improving disadvantaged students’ access to effective teachers may be through state and local policy, additional federal funding for districts, or through federal intervention on state legislatures, rather than direct federal regulation of school districts.

### Alt cause - ESSA teacher standards

#### ESSA harms the quality of public education—lowered teacher standards and high-stakes testing 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)

Kenneth Zeichner, a professor of teacher education at the University of Washington at Seattle, believes that ESSA lowers the standard for teacher preparation. He uncovered provisions in the legislation for establishing “teacher preparation academies” designed to promote “entrepreneurial programs like those funded by venture philanthropists. These include fast-track teacher education programs such as Teach For America, Relay and TNTP, which place individuals in classrooms as teachers of record before they complete certification requirements.”∂ In her blog, Mercedes Schneider points out that ESSA largely keeps the high-stakes testing regime in place and poses a new threat to parents and communities that want to opt-out of the testing. According to Schneider “ESSA pushes for that 95-percent-test-taker-completion as a condition of Title I funding and leaves states at the mercy of the US secretary of education to not cut Title I funding in the face of parents choosing to refuse the tests.”

### Performance results metric flawed

#### No internal link—US student performance isn’t dropping—other countries are just catching up

**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)

Contrary to common belief, U.S. students are not doing worse than they did in the past; rather, despite challenging demographic changes, students are holding their own in academic achievement or even doing better as measured by national test scores. Some other indicators also show progress: High school graduation is at a historic high, college- going rates have increased signi cantly since 1980, and the proportion of students ages 17-24 who are high school dropouts has fallen by more than half since 1970 (Child Trends, 2014).∂ Granting these positive trends, what is different from the past and is pressing on the U.S. is that other countries’ students are taking education very seri- ously and are doing better than ours on several im- portant measures of educational progress.∂ From the 1940s through the 1990s, the U.S. led the world on many indicators of educational achieve- ment, but that record has been eroding as the edu- cational levels of other nations have risen. In 1995, the U.S. ranked second after New Zealand in higher education graduation rates among 19 OECD (Or- ganization for Economic Cooperation and Develop- ment) countries with comparable data, but by 2010, it ranked 13th among 25 countries with comparable data. This relative decline in rankings occurred not because the U.S. was doing worse, but because other countries were doing better (OECD, 2012a).∂ Another indicator of the relative performance of U.S. students comes from the international test called the Program for International Student As- sessment (PISA). In results released in 2013, even our top high school students did not perform as well in mathematics as top students in many other ec- onomically advanced coun- tries (OECD, 2012b). PISA mainly assesses students’ achievement in reading, mathematics, and science, and is designed to mea- sure students’ ability to solve problems and apply their knowledge to real- life problems.

# Solvency answers

## General Solvency

### Resources don’t solve

#### Resources don’t increase equality – increase in funding doesn’t address other inherent inequalities in schools

Brown, American Progress Vice President of Education Policy, et al. 17 (Catherine “Hidden Money” Center for American Progress 4-8-2017 https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2017/04/08/428484/hidden-money/ 7-11-2017 GDI-JIJD)

It is also important to note that even in states and districts where high-need schools are equitably funded, equal funding will not necessarily drive equitable opportunities. A growing body of rigorous research indicates that increased education spending makes a significant impact for low-income students because they need schools to deliver much more support in order to compete on a level playing field with their more affluent peers. Disadvantaged students generally grow up in less verbal home environments, often with less access to enrichment activities.16 They enter formal schooling academically behind their more affluent peers. To even attain equal footing, therefore, they need additional support. Recent research out of the National Bureau of Economic Research, or NBER, found that investing additional resources in education for low-income students yielded statistically significant effects for student outcomes.17 Specifically, every additional $1,000 in per-pupil spending increased student test scores by 0.18 standard deviations, which is twice the effect of reducing class size through the Project STAR experiment.18 The Project STAR experiment reduced elementary school class sizes by an average of 35 percent.19¶ Parent donations only further the current funding inequities at the district and school levels. What’s more, because districts and schools do not readily report the use of private contributions, the dollars are not included as part of national, state, district, and school funding comparisons. When private dollars are taken into account, it is evident that the education finance system benefits the affluent—it does not, in Horace Mann’s own words, serve as “the great equalizer.”20¶ In short, wealthy parents are raising large sums of money to improve their already-advantaged schools. In addition to having more experienced teachers, for example, higher-income students are more likely to attend schools with higher-quality facilities.21 And schools with robust and well-funded PTAs spend thousands of dollars per student to provide even better programming, including field trips, new computers, art and music instructors, and new supplies for teachers. In less affluent schools without parent donations, funding for these programs or resources likely comes out of schools’ overall budgets, requiring administrators to pull funding from other core activities for enrichment opportunities.

#### Resources don’t solve myriad of factors that contribute to achievement gap

**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)

The U.S. spends significantly more on education than other OECD countries. In 2010, the U.S. spent 39 percent more per full-time student for elementary and secondary education than the average for other countries in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, according to the National Center for Education Statistics. ∂ Yet, more money spent doesn’t translate to better educational outcomes. In fact, American education is rife with problems, starting with the gaping differences between white students and students of color: More than 60 years after Brown vs. Board of Education, school systems in the United States are separate and unequal. By 2022, the number of Hispanic students in public elementary and secondary schools is projected to grow 33 percent from the 2011 numbers. The number of multi-racial students is expected to grow 44 percent. ∂ As the percentage of white students in our education shrinks and the percentage of students of color grow, the U.S. will be left with an education system that doesn't serve the majority of its children properly; the gaps in education will prove especially problematic.∂ As with those areas, many factors contribute to disparities in education. Lower wealth, lower health, lower parental education levels, more dealings with the justice system and other circumstances create a perfect storm that leaves blacks without the same educational opportunities as whites.

### Title I implementation flaws

#### Title I flawed vehicle for instructional problems

**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)

2. Profession of teaching. A second chief and related challenge to improved instruction has arisen from the key profession in schools— teaching. Weaknesses in instructional practice have arisen from several sources. As American public schooling developed throughout the nine- teenth and early twentieth centuries, the job requirements for entry to the occupation were typically modest, as was preservice education and state-legislature oversight of this feature of higher education. These weaknesses persisted through the post-WWII decades. Most teachers reported that their preservice education was little help to them in class- rooms, and few institutions of higher education tried to promote deep content knowledge among elementary school educators in the subjects they would later teach. For Title I, the legacy of weak teacher educa- tion has meant that the general education program upon which many supplemental Title I services are built has been typically weak as well.13 Title I, in other words, layers on top of this uneven and weak profes- sion.14

#### Title 1 falls short—lack of improvement in instruction or state capacity proves

**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)

In conclusion, consistent with path-dependence expressed else- where in the American delegated and submerged state, state building through Title I has continued on the dimensions already established, such as augmenting the capacity of state-level governments to hold local educational agencies accountable, and reinforcing the capacity for congeries of nongovernmental organizations to provide the core technology of instructional programs (such as curriculum, texts, tests, and professional development). The problem for state building, thus, was not simply the overall lack of capacity to implement Title I. State building has continued to develop along well-established paths. Problems for state building instead have emerged with respect to the creation and support of new dimensions in the existing delegated and submerged state, in particular, improvements in instructional prac- tice that cultivate ambitious teaching that treats all children like active sense-makers. These dimensions are relatively rare in intermediaries’ established repertoires and collide with aspects of their established in- terests. State building on these new dimensions has been rendered all the more challenging in the context of persistently unequal allocation of educational resources, rising income inequality, and the lack of as- sistance from other forms of American social and economic policy.∂ Assessing Title I from the perspective of the delegated and sub- merged state, thus, does more than explain Title I’s mixed legacy of cultivating various forms of relatively strong accountability on the one hand, but producing relatively weak effects on aspects of instructional improvement on the other. It also highlights the fundamentally con- ditional nature of the concept of state capacity. State capacity is not a fixed attribute, something we can determine counting bodies in ad- ministrative offices and measuring budgets alone. State capacity instead depends on the scope of the national goal, on the capacities of im- plementing intermediaries upon which the state can draw, and on the social and economic context in which it subsists. Title I has done much to create new authorities and responsibilities for states, districts, and nongovernmental entities. But this expanded scope and responsibility of governance did not build significant capacity to redress some of the problems that Title I inherited, including weak teacher education and fundamentally unequal school finance. Nor did it build sufficient ca- pacity in the context of rising income inequality, which makes Title I’s goal of closing the achievement gap a moving target that is all the more difficult to achieve.

### Federal action fails – inequality

#### Flaws in accountability, state-building, and the political economy currently hamper federal education regulation

**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)

Among less affluent communities, where local resources are either thin or nonexistent, a different kind of disenfranchisement of the local educational actor has taken place. While in many poor communities the continuing and grotesque denial of a quality education to mostly minority and poor children is often linked to low expectations for those children, it is also linked to the contexts in which those children learn. One particularly salient context in poorer districts is the capacity and skill set of the teaching force. Unfortunately, the accountability mecha- nism established by the federal government through NCLB did little to address the capacity question, leaving both teachers and students pun- ished for underperformance but without recourse to a local entity that could, potentially, address these issues. The result was a disempowering of both teachers and community members.∂ All of this is not to say that there should not be a federal role in education or a federal floor to guarantee a quality education for all children. My point is simply that because the development of ESEA has led federal policy makers to discount both the political economy of schooling (the material contexts of schooling) and the processes by which community members and parents validate local educational goals (the aims of schooling), ESEA has produced an awkward kind of state-building, one that is hard pressed to produce better educational outcomes. ESEA’s initial ambitions were—in an educational sense— quite modest. Those changed over the course of the last twenty years to a more robust and vigorous state presence, but policy makers neglected to address the political economy of schooling or the space in which local actors legitimate educational practices and policies. Because of these oversights, the gulf between federal ambitions and local realities will persist, and most likely grow larger.

**increase federal control unsuccessful – political economy and legitimacy of education policies insulated from federal control means no solvency**

**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)

The challenges of educational governance are also highlighted by a glance at the long-running stalemate in Congress over simply reautho- rizing the existing federal education policy. The passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in December 2015 does not really resolve the impasse over the nature of educational reform and governance in the United States; it simply shifts the debate away from the federal level and back to the states.4∂ To make these two simple observations about educational gov- ernance is to highlight the fragmented nature of what I have called elsewhere “the education state.”5 At best, the education state—which ESEA helped birth—is a hybrid of partially fused local, state, and federal actors rarely working in unison, and sometimes openly at odds with one another. The education state has been built through the coercive power of the federal government as it sought to make more equal the educa- tional opportunities of whites and racial minorities, students with special needs, and students whose first language is not English. It has also been built by ESEA’s Title I efforts to direct more educational resources to children in poverty. Over the past twenty years, however, those coer- cive efforts by the federal authorities to create more equal educational opportunities have shifted away from educational inputs and focused on improving student performance on standardized tests and seeking comparable outcomes for students in different demographic groups.∂ The central argument of this essay focuses on how ESEA and the rise of federal authority over public education exhibit the hallmarks of state-building, but in a peculiar form. In short, the construction of the education state has fostered greater standardization of educational goals, expectations, and even pedagogies, but the process is bedeviled by the incomplete control of the federal government over two central aspects of schooling: the political economy of public education and the processes by which educational policies are legitimated. Without sufficient authority over both those domains, the federal government’s aspirations in public education will be at best incomplete and contested. This essay offers some thoughts on how this not only reflects certain distinctive elements of American state-building, but also reveals a pro- found contradiction at the heart of the American commitment to public education—a contradiction with tragic consequences.

#### Federal regulation of education spurs inequality—shortcomings of ESEA and focus on test scores 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)

If standardization is a hallmark of state-building, ESEA launched a policy dynamic that effectively standardized many elements of the U.S. educational system. But it has been a peculiar form of state-building, a process that neglects two central functions of the state, at least within democratic political orders: (1) the consolidation and control over state expenditures and (2) the maintenance of the processes by which policies are legitimated.∂ With little control over the flow of educational money at the state and local level, the federal government, ultimately, is limited in its abil- ity to directly order changes to the U.S. educational system. ESEA came into being in the context of an educational system that had existed and thrived through state and local revenues. At the same time, that edu- cational system had generated enormous resource inequalities, particu- larly for African-American students and poor students. The dismantling of Jim Crow addressed, partially, the systematic and formal exclusion of African-American students from local educational resources, but it was not until ESEA’s Title I program that federal policies addressed poor students. Title I, in particular, was seen as an add-on and a supplement to the existing structure of educational finance, and the federal gov- ernment took great steps to ensure that federal money supplemented rather than supplanted local and state resources. However, the funda- mental mechanism for funding schools in the United States was left wholly unchallenged by ESEA: local revenues (which stem primar- ily from property tax receipts and which vary considerably by school district and county) has provided roughly 55–40% of all educational spending from 1965 to today.9 The federal government’s contribution to educational spending, by contrast, peaked at 10 percent of educa- tional revenues in the midst of the Great Recession and has hovered at roughly 8–9% over the past two decades.∂ This pattern of educational spending, in the context of NCLB and now the Common Core, highlights a deep irony in the political develop- ment of the federal role in public education. The federal government’s role was, initially, to provide additional resources to address, albeit im- perfectly, the circumstances of students (and schools) in poverty. As the federal role shifted from inputs to outputs, it began to require that all schools—regardless of their resource base—hit the same test score benchmarks, or suffer profound consequences.

#### Administrative focus of implementation decreases effectiveness of title I

**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)

1. Disproportionate development in administrative capacity over instructional support. One inherited problem arises from the disproportionate growth of government capacity in areas such as fi- nance, administration, and various forms of accountability relative to the capacity to guide, inform, and improve instruction. Many state ed- ucation agencies added staff in finance, administration, assessment, and other areas through the first six decades of the twentieth century, but they added much less in the core domains of schooling, such as curricu- lum, teacher education, and instructional support.8 Title I infused new money into state departments of education, but largely built on state de- partments’ administrative foundations.9 Relying on intermediaries has meant that Title I has been implemented in organizations at the state level that had more capacity and resources devoted to administrative oversight than instruction. Title I’s ability to develop fiscal account- ability mechanisms in the 1970s were consistent with this tradition that focused on administration as distinct from instructional practice.

## Comparability loophole – specific

#### Compliance with federal requirements not driver of inequality in 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)

This study contributes to understanding of educational inequality in a number of ways. Consistent with prior analyses (e.g., Card & Payne, 2002), we show that inequality in school resource allocation is primarily caused by disparities across states and across districts within states, while funding is more evenly distributed within school districts on average. This pattern holds regardless of whether districts face federal regulation through the Comparability Rule, suggesting that districts likely have alternate incentives to allocate resources equitably across schools beyond compliance with federal policy. For example, given studies that show lower- achieving and lower-income students benefit more from additional resources that provide, for example, lower class sizes or other programs that may improve teacher retention (Knight, 2015; Ronfeldt, Loeb & Wyckoff, 2014), district leaders may choose to target more resources to higher need schools. Additionally, many states regulate district resource allocation across schools (Picus & Odden, 2015).

## Portability – specific

### Turn – results in decrease funding for Title I schools – 1nc

#### Portability would decrease funding for Title I schools

Gordon, Associate of the National bureau of Education, 17 (Nora Gordon; Associate Professor at Georgetown University McCourt School of Public Policy and Research Associate of the National Bureau of Education; Economic Studies at Brookings; <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/es_20170223_gordon_evidence_speaks1.pdf>; “What Title I portability would mean for the distribution of federal education aid”; 2-23-2017//7-3-2017/GDI/ CH)

Congressional attempts in the last few years to allow states to divert their Title I funds through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act into vouchers that would follow individual poor students to the public or private schools of their choice—Title I “portability”—were unsuccessful. Such vouchers are now a far more politically realistic possibility. It seems most likely that policy choices around vouchers would be made at the state level. While this reassured many senators during Secretary DeVos’ confirmation process, it may not reassure those at the local level. Current Title I rules allow school districts to concentrate their federal funds in their poorest schools, while under a portability state option, school districts would be forced to distribute those funds uniformly per poor pupil. This shift in allocation rules means that portability would affect the distribution of funds not only across districts, but also within them—and that this shift would happen among public schools even in districts where few, if any, students chose to take Title I funds to private schools.

### Decrease funding for Title I school – 2nc

#### Portabilty decreases resources and undermines programs that benefit kids

Kemmer, a 4th grade advanced studies/GATE teacher in the Los Angeles Unified School District and has served as Title I coordinator,  2015

(Misti, “Why title one portability does not make sense”, The Hill , November 23 2015, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/education/260969-why-title-i-portability-does-not-make-sense>, GDI-TFW)

As both a teacher in Los Angeles Unified School District and a mother of two school-aged children, I am particularly interested in negotiations between the House and the Senate on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the possibility of Title I[portability](http://www.educationdive.com/news/esea-portability-clause-distressing-to-many/408361/) making it into the final bill. Those that support portability would allow students to transfer to higher performing, often more affluent schools outside their neighborhoods with funding following the student to their new school in such a scenario. On paper, such an idea appears to make sense. But in the real world, in real schools, moving money does little more than deplete funding from already high-need schools that use such resources to offer student and, sometimes their families, essential services they cannot afford on their own. I teach in the heart of South Los Angeles, just blocks from where Rodney King and the OJ Simpson trial enflamed citizens to the point of uprising.  The unfortunately infamous neighborhood has many struggles, but the elementary school where I work is a place full of dedicated teachers and staff.  The children I work with are bright, enthusiastic learners.  If you walked into a classroom, you’d see the colorful walls full of student art and writing samples that you would see at any school. Thankfully, most students are blissfully unaware of the behind-the-scenes troubles at the school, such as, not enough computers for all students or the lack of books in every classroom. They don’t even seem to notice how we have no assemblies or “extras” for them. They are used to seeing homeless sleeping at the gates of the school in the morning.  They do not seem to notice that our playground has no netting on the basketball hoops, no net on the volleyball court, and not an inch of grass.  Graffiti covered buildings and walls on their walk home are perfectly normal.  They are just kids being kids, going to school everyday. A mere freeway ride away, my own child goes to school at a place where parents volunteer to work with struggling students.  There are ample computers and iPads to meet the rigors of new testing requirements, and nearly all funds for those items came from parent donations and PTA fundraising.  Most students at my child’s school have internet access at home and many have tutoring after school from one of the many establishments in my neighborhood.  My son has login names memorized for more than a few web-based learning programs the school encourages parents to use at home. Almost all school supplies are bought by parents through a program that fundraises money to the school and most parents buy additional supplies for any students without. When I go to work, I enter an entirely different world.  I have no parents that can volunteer because many work two jobs to put food on the table.  My 30 students compete for time with the one school-issued iPad in my class.  We have 6 laptops, more than any other class in the school, but the software is so outdated many programs no longer function.  There is no PTA.  School supplies must be purchased completely with Title I dollars and most teachers have no expectation that students will bring their own supplies.  e know many cannot afford it. I have worked at my school for 11 years, and I have yet to see a tutoring location anywhere near the campus.  The majority of my students have no Internet access at home. When I switch between my two worlds, I cannot help but look at language around [the House’s version of the ESEA rewrite](https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/5) and ask, how can anyone think portability is a good idea?  Just a few years ago, before Americans saw a budget crisis after the economic downturn of 2008, and we used Title I funds to give free tutoring to students.  We had the funds to provide after school interventions classes.  We were able to use Title I funds to hire additional teachers in impacted grade levels to lower class sizes.  With adequate funding, we are able to do great work to help out our kids. The portability clause in the [Student Success Act](https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/5/text#toc-H4124959A38874203BB0DDF57E03AF14A) would only further drain much needed funds from our students who need it most - schools that have a high concentration of students in poverty - and give it to schools that are much richer in resources. As Congress moves forward on reauthorizing ESEA, my hope is that the original intent of ESEA is taken to heart at the negotiation table.  [ESEA was originally a piece of civil rights legislation](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2014/01/08/everything-you-need-to-know-about-the-war-on-poverty/)meant to help level the playing field for kids in poverty, like my own students. Legislators who pen the conference bill must remember this purpose and the students who Title I is meant to aid. Portability does nothing but dilute much-needed funds to the schools and students who need it the most.

### Portability undermines school wide programming – 1nc

#### School wide programming hurt by scarce resources – portability decreases school control over provision of quality education

Pudeleski, AASA assistant director of policy and advocacy, 2015

(Sasha, "Title one portability: A white paper", AASA (School Superintendents Association, January 2015, <https://www.aasa.org/uploadedFiles/Policy_and_Advocacy/files/AASAPortabilityWhitePaperJan2015.pdf>, GDI-TFW)

Title I Portability is an attempt to limit local school district administrators’ ability to effectively target federal resources to at-risk students in their community. Since 1965, federal funds have been distributed to states and then directly to school districts to provide coordinated programs and services to groups of academically struggling, low-income students. Under current law, districts can concentrate the funding into specific schools—typically elementary—in order to maximize the services and professionals provided to eligible students in those schools. For example, if 75% of students in an elementary school are Title I eligible and a majority of these students are below proficient in reading, the school district can use Title I funds to provide a trained reading specialist, a new reading curriculum and books that would benefit all students in the school. But under a portability schema, the dollars would no longer flow directly to districts to craft a comprehensive program for improving academic achievement for eligible students within a high-poverty school. Instead, districts would be required to ensure that Title I funds were spent on “something” that could benefit every eligible student in the district regardless of the school he attends or his need for services. With the current funding levels of Title I unchanged, portability would result in less effective and fewer comprehensive services for all Title I eligible students. The district would still have to provide some form of academic assistance to each eligible student, but it’s unlikely the quality or quantity would be the same as when the funds were invested in providing a comprehensive academic program for groups of eligible students. It is both complex and inefficient to parse out pieces of the Title I program into a single, quantifiable service or good that can “follow the child” to other schools .

### Portability undermines school wide programming – 2nc

#### Limited effective control over targeting resources

Pudeleski, AASA assistant director of policy and advocacy, 2015

(Sasha, "Title one portability: A white paper", AASA (School Superintendents Association, January 2015, <https://www.aasa.org/uploadedFiles/Policy_and_Advocacy/files/AASAPortabilityWhitePaperJan2015.pdf>, GDI-TFW)

Title I Portability Would Decrease the Effectiveness of Title I Services and Undermine Local Educational Authority Allowing Title I dollars to be targeted towards groups of struggling students at the start of their academic career provides the best return on the federal investment in our schools, which is why the bulk of Title I services and professionals are committed to serving students in elementary school. If Title I funding increased substantially, districts could provide additional, higher-quality services to students outside the elementary and middle school grades. The perpetual underfunding of Title I means the program doesn’t provide enough for schools to serve all Title I students. Left to ensure that limited Title I dollars are invested effectively, many districts target their funds on the early elementary years. This practice of focusing on the early grades is also in part attributable to the challenges of providing Title I services to students in the later grades, as schedules and credit requirements are more specific and intensive. Students in need of academic support in later grades certainly still receive academic support services, but these supports are paid for by local and state funding and are typically less far-reaching than what elementary school students receive. Title I portability requirements undermine the educational expertise of school administrators, who are best positioned to decide how to target Title I funding in ways that would provide the greatest return on the federal investment. Portability provisions that require Title I dollars to follow a child would require districts to spend more money on high school students than may be feasible or appropriate. Since the overall pot of federal Title I dollars is constant, academically struggling students in elementary school would receive less supports and services even if they could benefit more from these supports than their high school peers. School administrators are best positioned to decide how to target Title I funding in ways that would provide the greatest return on the federal investment. However, portability provisions that require Title I dollars to follow a child would undermine their ability to make these decisions. Funds would go equally to high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools, regardless of level of student need or the feasibility of providing those services. Unfortunately, it is already difficult for most districts to provide the type and intensity of services students need because of the scarcity of Title I funds and the number of students who qualify for Title I. A per-pupil funding basis would further limit services students receive and reduce investments in the deeper, earlier academic interventions that produce the greatest return.

### Portability fails – general

#### Title 1 portability fails and disadvantages low-income students—obstacles to school choice prove

**McEachin,** Associate Policy Researcher, RAND Corporation, **et al. 2015**

(Andrew, “How School Choice Could Disadvantage Low-Income Students”, RAND Corporation, September 1, 2015, <https://www.rand.org/blog/2015/09/how-school-choice-could-disadvantage-low-income-students.html>, accessed 7/8/17, GDI-JG)

So, what is driving the returned focus on Title I portability? The federal attention to the issue reflects a broader political movement at the state level over the past decade to use public funds to allow students to attend schools of choice. Legislation passed in North Carolina and Nevada are recent examples. Many advocates of school choice support portability as a way for families to access schooling options that would not otherwise be available to them.∂ However, research shows that voucher-like school choice policies often face a number of constraints, many of which would occur under the proposed Title I portability policies. School choice policies are predicated on the assumption that parents have enough information to make an informed decision on where to send their children. However, the vast majority of school districts do not provide families with robust school quality information — in part because school quality is difficult to measure and portray clearly to parents and students. Even districts with large choice programs, like Denver and New Orleans, often struggle to provide families with the information they need to make optimal decisions. Research also shows that districts don't always do a good job of disseminating information and explaining options to certain groups — low-income parents and those whose children are first-generation Americans, for example.∂ Furthermore, school choice policies also assume that students have the means to get to their desired school. If families do not have the flexibility to drive children across the city, or schools do not provide busing, research shows that school choice options alone will not help families access better schools. Research also suggests that many parents prefer to send their children to schools in their neighborhood and that they would rather have higher-quality neighborhood schools than the option to send their students to high-quality schools elsewhere.∂ The use of public funds to provide both public and private school choice options is not a new idea (philosopher John Stuart Mill wrote about it in the 1800s), and it does have intuitive appeal. Federal policymakers interested in pursuing portability or other methods to expand school choice should also consider ways to ensure that families have enough information and support to make informed decisions and the help they may need to implement those decisions.∂ Policymakers must realize that not all families will be able to take advantage of choice, whether because of family circumstances or limits on the capacity of schools to accept new students. Furthermore, policymakers should carefully consider the potential unintended consequences of reducing federal funding for schools serving large shares of the nation's most vulnerable students.∂ While portability has a certain immediate appeal, it could have negative consequences for some of the poorest students. Policymakers seeking to expand school choice should recognize the complexity of the issue and be sure to address both the advantages and disadvantages of these policies.

#### Title one portability hurts local educational authority – and planning for interventions for at risk students

Pudeleski, AASA assistant director of policy and advocacy, 2015

(Sasha, "Title one portability: A white paper", AASA (School Superintendents Association, January 2015, <https://www.aasa.org/uploadedFiles/Policy_and_Advocacy/files/AASAPortabilityWhitePaperJan2015.pdf>, GDI-TFW)

Title I Portability Would Destabilize District Financial Planning Resulting in Less Effective Services for Students

If meaningfully significant groups of students leave one school within the district for another school, then successful budgeting for how to best deliver a Title I program would be compromised. Unlike Congress, school districts must pass budgets on time and they typically complete their budgeting process far in advance of the start of the next school year. This means that decisions are made well in advance about professionals to hire or maintain, professional development to conduct, technology purchases to make and how to generally administer the district’s Title I dollars in Targeted Assistance or Schoolwide schools. If portability becomes wide spread, in addition to the previously outlined issues, the process will create more chaos for schools as they would be unable to plan their program with sufficient time to ensure success. Specifically, programs for disadvantaged children require teachers who are well trained, class sizes that reflect their special needs as well as materials that are needed to support their learning. All of these points require planning. The more variability that exists in individual classroom and school funding streams, the less able the district is to effectively plan for services and professionals to assist students. Districts currently operate by budgeting and planning in a conservative manner since school year budgets are developed in the spring of the prior school year before federal, and sometimes state, allocations are set. Superintendents typically build the budget to reflect the most accurate counts of students in each school for that school year. However, with Title I portability, large or statistically meaningful groups of students could transfer at the beginning of the school year or over the summer and their Title I dollars would follow them to the school of their choice. This means that district financial officers would have to budget even more conservatively since they would not want to risk hiring additional staff or providing professional development that could compromise the district’s financial or legal obligations. Once federal and state funding was known or distributed, a district could then add to the funding streams allocated to each school to serve Title I students. Adding professionals who can provide instructional strategies directly to students is the most effective way to improve Title I students’ outcomes. Unfortunately, it would be highly unlikely that the district could add professionals to assist students once school began and student enrollment data was finalized since adding new professionals can be disruptive to both student and teacher schedules and class loads. This means that instead of putting Title I dollars towards direct services for students, the district would likely spend the Title I dollars in a less effective manner for students, which would cripple the ability of school personnel to assist all students in meeting challenging state academic standards.

### Portability ends Title I

#### Portability hurts low-income students the most- more targeting is needed to support them

Marchitello, Center for American Progress Policy Analyst, and Hanna, CAP Senior Policy Analyst, 15 (Max and Robert, "Robin Hood in Reverse", Center for American Progress, 2-4-15, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/02/04/105896/robin-hood-in-reverse/, 7-14-17, GDI-EC)

On the other hand, it has been long recognized that low-income students need additional resources and support to have an equal opportunity for success in college and career. Moreover, low-income students attending school with high concentrations of similarly economically disadvantaged students need even more support to overcome the burdens and barriers erected by poverty. Title I is how the federal government attempts to meet its obligation to these students. This targeted approach has helped ensure that low-income students do in fact receive more resources and support and that their right to a high-quality education is protected. More targeting, not less, is the appropriate policy response to our country’s growing student poverty.

Under portability, each low-income student is provided with the same allocation of federal funds. As a result, the marginal increases in funding that current law provides to students as a district’s poverty level increases have been eliminated. Simply put, this funding system ignores the fact that concentrated poverty has a significant negative impact on students beyond their own economic circumstances. Ultimately, portability weakens the ability of Title I dollars to combat the adverse effects of poverty.

#### Portability alters all title I calculations, undermining intent of the law

**NCPE – 2015**

(NCPE = national coalition for public education, “NCPE opposes title one portability measures”, January 13, 2015 <https://www.au.org/files/2015-01-13%20NCPE%20Statement%20on%20Portability%20of%20Title%20I%20Funds.pdf>, GDI-TFW)

To fulfill congressional intent, today’s Title I funds are given directly to school districts to provide coordinated programs and services to groups of academically struggling, low-income students**. Portability would completely change the formula for distributing money to districts and schools, and eliminate the concept of Title I-eligible schools altogether.** The state would be able to fully disregard—and school districts then denied the ability to address—the unique needs of schools and communities with a concentration of students in poverty when distributing Title I funds throughout the state. Instead, the funds would be allocated on a per-student basis. This dilutes the effect of these limited federal funds on combatting concentrations of poverty. Portability Would Undermine the Ability of Educators to Target Federal Funds to the Neediest Students Portability would make Title I programs incredibly inefficient and undercut attempts to effectively support learning and achievement outcomes for high-need students. Districts would be severely hindered in their ability to effectively use federal funding to address the academic needs of students resulting from systemic poverty in their neighborhoods and communities. Further, it would make it difficult for districts to target federal dollars toward groups of students who most need services and supports and who could most benefit from an early investment of additional federal resources. Under current law, districts make local decisions about how to best use the Title I funding they receive, including deciding to “pool” Title I funding so that the highest poverty schools in the district receive the funds. This allows Title I-eligible schools to operate school-level programs of sufficient size and scale to improve academic achievement. For decades districts have chosen to invest their Title I funds primarily in their highest poverty elementary schools because addressing student learning needs at the earliest age possible produces the greatest return on investment. Portability would divest local school districts of important decision making authority – including the decision to “pool” funds—that would have a direct, and often negative, effect on learning opportunities for high-need students in those districts. Currently, districts can also further target their federal dollars toward specific students within a school based on their academic needs. This means a student who enters first grade with little to no prior schooling would have access to more Title I services and professionals than his or her peers who are not as academically challenged. If, however, Title I portability became law, a district could not plan to dedicate more Title I dollars to high-need students in the same way.

#### Portability harms poorest districts- inequitable distribution of funds

Marchitello, Center for American Progress Policy Analyst, and Hanna, CAP Senior Policy Analyst, 15 (Max and Robert, "Robin Hood in Reverse", Center for American Progress, 2-4-15, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/02/04/105896/robin-hood-in-reverse/, 7-14-17, GDI-EC)

Chairman Alexander’s bill takes a different and harmful tack and actually dismantles the targeting of Title I. His proposal provides states with the option of opting out of the current system of Title I funding for schools. Instead of following the current formulas, states would distribute to all districts the same amount per student simply based on the total number of children in low-income families. This approach is sometimes referred to as “portability.” It is unclear how many states would exercise this option. However, considering wealthier school districts receive less federal support but often have greater political capital, it is possible that some states may feel considerable pressure to use portability to distribute their Title I, Part A, funds.

Using the fiscal year 2014 allocations for school districts, the Center for American Progress analyzed the impact that portability would have had on students last year. We compared how much districts would have received under portability with how much they actually received under current policy. In our analysis, we made the following key findings:

Portability actually drives resources away from high-poverty districts and into more affluent ones.

Nationally, districts with high concentrations of poverty could lose an average of around $85 per student.

On average, the most affluent districts could gain more than $290 per student.

If all states opted into this new system, school districts with a poverty rate of more than 30 percent would lose money, while districts with a poverty rate of under 15 percent would see dramatic increases in funding. This is illustrated in Figure 1 below. In total, the poorest school districts would lose more than $675 million, while the lowest-poverty districts would gain more than $440 million.

### Portability won’t solve inequality

#### Portability won’t address inequality – and will increase the risk of outflow of money to private schools

**Sunderman 2014**

(Gail, "NEPC Review: Federal School Finance Reform: Moving Toward Title I Funding Following the Child", National Education Policy Center, November 6, 2014, http://nepc.colorado.edu/thinktank/review-title-1-reason-foundation, GDI - TFW)

Portability (letting the money follow the child) is a policy proposal developed and supported by conservative think tanks and interest groups critical of the track record of federal categorical programs; it dates to the 1990s.5 This report repeats many of the arguments typically made by supporters of portability and of greater flexibility from federal requirements. These include the claim that federal programs lead to bloated bureaucracies that do not serve their intended beneficiaries and that portability will empower parents and create incentives for public schools to improve. Generally, however, 4 of 6 portability proposals, including those made in this report, do not explain how portability will improve instruction in Title I schools. One of the ironies of this report is that while the aim of Title I is to improve funding inequities between Title I and non-Title I schools, the report’s recommendation that the money follow the child is likely to exacerbate existing inequities between schools within the same district rather than improve them. This is because portability would permit federal Title I funds to flow out of the public system to private schools. It is not clear from the report how portability would improve student performance, particularly that of students in Title I schools. This is significant since the report cites the poor performance of Title I schools as a reason for reforming Title I funding. The portability proposal is not tied to public school reform and does not address other inequities between schools, such as the inequities in the distribution of teachers between schools referred to in the report. Finally, funding public schools, and Title I funding, are much more complex than the report suggests. For one, choices about how Title I funding is allocated to schools are local decisions, and Title I funding is just one element of how schools are funded. For example, the report argues that allowing districts to average salaries across the district when reporting school level expenditures does little to address funding inequities between schools. However, making Title I portable does not address this inequity, which arises from the way districts develop their budgets much more than from Title I requirements. Some districts are beginning to adopt alternative budgeting policies that allow for more equitable and rational allocation of funds among students.6 These include student-based budgeting and weighted student funding, where budgets for schools are based on its mix of students, rather than on the number of staff positions per student. These practices also give principals more flexibility in budgeting, one of the stated goals of this report. Federal elementary and secondary education funding remains modest, accounting for about 9% of all education spending; therefore its ability to equalize education spending is limited. However, the report does not report the level of federal elementary and secondary funding, and instead reports how federal funds are distributed across programs. This shows that Title I accounts for about 39% of total federal elementary and secondary education expenditures. While correct, this can be misleading, since it ignores the Title I portion of total federal elementary and secondary education expenditures. While the supplement-not-supplant and the comparability requirements may affect how states and districts allocate Title I funds to schools, there is also evidence that funding gaps among states are larger than funding gaps within states, with wealthier, higher-spending states receiving a disproportionate share of Title I funds.7

#### Transportation issues currently hamper steps towards school choice

**Chingos,** Senior Fellow, Urban Institute, Director, Education Policy Program, Urban Institute, **and Blagg,** Research Associate, Urban Institute, **2017**

(Matthew M. and Kristin, “Who could benefit from school choice? Mapping access to public and private schools”, Brookings Institution, Evidence Speaks Reports, Vol 2, #12, March 30, 2017, https://www.brookings.edu/research/who-could-benefit-from-school-choice-mapping-access-to-public-and-private-schools/, accessed 7/14/17, GDI-JG)

Perhaps the most important implication of figure 5 is that the distance families are able and willing to travel may be more important for expanding school choice than the type of school the policy provides access to. For example, expanding distance from one mile to five more than doubles the number of families who could gain access to a choice of at least two public schools under an intradistrict choice policy. The same is true for private school choice.∂ This is easier said than done, as travel time is costly. We estimate that the average difference between a school within two miles and a school within two to five miles is roughly six additional driving minutes for families in both rural and urban areas. Because many school districts provide transportation to a student’s neighborhood school, but not to a district choice school or to a private school, this transportation hurdle could be even higher.[6] Research based on data from Washington, DC, which does not provide yellow bus transportation to most students, indicates that parents are willing to choose an elementary school that has proficiency rates that are 11 percentage lower if the school is one mile closer to them.[7]

### Portability doesn’t solve marginalization

#### **All school choice does for marginalized students is let them choose where they will be marginalized – not a realistic solution**

**Nelson**, Boston University, **2017** (Steven, “School Choice and School Desegregation: An Attempt to Serve Two Masters?” Boston University, Winter 2017 (Boston University Public Interest Law Journal) p. 11, Accessed 7/14/17, GDI – JPA)

Two Masters: Integration Ideals and Client Interests in School Desegregation Litigation, Professor Derrick Bell describes how serving the interests of individual clients is juxtaposed with the interests of civil rights attorneys in pursuing an agenda to eradicate segregation in all public places. n283 Bell's paper identifies the potential conflicts that arise when clients desire only educational effectiveness for Black children, whereas civil rights advocates desire broader system-level goals of desegregation. n284 This same conflict may affect the debate between school choice strategies and school desegregation strategies. School choice strategies may not accord well with the desegregation strategies and/or the desire of Black parents to improve the quality schools for their children.¶ Traditional civil rights groups, or those comprised of middle-class Blacks and Whites, dominated educational equity litigation. n285 These groups supported the integration agenda, notwithstanding the potential drawbacks to relying solely on integration to achieve educational equity. n286 They appear to have embraced the school choice/free market agenda. n287 Traditional civil rights groups have excelled at advocating for the school choice agenda, even if poorer, less privileged Blacks do not have similar interests. n288 These groups have historically failed to advocate for the interests of poorer Blacks; one need only look to the fact that traditional civil rights groups were silent regarding festering issues of mass incarceration while they focused on affirmative action. n289 They entered the national discussion of police brutality when the issue arrived, [\*71] undeniably, to middle class Blacks. Bell notes several examples of Black Americans rejecting desegregation as the only remedy for the ills of racial subordination of Blacks in education. n290 Anecdotally, some poor Black Americans in Northern Mississippi have sought segregated schools. n291 This fact is evidence that Black Americans do not wholesale believe in desegregation as the panacea to racial subordination in schools. Nevertheless, the response to this choice, questioning the Black parents' motives, is evidence that Black parents do not, in fact, have the choice to attempt to minimize the amount of racial subordination that their children incur.¶ The same shortcoming befalls both the school choice and school desegregation movements. As Professor Bell stated, policies "are not sufficiently directed at the real evil of pre-Brown public schools: the state-sponsored subordination of Blacks in every aspect of the educational process." n292 Essentially, Black students will not necessarily learn more if Black parents enroll them in predominately White schools. n293 Likewise, Black students will not necessarily learn more if Black parents are simply allowed to choose which schools Black students attend. This is especially the case if school choice does not offer better educational options for Black students.¶ To overcome the obstacles of racial oppression in the educational system, civil rights advocates must attack all policies that result in racial subordination. n294 It is not enough to merely mask efforts at racial subordination in the educational system by negligibly altering how and where Black students and their parents are marginalized and disenfranchised in the system. n295 Professor Bell reiterated this idea by predicting the development of the school-to-prison pipeline. n296 He argued that higher discipline rates and lower academic achievement might be the results of school desegregation efforts that failed to address broader policies, resulting in continued racial subordination for Black students. n297 The predictions have come to fruition in both the contexts of school desegregation n298 and school choice. n299

#### Vouchers destabilize schools and communities – especially marginalized students

**Campbell and Brown**, Directory of innovation for K-12 schools CFAP. VP of Education policy CFAP. **2017**

(Neil, Catherine. “Vouchers Are Not a Viable Solution for Vast Swaths of America” Center for American Progress, 3/3/17. (Center for American Progress) Accessed 7/10/17, GDI - JPA)

President Donald Trump oﬀered one major K-12 education proposal during the presidential campaign: a $20 billion plan that would reprioritize existing federal education funds to¶ provide vouchers for private-school choice. And with his selection of Betsy DeVos as secretary of education, who has been referred to as the “four-star general of the pro-voucher movement,” he signaled the seriousness with which he intends to pursue this idea as a solution to what Trump has called “failing government schools” and DeVos has called a “dead end” public education system.¶ Much has been written about the devastating impact such a proposal would have on local communities, since $20 billion would subsume most federal K-12 education spending. Currently, that spending is speciﬁcally targeted to low-income students, students with disabilities, English language learners, and other vulnerable children. But little has been written about the fact that the proposal misses the mark when it comes to the real challenges facing the vast majority of school districts across the country. The simple fact is that most rural and suburban areas are either sparsely populated or organized in small districts where there are not enough schools for vouchers to be a viable or eﬀective policy solution. In these districts, vouchers would be not just ineﬀective, but they could also dramatically destabilize public school systems and communities.

# Off case

## Topicality

### T – increase v comparability loophole

#### Increase requires a net increase

Words and Phrases 8

(20B W&P – 265-265)

Cal.App.2 Dist. 1991. Term “increase,” as used in statute giving the Energy Commission modification jurisdiction over any alteration, replacement, or improvement of equipment that results in “increase” of 50 megawatts or more in electric generating capacity of existing thermal power plant, refers to “net increase” in power plant’s total generating capacity; in deciding whether there has been the requisite 50-megawatt increase as a result of new units being incorporated into a plant, Energy Commission cannot ignore decreases in capacity caused by retirement or deactivation of other units at plant. West’s Ann.Cal.Pub.Res.Code § 25123.

#### Plan closes a loophole they don’t result in a net increase in regulations

#### Vote neg - Predictable limits and ground – our links and cp assume an net increase in the regulations. They can spike out of our DA and CP ground by arguing that they only stop abuses in the system not increasing the regulations.

### T – increase v meta formula reforms

#### Increase requires a net increase

Words and Phrases 8

(20B W&P – 265-265)

Cal.App.2 Dist. 1991. Term “increase,” as used in statute giving the Energy Commission modification jurisdiction over any alteration, replacement, or improvement of equipment that results in “increase” of 50 megawatts or more in electric generating capacity of existing thermal power plant, refers to “net increase” in power plant’s total generating capacity; in deciding whether there has been the requisite 50-megawatt increase as a result of new units being incorporated into a plant, Energy Commission cannot ignore decreases in capacity caused by retirement or deactivation of other units at plant. West’s Ann.Cal.Pub.Res.Code § 25123.

#### Plan changes formulas - they don’t result in a net increase in regulations or in funding

#### Vote neg - Predictable limits and ground – our links and cp assume an net increase in the regulations. They can spike out of our DA and CP ground by arguing that they only stop abuses in the system not increasing the regulations.

## Federalism

### Uniqueness – ESSA increasing state influence now

#### Uniqueness—states control school improvement initiatives now—ESSA proves

**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)

In recent years, a backlash against federally mandated testing and school accountability has reinforced demands that school improvement be left to the states. The December 2015 passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which reauthorized the long-standing Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), intended to return policy au-thority back to legislatures, governors, and state education agencies. With this act, the federal government reversed many of the policy requirements of the 2001 reauthorization of ESEA, known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), as well as subsequent NCLB waiver provisions made around teacher evaluation, testing, charter schools, curriculum stand-ards and school turnaround, and the Race to the Top competition. The federal government still requires states to test students in grades three through eight and in a high school grade, but they have much more leeway to judge results and decide what to do to improve schools. n1

#### Uniqueness—cooperative federalism manages education reform—the zeitgeist of No Child Left Behind proves

**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)

We have shown that states, with lingering influence of federal policy and greater analytic, bureaucratic, and policy capacity, are taking a great deal of initiative and borrowing ideas from one another. This is consistent with the ideal of cooperative federalism, which argues that states act independently but pay attention to one another's initiatives and imi-tate the most appealing ones. Of course, what is appealing can be defined in many ways; cooperative federalism can lead to the spread of ideas based on the politics or dominant ideology of the time rather than their ability to support improvements in student learning or reduce achievement gaps.∂ Based on the foregoing observations about policy feedback, we think it is safe to say that in the future few, if any, states will confine their roles to setting input requirements and funding levels. Consistent with the zeitgeist [\*319] of NCLB, at least some states will adopt positive leadership roles focused on improving education for all and reducing achievement gaps.

## Politics

### Politics – Comparability requiring salary equity unpopular

#### Closing comparability loophole by requiring salary equity unpopular

**Malkus,** Research Fellow, Education Policy Studies, American Enterprise Institute, **2016**

(Nat, “The Title I funding fight”, American Enterprise Institute, April 26, 2016, <http://www.aei.org/publication/the-title-i-funding-fight/>, accessed 7/8/17, GDI-JG)

Undaunted by these limitations, King and the Department of Education are leveraging “supplement, not supplant” to close the comparability loophole. The Every Student Succeeds Act prohibits the department from dictating the methodology by which districts allocate Title I funds, but allows the department to approve districts’ methodology. The Education Department is skirting the act’s prohibition on requiring “equalized spending” by allowing districts flexibility so long as Title I schools receive “at least as much in State and local funding as the average non-Title I school.” In other words, the rule does not require equalized spending, just equal or better. In this way, the Education Department’s new “supplement, not supplant” rule flouts the will of Congress by effectively closing the comparability loophole.∂ Alexander, and some rulemaking committee members, are incensed because this rule would be an enormous disruption in school districts across the nation. The rule could require billions in new funds, upend teacher compensation systems, break collective bargaining agreements, force districts to reallocate teachers across schools or all of the above. The potential shake up is enough to unite groups from governors to teachers unions, who signed a letter opposing the department’s rules.∂ Alexander’s outrage is appropriate because the Department of Education’s novel “supplement, not supplant” rule is undoubtedly an end run around the comparability provision in the Every Student Succeeds Act. It’s no small irony that the department is overreaching to accomplish what was not done in a legislative process that was focused in large part on curbing regular overreach by the Obama Department of Education. The further irony is that King defends a rule that runs counter to the will of this Congress by claiming it’s both within the letter of the new law and within the spirit of the original “supplement, not supplant” clause.∂ The comparability provision needs an enduring solution, but King’s overreach isn’t it. If the uncommonly broad opposition or the dubious legal footing weren’t enough to do away with it, this administration will soon be replaced with one unlikely to sustain this rule, be it Democratic or Republican. The hard truth is that there is insufficient support to fix Title I comparability, which is why the comparability provision is still in the Every Student Succeeds Act. Harder still is the fact that students attending Title I schools will continue to be shortchanged until a legislative solution succeeds.

### Politics – portability unpopular

**Plan raises multiple red flags** **with education organizations**

**Klein 2015**

(Alyson, “red flags raised on plan to let Title I aid follow students”, Education Week, February 3 2015, <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2015/02/04/red-flags-raised-on-plan-to-let.html>, GDI – TFW)

Education groups are fighting a proposal on Capitol Hill that would allow federal funding to follow disadvantaged students to the public schools of their choice—an idea that school district advocates see as a pit stop on the highway to Voucherville. The policy—known as "Title I portability"—is included in a draft bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act introduced by U.S. Sen. Lamar Alexander, the Tennessee Republican who chairs the Senate education committee. Under the proposal, which was also included in an ESEA renewal bill that passed the House of Representatives with only Republican support in 2013, states would have the option of allowing federal money for disadvantaged children to follow students to any public school. Politically, the provision could cost Sen. Alexander the support of some organizations that might otherwise embrace the overall push in the draft legislation to scale back the federal footprint on such matters as accountability, teacher quality, and school turnarounds. Part of the reason: Those education organizations see it as stalking horse for a full-fledged voucher program. "It's not a winner to try and throw a private school voucher in here," said Sasha Pudelski, the assistant director of policy and advocacy for AASA, the School Superintendents Association. "We are generally very confused as to why it is in the bill if it is truly a public school option and not a voucher." Ironically, the idea is also unpopular among some adamant school choice proponents, who say it doesn't go far enough—they want students to be able to use federal aid at private schools as well as public. Lindsey Burke, the Will Skillman fellow in education at the Heritage Foundation, a Washington think tank, wishes Mr. Alexander's draft were much bolder on school choice. "Conservatives have long worked toward Title I portability that would allow states to make their Title I dollars portable to public and private schooling options of choice," she said. "The current proposal would only allow Title I funds to follow a child to a public school of choice and, as such, is a missed opportunity." Funding Complexities Education finance experts wonder if the policy is even workable, given the complexities of the Red Flags Raised on Plan to Let Title I Aid Follow Students

### Politics – lobbying groups dislike portability

#### Major education groups opposed to portability

Marchitello, Center for American Progress Policy Analyst, and Hanna, CAP Senior Policy Analyst, 15 (Max and Robert, "Robin Hood in Reverse", Center for American Progress, 2-4-15, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/02/04/105896/robin-hood-in-reverse/, 7-14-17, GDI-EC)

CAP is not the first organization to point out that portability hurts the most-disadvantaged students. Recently, the American Association of School Administrators argued that portability eliminates the flexibility that current law affords it to decide on which grades to focus Title I resources. Instead, as a consequence of portability, districts might need to spend Title I money across all grades even if that approach would not be most effective for their students. The National Coalition for Public Education—which includes 50 organizations, including the Children’s Defense Fund and the National Urban League—has also written that portability would expand the amount of students served through Title I and result in the poorest districts getting less of overall Title I dollars.

## K links

### Neolib – see file

### Deschooling – see file

## States CP solvency – Title I

### States CP – solves teachers

#### States can solve gap themselves – increased funding, spent specifically on salaries would solve

**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)

No one was particularly surprised last month when a roomful of negotiators that included representatives of state, local and tribal leaders, teachers, parents, students and the civil rights community failed to reach agreement on one of the more contentious pieces of the new Every Student Succeeds Act. The issue that divided them so deeply was whether or not school districts need to make sure that schools serving children from low-income families get at least as much state and local funding as wealthier schools. Unfortunately, after three separate negotiating sessions spread over eight days, the two sides ended just about as far apart as they started.∂ Despite the gridlock, the Department of Education is right to tackle this problem head-on. The department has proposed something simple and powerful – that school districts have the responsibility to make sure that the students that need the most resources actually get them and that federal funding is truly supplemental for these students.∂ At its core, this issue is really about two questions. One, does money matter in education? And two, if money does matter, should the federal government make sure that poor schools get what they need?∂ There's a long-standing debate about that first question. But two recent studies are helping to tip the scales towards the view that money does make a difference, particularly for low-income students. Of course, how schools spend the money matters, too. Still, when across the country the poorest schools get on average around $1,200 less per student in state and local funding than wealthier schools, there's clearly a problem. Especially when these schools need up to 50 percent more funding to support their disadvantaged students.∂ No doubt, the problem is difficult. But it's solvable. In fact, if states and districts increased their spending on public schools just 1.5 percent and directed that money towards the neediest schools, the funding gap between rich and poor schools would close completely.∂ Another concern with requiring states and districts to address disparities is a perception that they will inevitably do so by forcing more veteran teachers to transfer. Underlying this concern is the fact that 80 percent of public school spending is allocated to salaries and benefits, and low-income schools often have a disproportionate number of new teachers who have lower salaries. Let's be clear: Forcing teachers to transfer schools is a bad idea. We cannot and must not treat teachers like machines that we shuttle from one factory to another – rather, we need to modernize and elevate the teaching profession.∂ There are numerous ways to get more resources to these schools. For example, districts can pay great teachers more when they choose to teach there, invest in wraparound services and extend the school day. By directing funding to these types of activities in schools serving low-income students, districts can raise spending – and achievement – in these schools without forcing teachers to transfer.

#### States key to funding levels and distribution – federal regulations limited utility

**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 the DOE continues the process of negotiated rulemaking, federal policymakers will need to determine whether any federal regulations will govern the supplement-not-supplant rule, of if the methodology for determining compliance will be left up to individual states. The DOE’s ultimate goal of providing students with equitable learning opportunities may be undermined by strict requirements placed on districts to equalize funding across schools. States may benefit from using targeted funding for high-need districts as a way to reduce within-district resource gaps. As this study demonstrates, despite the potentially large impacts of the new federal education law, the greatest control over the distribution of educational opportunity most likely rest with state legislatures who determine human capital management policies, school funding levels, funding allocation patterns.

### AT: States not key to teacher quality

#### Studies show that state policies impactful on 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)

Given that districts actually spend more per student on teacher salaries in their higher poverty schools by providing more teachers per student, a natural question is whether districts are encouraged to do so through the federal Comparability Rule. We address this question by comparing resource allocation patterns in districts with at least one, but not all Title I schools to districts with all Title I schools. Because the Comparability Rule regulates resource allocation between Title I and non-Title schools, districts with all Title I schools are not affected by the Comparability Rule. We find that the results described above are not significantly different when we run our analyses separately for districts with at least one, but not all Title I schools and for districts with all Title I schools (shown in online appendix Table A3).10

Table 5 shows similar results based on our constructed measures of within-district teacher resource gaps (positive gaps represent inequitable distributions). The figures align with the findings reviewed above: On average, high-poverty schools receive slightly more teacher salary funding per student (about $36 for elementary schools), and have more teachers per student than low-poverty schools in the same district, while teacher experience is inequitably distributed within districts.11 The intraclass correlations for teacher resource gaps are substantially smaller than for teacher resources. Between 91% and 99% of the variation in teacher resource gaps is across states (teacher resource gaps are more related to which district a student attends within a given state and less related to the state in which a student lives). This suggests that states do not differ substantially in their average teacher resource gaps, and it may be less likely that state policies would explain much of the variation in teacher resource gaps. At the same time, states may have policies that differentially impact districts, so a lack of substantial differences in state average resource gaps does not necessarily imply that state policy does not serve an important role. In the section below, we examine variation in teacher resource gaps and whether district or state characteristics are associated with those gaps.

### AT: Cooperative Federalism permutation

#### Cooperative federalism fall short of the experimentalism required for benefits of states – states should engage with each other

**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)

To make real progress in the common search for instructional improvements and greater equity, states need to adopt a collaborative, evidence-based project like democratic experimentalism, an idea pioneered by Columbia University law professor Charles Sabel and used by the European Community. n98 As explained by Sabel and colleagues, democratic experimentalism is appropriate for situations in which independent entities like U.S. states can collaborate and benefit from one another's experience without giving up their freedom of action to some higher level of government. Propo-nents do not claim that it is always more efficient than centralized decision-making, but rather that it is a way to make progress when, as is the case with state governments, the entities involved will not or cannot give up their independ-ence.∂ Under democratic experimentalism, independent communities (e.g., states) engage in four related activities: (a) they work together to test out alternative approaches to reach a goal that none has yet attained, (b) they rigorously assess the results and evidence about conditions leading to success and failure, (c) they create a mechanism by which these results are fully [\*320] shared, and (d) they commit to using past results as the starting point for further experimentation. n99∂ Charles Sabel and his colleague Michael Dorf have shown how democratic experimentalism has been used in the European Community and suggest how it can work in the United States. As they argue, it is ideal for a federal system in which all units are struggling with a problem that none has solved. n100 As Sabel writes:∂ The more uncertain the world--the harder it is to know what it can become--the riskier and potentially more costly it is to rely on familiar strategies (and associated conceptions of self-interest) resting on complex assumptions about the way the world must be; the more prudent it becomes to the contrary to entertain the possibility of elaborating next steps with others similarly at sea, on condition that they share what they learn and bear a share of the costs of exploration. n101∂ In the United States, this approach has been used in environmental resource management, n102 environmental regu-lation, treatment of substance abusers, provision of child-protective and other services to at-risk families, and reform of sentencing and police practices. n103 Sabel also cites the 1989 devolution of governance of Chicago city schools to local site councils as an example of democratic experimentalism. In the European Union, democratic experimentalism has been used in refinement of social service delivery and, in Britain, a broad devolution of governing power from White-hall to Scotland. n104∂ The established United States tradition of cooperative federalism, with its independent action and lack of disci-plined analysis, "falls short of creating an experimentalist regime. What is missing is the continuous pooling, at the national level, of local experience and ongoing revision of norms [e.g., of what can be accomplished] at various levels in the light of it." n105∂ Democratic experimentalism goes beyond mutual imitation and sharing of fads in two ways. n106 First, entities (e.g., states) have to create internal conditions under which diverse experimental initiatives can be fully implemented [\*321] and tested. In K-12 education, states need to make it possible for localities, and even individual schools, to experiment with factors that in the past have been standardized by law and regulation. In many respects, this approach is a departure from the inputs-driven policy of the first part of the twentieth century, but potentially consistent with the more recent performance orientation sparked in part by NCLB.∂ Second, states must commit to serious analysis of results and sharing them through an objective mechanism that no single set of states or policy advocates controls. Professors Dorf and Sabel suggest that federal entities like the Eu-ropean Union or the United States national government can perform this function. n107 Again, many states are currently well positioned to participate in this function, given the data and analytic capacity they have developed through NCLB and RTTT.∂ 5. POLICY PRECONDITIONS FOR DEMOCRATIC EXPERIMENTALISM: ESTABLISHING THE INTER-NAL CONDITIONS∂ As Sabel writes, "the law has to encourage adaptation and revision when applied in context; the contextual adapta-tion has to . . . permit learning across contexts." n108 States need to recognize the huge differences across the districts they oversee and allow experimentation. This means, for example, avoid mandating policies that are appropriate for urban and suburban localities but unworkable for remote rural areas. n109 Even more importantly, it means not mandat-ing policies that prevent districts from experimenting with new solutions to their problems and from changing what they do in light of shifting needs. More specifically, this approach would involve giving districts and schools flexibil-ity in:∂ . How schools spend money;∂ . Who is hired to teach, how they are trained, where they are assigned, and how they are paid;∂ . How student time is set and structured;∂ . How courses are defined and organized; and∂ . How students are assessed for progress.∂ Democratic experimentalism also means that any current practice or policy should be considered tentative and con-stantly open to revision based on new evidence or new contexts. In practice, this means governments must craft policy that only limits practices that are known to be harmful and respect the local actors' competence to craft and implement initiatives that match their local context. It also means any policy should be scheduled for periodic evaluation and revi-sion. n110∂ [\*322] Echoing the principle of subsidiarity, n111 Sabel writes, "[w]hat is expected of the lower-level officials [e.g., superintendents and school principals] . . . is not conformity to a rule, but active investigation of superior solu-tions . . . ." n112 Others more focused on education than Sabel, including the current authors, have made similar points, arguing the need for deregulation of schools coupled with close tracking of performance, abandonment of failures, and reproduction of successful practices. n113

## CPs versus portability

### Federal support for school choice CP

#### Fed should provide funding for transportation under existing state structures – avoids federalism DA

**Chingos,** Senior Fellow, Urban Institute, Director, Education Policy Program, Urban Institute, **and Blagg,** Research Associate, Urban Institute, **2017**

(Matthew M. and Kristin, “Who could benefit from school choice? Mapping access to public and private schools”, Brookings Institution, Evidence Speaks Reports, Vol 2, #12, March 30, 2017, https://www.brookings.edu/research/who-could-benefit-from-school-choice-mapping-access-to-public-and-private-schools/, accessed 7/14/17, GDI-JG)

An obvious implication of this analysis is that federal policymakers seeking to expand families’ access to a larger number of schools (and school types) might seek to accomplish this goal in part by helping families access schools which they are eligible to attend under existing choice policies. For example, Congress could authorize a program that provides grants to states or districts to help cover the costs of transporting students to schools of choice. Such a policy would help support state and local choice programs without inserting the federal government into decisions about the design and operation of such programs.∂ More generally, federal policymakers seeking to expand school choice need to bear in mind the widely varying contexts across jurisdictions. Appendix table 1 reports our main estimates of potential school access within five miles for each state. These measures vary widely among states. For example, 95 percent of California and Massachusetts families live within five miles of a private school, compared to less than 60 percent of Montana and West Virginia families. Additionally, interdistrict choice would open up more options for families in states with many smaller districts (e.g., 49 percent of New York families) than in states with fewer large districts (e.g., 15 percent of Florida families).∂ This variation highlights the challenge of designing federal policies that work well in states that vary in terms of district size, charter enrollment, size of the private sector, and existing choice policies such as interdistrict choice, charters, and vouchers. For example, a state with a relatively new charter sector may want to focus on supporting the creation and growth of high-quality charters, whereas one with a more mature charter sector may want to focus on increasing the involvement of an existing private sector that is significant in size and geographic reach but has not historically served large numbers of disadvantaged students.∂ Alternatively, a state without strong political support for charters or vouchers may want to focus on providing more equitable access to high-quality schools within the traditional public sector. The most appropriate role for the federal government may be to provide resources to states through categorical formula funding or a competitive grant program that would allow policy design to fit the local context rather than try to act as a national school board from Washington, DC.

## Study CP

### Study regulations CP [spending net benefit]

#### Review of federal regulations and programs spurs flexibility, better learning, and economic growth

**Allen,** CEO and founder, Center for Education Reform, and contributor, Washington Examiner's Beltway Confidential blog, **2017**

(Jeanne, “Could education innovation actually thrive through the federal government?”, Washington Examiner, May 11, 2017, <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/could-education-innovation-actually-thrive-through-the-federal-government/article/2622836>, accessed 7/7/17, GDI-JG)

But what if there were a solution to educational failure that not only was the antithesis of the status quo, but cost no additional funds and could be led by Washington?∂ Sitting recently in the office of Rep. Will Hurd, R-Texas, I learned just how this could be possible. As his team drew the district boundaries for me — the largest in the state of Texas and spread out between suburban and rural districts – they shared how some of his leading school superintendents were engaged with technology innovations, including testing the use of drones and connecting with NASA scientists.∂ "How do we help more school districts do that?" his chief asked me. There are two answers: one traditional, one not so traditional. First, ESSA does indeed allow more flexibility in how districts operate, but to be truly able to use funds to develop dynamic learning environments, the Education Department must allow them to escape federal spending silos, and remove any restrictions on combining germane or related programs.∂ As we argued in "The First 100 Days," "The administration should conduct a thorough review of all regulatory limitations imposed on spending in education regulations, as well as across other departments from which schools and school districts benefit. Education funding and regulation is not limited to the Education Department."∂ At a recent Yale event, I happened to talk with two instructional leaders from the district of New Haven, Conn. They go from school to school providing support and guidance. I asked about their biggest challenge, and it was a textbook case of government morass: Every program has reports that must be done, and people spend so much time accounting for the program in reports that they don't operate the programs as well. It's costly and ineffective. "What if you could work with schools to combine program funds and do one report, not dozens," I asked. "Well, that would be heaven," the more senior one said.∂ Part of why districts do what they do is the result of a long-standing culture. But part of it is also directives and guidance from Washington and the states, reinforcing that status quo and valuing compliance over innovation.∂ When school leaders have flexibility to depart from such arcane ideas as using the amount of time and days a student is in a seat as a proxy for funding and measurement, they can help transform the learning process. Just look how personalized learning efforts are going on in communities across the country. Dozens of breakthrough school models in every education sector are flipping classrooms, applying project-based learning to the old classroom, creating digital learning drive classrooms and the like.∂ The folks in Washington get this today. Many are digital natives, having been born in an age of technology-driven innovations. Even if they aren't tech geeks, they recognize that technology and its advantages are all around them, and they're aware of all the innovations happening in education across the country.∂ A generation ago, one only saw sporadic news about the dynamic changes happening in charter schools, for example, or the wave of digital learning allowing students to learn 24-7, or online higher education, and career boot camps and apprenticeships that can be done anywhere.∂ And these are lifelong learners. With learning close at hand, independently of place and space, this is a generation of people who are more likely to have an innovation mindset, one that can be put to good use for the nation's schools.∂ So what's that magic, no-cost bullet Washington can do to accelerate this?∂ Make innovation a mandate from Washington, with no strings.∂ First, require Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos to do a forensic audit of how regulatory and non-regulatory guidance misdirects spending, with the goal of authorizing new guidance (replacing all old) to ensure that local leaders can indeed combine and authorize spending on new innovations.∂ Second, engage congressional committees like the Education & the Workforce Committee or the Subcommittee on Information Technology, which Hurd chairs, to hold a series of hearings to uncover what local education leaders think most needs to be done in Washington to enable innovations. They'll get an earful, for sure.∂ Third, create a national rural education initiative that directs infrastructure dollars to support any public-private partnerships that drives the creation of new schools, connected by new roads and new bandwidths that can reach more learners at all levels closer to their homes and communities. Making personalized education part of the promised new federal infrastructure plan can not only accelerate and change learning for the better, but it could spur economic growth.∂ Transforming these no-cost or planned-cost efforts from business-as-usual to unusually-innovative federal incentives for educational change would be path-breaking, to say the least. And long overdue.

## Advantage CPs

### Desegregating CP solvency

#### Schools resegrgating – need focused attention on desegregation

**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, the study adds to policy discussion related to the growing trend of re-segregation across schools by race/ethnicity and by family income levels (Frankenberg & Kotok, 2013). The national teacher experience gap found in this study adds to the potential problems associated with race- and income-based re-segregation. In addition to increasing of students’ interactions with peers from other racial/ethnic or cultural background, desegregation necessarily reduces disparities gaps in resources across schools (Mickelson & Nkomo, 2012; Reardon & Firebaugh, 2002). Policymakers aiming to narrow resource gaps between rich and poor schools and between schools serving predominantly white students and students of color could focus on desegregating schools in addition to reallocating resources more equitably.

### Manufacturing hub CP

#### Midsized cities benefit from manufacturing hubs to stimulate the regonal economies

Frerick, an economist at the U.S. Department of the Treasury in Washington, D.C, 2017

(Austin, “Chasing service jobs won't save midsize cities. Education and manufacturing innovation can” Des Moines Register April 6 2017

<http://www.desmoinesregister.com/story/opinion/abetteriowa/2017/04/06/chasing-service-jobs-wont-save-midsize-cities-education-and-manufacturing-innovation-can/100070224/>

Fort Dodge, Keokuk and the 15 other midsize cities can thrive with both manufacturing and professional service jobs. Moreover, there is a real opportunity to bring back the type of well-paying manufacturing jobs that will allow these towns to once again thrive. The challenge that these towns face is that, because of technological advances, almost all new jobs in manufacturing since 2000 require an education beyond a high school degree. Yet, Iowa’s students graduate with the 8th highest debt load in the nation, and the current Legislature seems intent on increasing this debt burden and making a post-secondary education less accessible and affordable. If we want these advanced manufacturing jobs, then Iowa needs to make all post-secondary education free to all capable students. But improving access to education is not enough. Iowa needs to aggressively grow its advanced manufacturing base. Like any investment, this effort requires an initial outlay. In 2012, President Barack Obama proposed the establishment of the National Network for Manufacturing Innovation, including the creation of 15 independent nonprofit centers that cultivate different niche advanced manufacturing industries. These centers would bring together the latest academic research with entrepreneurs, industry associations, economic development authorities and state and local governments. The Obama Administration modeled this proposal after the acclaimed Fraunhofer Society in Germany. The Society’s 67 institutes have longed been credited for the country’s success in a thriving advanced manufacturing sector. With Congress only funding a portion of the initial request, the Obama Administration just got eight centers up and running nationally. Let’s go further and create 17 right here in each of Iowa's midsize cities. For example, a center in Carroll for agricultural equipment would help its manufacturing base thrive, because it would bridge the latest research from Iowa State University with local tractor part suppliers so that their products are constantly state of the art globally. Iowa towns cannot turn things around simply by attracting another accountant or two. Many more Iowans will succeed if we focus on developing robust advanced manufacturing industries in these communities by offering free post-secondary education and establishing innovation hubs.

### Democracy Adv CP

#### Comprehensive reform for democracy promotion allows the US to rebuild credibility for and spread democracy

**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)

But the United States can and should do more. The next president should make democracy promotion a pillar of his or her foreign policy. Washington could do so peacefully, multilaterally, and without significant new spending.∂ Pursuing such a policy requires, first of all, taking care to avoid legitimizing authoritarian rule. President Barack Obama did just the opposite during a July 2015 visit to Ethiopia, when he twice called its government "democratically elected," even though it had held sham elections earlier that same year. When he visited Kenya on the same trip, Obama expressed the hope that its corrupt and semiauthoritarian regime would keep "continuing down the path of a strong, more inclusive, more accountable and transparent democracy." Regimes pounce on such language, using implicit U.S. endorsements to stifle free speech and activism at home. In 1981, George H. W. Bush, then vice president, visited Manila and said to the country's dictator, Ferdinand Marcos, "We love your adherence to democratic principle." Within the next few years, Marcos' abuses intensified, and his principal rival in the democratic opposition, Benigno Aquino, Jr., was assassinated.∂ Washington should also seize opportunities to reaffirm the country's commitment to democracy abroad. In 2015, the United States assumed leadership of the Community of Democracies, which will hold its next biennial meeting in Washington in 2017, a few months after the next president is inaugurated. He or she should speak at the meeting to emphasize the organization's importance and to endorse the values for which it stands.∂ The next president should also increase financial support to fragile democracies. States undergoing political transitions-such as Myanmar, Tunisia, and Ukraine-are particularly vulnerable to outside influence. So U.S. support can have an outsize impact in such places. Congress has already increased assistance to Tunisia, from $61 million in 2015 to $142 million this year, and to Ukraine, from $88 million in 2014 to $659 million today. It could and should do still more for these countries, and for other emerging and fragile democracies both small (Senegal, for example) and large (such as Indonesia). But part of the bargain for increased economic aid has to be a serious commitment by the leaders of those countries to fight corruption and improve the quality of governance.∂ Countries bordered by democracies tend to evolve in a democratic direction, while those bordered by authoritarian regimes tend toward autocracy. Washington should thus develop a comprehensive strategy for targeting states where democratic progress could affect the entire region. Populous countries tend to be more influential, so the next president should find ways to nudge states such as Bangladesh, Indonesia, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines, and South Africa toward more effective, accountable, and democratic governance. At the same time, he or she should not neglect smaller democracies such as Georgia, Senegal, and Tunisia. In the post-Soviet sphere, in West Africa, and in the Arab world, civic and political actors are closely watching these three high-profile experiments. In each case, success could generate significant spillover effects. The United States should also focus on places on the cusp of a breakthrough. Venezuela, for instance, has been poised for a democratic transition since late 2015, when the opposition trounced the governing party in legislative elections, undermining roughly two decades of socialist rule. And Vietnam represents an intriguing opportunity, due to its emerging civil society, membership in the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and clear desire to draw closer to the United States in order to counter the threat from China.∂ Any policy to promote democracy must include bolder, smarter efforts to fight corruption, which sustains most authoritarian regimes. In the past decade, Washington has made progress in identifying, tracking, and seizing ill-gotten wealth-a crucial step in the wars against terrorism and drug trafficking that can also advance democracy and human rights. But the United States must do more to identify the international assets of venal dictators and their cronies, prosecute them for money laundering, and return their vast fortunes to their neglected citizens. The next administration should direct usaid to prioritize programs that help countries build professional bureaucracies and autonomous agencies capable of auditing government accounts and prosecuting corruption. And it should aid civil society groups and the media in their efforts to track stolen funds and hold public servants accountable.∂ As part of a push to discourage corruption, the next president should accelerate the use of legal strategies and tools to seize the U.S.based assets of venal dictators. Since the United States launched the Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Initiative in 2010, lawyers and investigators from Between 2000 and 2015, ment of Homeland Security, and the democracy broke down in fbi have brought 25 legal cases against 27 countries. 20 foreign officials, seeking to recover $1.5 billion in ill-gotten gains, including from the estate of the late Nigerian dictator Sani Abacha and from Gulnara Karimova, daughter of the Uzbek president. Washington has also been stepping up efforts to halt the flow of illicit money into U.S. banks. The next president should dramatically increase the resources and political capital for such efforts, both nationally and globally, to ensure that kleptocrats can find no safe haven.∂ He or she should also encourage U.S. diplomats to make support for democracy a major priority in their work on the ground. These envoys can use their diplomatic immunity to shield activists from arrest or to make it more difficult for a regime to target them, as has been the case with U.S. and European diplomatic support for Las Damas de Blanco (the Ladies in White), the opposition movement that wives of jailed dissidents and other women founded in Cuba. In extreme circumstances, they can and should shelter dissidents in their embassies and consulates, as the U.S. embassy did for the Chinese scientist and dissident Fang Lizhi after the 1989 crackdown on the Tiananmen Square protesters. Diplomats also have unparalleled access to local leaders, which gives them a unique opportunity to nudge autocrats toward reform. In a country transitioning to democracy, such as South Africa in the late 1980s and early 1990s, or Myanmar today, such engagement can help foster and sustain the resolve for democratic change. Where an authoritarian regime is powerful, confident, and sitting tight, as in China today, it may seem as though such efforts are hopeless. But most authoritarian regimes have moderate and pragmatic elements who may see the need for political opening. China is no different. The marginal moderates of today could well become the rulers of tomorrow.∂ Meanwhile, the next administration ought to support Internet freedom and digital rights-an especially important effort in light of what the Edward Snowden leaks revealing U.S. government surveillance of Internet and phone communications did to U.S. credibility. In this vein, the government should start by refining its economic sanctions. In 2014, Washington exempted the export of software for "personal communications over the Internet, such as instant messaging, chat and email, social networking, sharing of photos and movies, web browsing, and blogging" from its sanctions against Iran. Such exemptions, as well as the free distribution of software to circumvent Internet censorship and allow dissidents to communicate securely, should become a standard part of any U.S. sanctions effort, including that against North Korea. Authoritarian regimes need to filter information and control communications to sustain their rule, and undermining that control is one of the best ways the United States can foster democratic change.∂ The next president can also use trade agreements to advance democracy. Academic studies confirm that when free-trade agreements are conditional on governments taking specific measures to protect human rights, meaningful improvements follow. The White House has reported that the mere process of negotiating the Trans-Pacific Partnership induced Brunei to sign and Vietnam to ratify the un Convention Against Torture, while also encouraging other human rights improvements in these two countries and in Malaysia. Embedding strong guarantees for human rights (including labor rights) into future trade agreements offers a dual benefit: it can nurture democratic reform in partner countries and help undermine the charge that U.S. trade pacts establish an unfair playing field for American workers and companies. Needless to say, the success of such provisions will depend on whether Washington is willing to bring legal action against member states that violate them.