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### File Notes

The Title 1 Affirmative argues that the federal government should both increase and reform Title 1 funding to better target low-income districts. “Title 1” refers to the federal funding for schools authorized through Title 1, Part A, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title 1 was first signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson in 1965. The funding this act provided was originally created to target resources towards schools with high percentages of low income students. However, critics have argued that too much of Title 1 funding ends up going to wealthy schools instead. This is because the current formula (which is really four different formulas) gives funding to schools in part based on how many low-income students they have, rather than the concentration of low-income students in the school. This means that a big, wealthy school with 50 low income students would receive more funding than a small, poor school with 45 low-income students, even though low-income students are a bigger share of the population at the small school. Moreover, state governments themselves often have regressive funding formulas (states and localities provide the majority of school funding). Thus, the affirmative proposes that the federal government should reform Title 1 in two ways. First, it should increase funding by approximately 45 billion dollars, which according to the affirmative’s authors is necessary to truly give low-income schools the resources that they need. Second, it should change the funding formula for how Title 1 funds are distributed to make it more equitable by targeting concentrated poverty and by providing extra resources to states that adopt a progressive funding formula for their own education funds.

The plan has two advantages. The first advantage is equity. This advantage argues that increasing and equalizing Title 1 funding will decrease societal inequality by providing everyone access to a strong education. According to this advantage, societal inequality contributes to widespread structural violence, also known as “everyday violence,” and is a major factor in at least a third of all deaths in the United States every year.

The second advantage is competitiveness. This advantage argues that inequality in our education system makes our economy weak, which makes us less competitive against other nations in the global marketplace. Moreover, growing US debt will undermine our economic leadership, which the aff argues- is necessary to maintain global stability. The plan solves this by training more students to participate in the high-skill labor economy, increasing our nation’s GDP enough to eliminate the national debt and launch our economy into a new era of growth.

### Glossary

Achievement Gap: The achievement gap in the United States refers to the observed, persistent disparity in measures of educational performance among subgroups of U.S. students, especially groups defined by socioeconomic status (SES), race/ethnicity and gender.

Competitiveness: the ability of an economy to compete fairly and successfully in markets for internationally traded goods and services that allows for rising standards of living over time.

Devolve: transfer or delegate (power) to a lower level, especially from central government to local or regional administration.

Equity: the quality of being fair and impartial.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA): The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was passed as a part of United States President Lyndon B. Johnson's "War on Poverty" and has been the most far-reaching federal legislation affecting education ever passed by the United States Congress.

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA): The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) is a US law passed in December 2015 that governs the United States K–12 public education policy. The law replaced its predecessor, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), and modified but did not eliminate provisions relating to the periodic standardized tests given to students. Like the No Child Left Behind Act, ESSA is a reauthorization of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which established the federal government's expanded role in public education.

Gross Domestic Product (GDP): the total value of goods produced and services provided in a country during one year.

Inequality: difference in size, degree, circumstances, etc.; lack of equality.

No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB): The No Child Left Behind Act authorizes several federal education programs that are administered by the states. The law is a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Under the 2002 law, states are required to test students in reading and math in grades 3–8 and once in high school.

Per-pupil expenditures: the amount of money spent on average per student.

School-to-prison pipeline: the increasing patterns of contact students have with the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems as a result of the recent practices implemented by educational institutions.

Statutory duty: required by law.

Title I: Title I, Part A (Title I) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA) provides financial assistance to local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools with high numbers or high percentages of children from low-income families to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic standards.

## 1AC

### 1AC – Equity

#### Contention 1 is Equity:

#### The Every Student Succeeds Act devolved education funding decisions entirely to the states. The result will be rapidly escalating inequality where more Title I funding goes to the wealthiest schools

Black, 17 - Professor of Law, University of South Carolina School of Law (Derek, “Abandoning the Federal Role in Education: The Every Student Succeeds Act”, 102 CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW [Vol. 105:101, SSRN)

On December 10, 2015, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act underwent drastic changes. Congress reauthorized the Act under the popularly titled bill, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).5 To the delight of states and school districts, the ESSA eliminated the punitive testing and accountability measures of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).6 But in the fervor to end the NCLB, few stopped to seriously consider the wisdom of what replaced it.7 The new Act, the ESSA, moves education in a direction that was unthinkable just a few short years ago: no definite equity provisions, no demands for specific student achievement, and no enforcement mechanism to prompt states to consistently pursue equity or achievement. The ESSA reverses the federal role in education and returns nearly full discretion to the states.8 Although state discretion in some contexts can ensure an appropriate balance of state and federal power,9 state discretion on issues of educational equality for disadvantaged students has proven particularly corrosive in the past. Most prominently, states and local districts vigorously resisted school integration for at least two decades following Brown v. Board of Education. 10 In fact, this very resistance made the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 necessary.11 State resistance to equality, however, extends well beyond desegregation. Over the last decade, states have significantly cut education funding and have refused to reinstate funding even as their economies improved.12 The effects of these cuts often have hit low-income and minority school districts hardest.13 This regression marks a troubling new era in which states are willing to actively disregard their duty under state constitutions to deliver equal educational opportunities.14 Although complete discretion allows states to adapt solutions to local needs, it also allows states to ignore the Elementary and Secondary Education Act’s historical mission of equal opportunity and supplemental resources for low-income students. The ESSA’s framework will, in effect, make equal educational opportunity a random occurrence rather than a legal guarantee. First, the ESSA grants states nearly unfettered discretion to create school performance systems and set goals. States are largely free to weight test results and soft variables however they see fit. 15 With this discretion, as many as fifty disparate state systems could follow. Second, even assuming states adopt reasonable performance systems, the ESSA does not specify the remedies or interventions that states must implement when schools underperform.16 Third, the ESSA undermines principles that have long stood at the center of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act’s mission to ensure equal access to resources.17 In particular, the ESSA weakens two equity standards18 and leaves a significant loophole in a third one that, in effect, exempts 80 percent of school expenditures from equity analyses. 19 To make matters worse, Congress did not include any significant increases in federal funding and instead afforded states more discretion in spending existing funds.20 This random and uncertain approach to equality ultimately will render the ESSA an incoherent extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. During the past half century, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has embraced differing theories of how best to achieve equal educational opportunity. The early decades focused most heavily on educational inputs, whereas recent decades focused more on educational outcomes.21 <<card continues>>

### 1AC – Equity

But no reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has ever fundamentally abandoned both inputs and outputs as levers for equality—until the ESSA. Without one of those commitments, the ESSA undermines its own raison d’être: improving education for low-income students by providing federal resources where states fall short.22 In place of this historical premise, the ESSA provides that states should decide the level of resources students receive and the standards to which they aspire. It removes the federal government from education at the cost of equal education for low-income students. The ESSA thus raises a fundamental question: What role should the federal government play in education? Traditionally, the federal government is involved in education because education is in our national interest, the Constitution commits the nation to equality, and educational shortfalls by states remain rampant.23 According to national assessments of student achievement, only one-third of students are proficient in math and reading, and low-income and minority students’ achievement lags three years behind their peers by the eighth grade.24 Substantial portions of this gap owe in no small part to the poor educational opportunities that states provide to many students.25 In real dollar terms, thirty-one states funded education at a lower level in 2014 than they did in 2008. 26 Likewise, recent data show that half of the states fund districts serving predominantly poor students at lower levels than they do districts serving predominantly middle-income and wealthy students.27 To achieve their potential, low-income students require more resources than their peers—not less.28

#### Title I funding is poorly targeted and benefits wealthier populations

Black, 17 - Professor of Law, University of South Carolina School of Law (Derek, “Abandoning the Federal Role in Education: The Every Student Succeeds Act”, 102 CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW [Vol. 105:101, SSRN)

The ESSA, however, did almost nothing to ensure adequacy moving forward. First, whereas the NCLB substantially increased federal funding for low-income students, the ESSA leaves funding flat. Second, the ESSA does nothing to improve the way existing funds target student need. Instead, the ESSA continues a pattern of distributing federal funds by happenstance. This happenstance distribution is a product of ill-conceived weights in the funding formula for district size, states with small student populations, and poverty concentrations.284 Some of these factors counteract one another and others are simply based on false assumptions.285 The overly broad distribution of federal funds is a product of the fact that a district only needs 2 percent poverty to receive Title I funds, a threshold that nearly every district in the nation meets. 286 As a result of the formulas, federal funds that might otherwise meet the need of high-poverty districts go to predominantly middle-income and wealthy districts. A recent study found that “20 percent of all Title I money for poor students—$2.6 billion—ends up in school districts with a higher proportion of wealthy families.”287 For instance, the “Montgomery County Schools in Maryland, an[] elite suburb outside Washington, get nearly $26 million [in Title I funding], despite a child poverty rate of 8.4 percent.”288 Moreover, the average per-pupil Title I allotment for wealthier districts is larger than that of schools with the highest poverty levels.289 A similar phenomenon occurs across state lines, with the wealthiest states receiving the largest per-pupil grants.290

### 1AC – Equity

#### Unequal funding denies millions access to an excellent education

Robinson, 15 - Professor, University of Richmond School of Law (Kimberly, “Disrupting Education Federalism” WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW [VOL. 92:959, <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2e3c/a1792fa3482b209ae0ba85ed07a05d697f74.pdf>

The United States continues to tolerate a longstanding educational opportunity gap. Today, it relegates at least ten million students in low-income neighborhoods and millions more minority students to poorly performing teachers, substandard facilities, and other inferior educational opportunities. n1 This occurs in part because the United States invests more money in high-income districts than in low-income districts, a sharp contrast to other developed nations. n2 Scholars and court decisions also have documented the sizeable intrastate disparities in educational opportunity. n3 In addition, interstate inequalities in educational opportunity represent the largest component of disparities in educational opportunity. n4 The harmful nature of interstate disparities falls hardest on disadvantaged schoolchildren who have the most educational needs, n5 and states do not [\*962] possess the resources and capacity to address the full scope of these disparities. n6 Furthermore, research confirms that as the gap in wealth has grown between low-income and high-income families, the achievement gap between children in low-income and high-income families also has widened. n7

#### The consequences are devastating and fuel school-to-prison pipelines

Meanes, 16 – Partner @Thompson Coburn, LLP; President @ National Bar Association 2014-15. J.D., University of Iowa; M.A., Clark Atlanta University; B.A., Monmouth College (Pamela J., “SCHOOL INEQUALITY: CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS: Allen Chair Issue 2016: SCHOOL DISCIPLINE POLICIES: EQUITY IN AMERICAN EDUCATION: THE INTERSECTION OF RACE, CLASS, AND EDUCATION,” University of Richmond Law Review, 3/16, Lexis, 50 U. Rich. L. Rev. 1075)//JLE

III. Inequitable School Funding "We must recognize the full human equality of all of our people ... . We must do this, not because it is economically advantageous, although it is; not because the laws of God command it, although they do; not because people in other lands wish it so. We must do it for the single and fundamental reason that it is the right thing to do." n42 - Robert Kennedy While school funding mechanisms vary from state to state, economically disadvantaged communities feature schools and school districts that are not as well funded as those in affluent communities. n43 In fact, today that is the case in twenty-four states. n44 This is rooted in the fact that many schools are funded to a significant extent by local property taxes. With this system, less money is generated by taxes collected from areas with lower property tax valuation. n45 Those same economically disadvantaged areas generate lower sales tax revenue as well. n46 Adding insult to injury, property tax rates are often significantly higher in poor areas, as districts struggle to collect enough revenue [\*1083] to operate. n47 So, it is not unusual for low income home owners to face much higher property tax rates - for their community's underfunded, poor-performing schools - than their more affluent counter-parts. Parents and property owners face steep property taxes that fund what are inevitably failing schools. School funding systems based on property value condemn innocent children born in poor communities - both ur-ban and rural - to marginal educations and nearly no chance at economic opportunity. n48 These children, trapped in underfunded and understaffed schools, will then live out their lives in the correctional system, on public assistance, or barely "getting by." In any case, they will grow up to be adults who are an expense to society, rather than becoming contributing taxpayers.

### 1AC – Equity

#### Reducing social inequality begins within k-12 schools---overwhelming evidence supports

Corydon Ireland 16 – journalist; this is based on interviews with Harvard professor of economics Roland Fryer, Harvard Graduate School of Education Dean James E. Ryan, Ronald Ferguson, adjunct lecturer in public policy at Harvard Kennedy School and faculty director of Harvard's Achievement Gap Initiative, Robert Putnam, the Peter and Isabel Malkin Professor of Public Policy at Harvard Kennedy School, and Harvard economist Lawrence Katz (Corydon Ireland US News & World Report, 2-16-2016, https://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016-02-16/the-costs-of-inequality-education-is-the-key-to-it-all] Valiaveedu

If inequality starts anywhere, many scholars agree, it's with faulty education. Conversely, a strong education can act as the bejeweled key that opens gates through every other aspect of inequality, whether political, economic, racial, judicial, gender- or health-based. Simply put, a top-flight education usually changes lives for the better. And yet, in the world's most prosperous major nation, it remains an elusive goal for millions of children and teenagers. Plateau on Educational Gains The revolutionary concept of free, nonsectarian public schools spread across America in the 19th century. By 1970, America had the world's leading educational system, and until 1990 the gap between minority and white students, while clear, was narrowing. But educational gains in this country have plateaued since then, and the gap between white and minority students has proven stubbornly difficult to close, says Ronald Ferguson, adjunct lecturer in public policy at Harvard Kennedy School and faculty director of Harvard's Achievement Gap Initiative. That gap extends along class lines as well. In recent years, scholars such as Ferguson, who is an economist, have puzzled over the ongoing achievement gap and what to do about it, even as other nations' school systems at first matched and then surpassed their U.S. peers. Among the 34 market-based, democracy-leaning countries in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United States ranks around 20th annually, earning average or below-average grades in reading, science, and mathematics. By eighth grade, Harvard economist Roland G. Fryer Jr. noted last year, only 44 percent of American students are proficient in reading and math. The proficiency of African-American students, many of them in underperforming schools, is even lower. Education Gap: The Root of Inequality Education may be the key to solving broader American inequality, but we have to solve educational inequality first. Ferguson says there is progress being made, there are encouraging examples to emulate, that an early start is critical, and that a lot of hard work lies ahead. But he also says, "There's nothing more important we can do." "The position of U.S. black students is truly alarming," wrote Fryer, the Henry Lee Professor of Economics, who used the OECD rankings as a metaphor for minority standing educationally. "If they were to be considered a country, they would rank just below Mexico in last place." Harvard Graduate School of Education Dean James E. Ryan, a former public interest lawyer, says geography has immense power in determining educational opportunity in America. As a scholar, he has studied how policies and the law affect learning, and how conditions are often vastly unequal. His book "Five Miles Away, A World Apart" (2010) is a case study of the disparity of opportunity in two Richmond, Virginia, schools, one grimly urban and the other richly suburban. Geography, he says, mirrors achievement levels. A ZIP Code as Predictor of Success "Right now, there exists an almost ironclad link between a child's ZIP code and her chances of success," said Ryan. "Our education system, traditionally thought of as the chief mechanism to address the opportunity gap, instead too often reflects and entrenches existing societal inequities." <<card continues>>

### 1AC – Equity

<<card continues>> The Costs of Inequality: When a Fair Shake Isn't Fair Enough Urban schools demonstrate the problem. In New York City, for example, only 8 percent of black males graduating from high school in 2014 were prepared for college-level work, according to the CUNY Institute for Education Policy, with Latinos close behind at 11 percent. The preparedness rates for Asians and whites — 48 and 40 percent, respectively — were unimpressive, too, but nonetheless were firmly on the other side of the achievement gap. In some impoverished urban pockets, the racial gap is even larger. In Washington, D.C., 8 percent of black eighth-graders are proficient in math, while 80 percent of their white counterparts are. Fryer said that in kindergarten black children are already 8 months behind their white peers in learning. By third grade, the gap is bigger, and by eighth grade is larger still. According to a recent report by the Education Commission of the States, black and Hispanic students in kindergarten through 12th grade perform on a par with the white students who languish in the lowest quartile of achievement. There was once great faith and hope in America's school systems. The rise of quality public education a century ago "was probably the best public policy decision Americans have ever made because it simultaneously raised the whole growth rate of the country for most of the 20th century, and it leveled the playing field," said Robert Putnam, the Peter and Isabel Malkin Professor of Public Policy at Harvard Kennedy School, who has written several best-selling books touching on inequality, including " Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of the American Community" and " Our Kids: The American Dream in Crisis." Historically, upward mobility in America was characterized by each generation becoming better educated than the previous one, said Harvard economist Lawrence Katz. But that trend, a central tenet of the nation's success mythology, has slackened, particularly for minorities. "Thirty years ago, the typical American had two more years of schooling than their parents. Today, we have the most educated group of Americans, but they only have about .4 more years of schooling, so that's one part of mobility not keeping up in the way we've invested in education in the past," Katz said. As globalization has transformed and sometimes undercut the American economy, "education is not keeping up," he said. "There's continuing growth of demand for more abstract, higher-end skills" that schools aren't delivering, "and then that feeds into a weakening of institutions like unions and minimum-wage protections." Fryer is among a diffuse cohort of Harvard faculty and researchers using academic tools to understand the achievement gap and the many reasons behind problematic schools. His venue is the Education Innovation Laboratory, where he is faculty director. "We use big data and causal methods," he said of his approach to the issue. Fryer, who is African-American, grew up poor in a segregated Florida neighborhood. He argues that outright discrimination has lost its power as a primary driver behind inequality, and uses economics as "a rational forum" for discussing social issues. Better Schools to Close the Gap Fryer set out in 2004 to use an economist's data and statistical tools to answer why black students often do poorly in school compared with whites. His years of research have convinced him that good schools would close the education gap faster and better than addressing any other social factor, including curtailing poverty and violence, and he believes that the quality of kindergarten through grade 12 matters above all. Supporting his belief is research that says the number of schools achieving excellent student outcomes is a large enough sample to prove that much better performance is possible. Despite the poor performance by many U.S. states, some have shown that strong results are possible on a broad scale. For instance, if Massachusetts were a nation, it would rate among the best-performing countries. At Harvard Graduate School of Education, where Ferguson is faculty co-chair as well as director of the Achievement Gap Initiative, many factors are probed. In the past 10 years, Ferguson, who is African-American, has studied every identifiable element contributing to unequal educational outcomes. But lately he is looking hardest at improving children's earliest years, from infancy to age 3. <<card continues>>

### 1AC – Equity

<<card continues>> Partly through an organization he founded called the Tripod Project, he launched the Boston Basics project in August, with support from the Black Philanthropy Fund. The first phase of the outreach campaign, a booklet and spot ads, starts with advice to parents of children a year old or younger. "Maximize love, manage stress" is its mantra and its foundational imperative, followed by concepts such as "talk, sing, and point." ("Talking," said Ferguson, "is teaching.") In early childhood, "The difference in life experiences begins at home." At Age 1, Children Score Similarly Fryer and Ferguson agree that the achievement gap starts early. At age 1, white, Asian, black, and Hispanic children score virtually the same in what Ferguson called "skill patterns" that measure cognitive ability among toddlers, including examining objects, exploring purposefully and "expressive jabbering." But by age 2, gaps are apparent, with black and Hispanic children scoring lower in expressive vocabulary, listening comprehension and other indicators of acuity. That suggests educational achievement involves more than just schooling, which typically starts at age 5. Key factors in the gap, researchers say, include poverty rates (which are three times higher for blacks than for whites), diminished teacher and school quality, unsettled neighborhoods, ineffective parenting, personal trauma, and peer group influence, which only strengthens as children grow older."Peer beliefs and values," said Ferguson, get "trapped in culture" and are compounded by the outsized influence of peers and the "pluralistic ignorance" they spawn. Fryer's research, for instance, says that the reported stigma of "acting white" among many black students is true. The better they do in school, the fewer friends they have — while for whites who are perceived as smarter, there's an opposite social effect. Fryer suspects that peer behavior among minorities was adversely affected by two main factors: the fading aspirational effects of the Civil Rights Movement that worked to the advantage of children in the 1960s, and the emergence of gangster rap culture in the 1980s. The researchers say that family upbringing matters, in all its crisscrossing influences and complexities, and that often undercuts minority children, who can come from poor or troubled homes. "Unequal outcomes," he said, "are from, to a large degree, inequality in life experiences." Trauma also subverts achievement, whether through family turbulence, street violence, bullying, sexual abuse, or intermittent homelessness. Such factors can lead to behaviors in school that reflect a pervasive form of childhood post-traumatic stress disorder. At Harvard Law School, both the Trauma and Learning Policy Initiative and the Education Law Clinic marshal legal aid resources for parents and children struggling with trauma-induced school expulsions and discipline issues. At Harvard Business School, Karim R. Lakhani, an associate professor who is a crowdfunding expert and a champion of open-source software, has studied how unequal racial and economic access to technology has worked to widen the achievement gap. At Harvard's Project Zero, a nonprofit called the Family Dinner Project is scraping away at the achievement gap from the ground level by pushing for families to gather around the meal table, which traditionally was a lively and comforting artifact of nuclear families, stable wages, close-knit extended families and culturally shared values. Lynn Barendsen, the project's executive director, believes that shared mealtimes improve reading skills, spur better grades and larger vocabularies, and fuel complex conversations. Interactive mealtimes provide a learning experience of their own, she said, along with structure, emotional support, a sense of safety, and family bonding. Even a modest jump in shared mealtimes could boost a child's academic performance, she said. The Rich and the Rest "We're not saying families have to be perfect," she said, acknowledging dinnertime impediments like full schedules, rudimentary cooking skills, the lure of technology, and the demands of single parenting. "The perfect is the enemy of the good." Whether poring over Fryer's big data or Barendsen's family dinner project, there is one commonality for Harvard researchers dealing with inequality in education: the issue's vast complexity. The achievement gap is a creature of interlocking factors that are hard to unpack constructively. Going Wide, Starting Early With help from faculty co-chair and Jesse Climenko Professor of Law Charles J. Ogletree, the Achievement Gap Initiative is analyzing the factors that make educational inequality such a complex puzzle: home and family life, school environments, teacher quality, neighborhood conditions, peer interaction, and the fate of "all those wholesome things," said Ferguson. The latter include working hard in school, showing respect, having nice friends, and following the rules, traits that can be "elements of a 21st-century movement for equality." In the end, best practices to create strong schools will matter most, said Fryer. He called high-quality education "the new civil rights battleground" in a landmark 2010 working paper for the National Bureau of Economic Research called "Racial Inequality in the 21st Century: The Declining Significance of Discrimination." Fryer tapped 10 large data sets on children 8 months to 17 years old. He studied charter schools, scouring for standards that worked. He champions longer school days and school years, data-driven instruction, small-group tutoring, high expectations, and a school culture that prizes human capital — all just "a few simple investments," he wrote in the working paper. "The challenge for the future is to take these examples to scale" across the country. How long would closing the gap take with a national commitment to do so? A best-practices experiment that Fryer conducted at low-achieving high schools in Houston closed the gap in math skills within three years, and narrowed the reading achievement gap by a third. "You don't need Superman for this," he said, referring to a film about Geoffrey Canada and his Harlem Children's Zone, just high-quality schools for everyone, to restore 19th-century educator Horace Mann's vision of public education as society's "balance-wheel."

### 1AC – Equity

#### Inequality creates widespread structural violence. Rigorous studies demonstrate it’s responsible for one-third of all deaths in the US every year

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

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

### 1AC – Competitiveness

#### Contention 2 is Competitiveness:

#### Inequality in educational opportunity is causing US growth to stagnate and will devastate competitiveness

Robinson, 15 - Professor, University of Richmond School of Law (Kimberly, “Disrupting Education Federalism” WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW [VOL. 92:959, <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2e3c/a1792fa3482b209ae0ba85ed07a05d697f74.pdf>

Primary state and local control over education essentially invite inequality in educational opportunity because of pervasive state insistence that local governments raise education funds and state funding formulas that do not effectively equalize the resulting disparities in revenue.121 Although some influential victories have occurred,122 school finance litigation has mostly failed to change the basic organizational structure of school finance systems and their reliance on property taxes to fund schools.123 Instead, this litigation at best has obtained limited increases in funding for property-poor districts while allowing property-rich districts to maintain the same funding level or to raise their funding rate at a slower pace.124 Recent evidence of the persistent inequalities in school funding can be found in two distinct 2013 reports. A report from the Council on Foreign Relations found that in the United States more is spent per pupil in highincome districts than in low-income districts.125 This stands in sharp contrast to most other developed nations where the reverse is true.126 The Equity and Excellence Commission report also found that “[n]o other developed nation has inequities nearly as deep or systemic; no other developed nation has, despite some efforts to the contrary, so thoroughly stacked the odds against so many of its children.”127 These disparities are due in substantial part to the continued state reliance on property taxes to fund schools.128 As a result, state school finance systems in the United States typically create many predominantly low-income and minority schools that predictably produce poor outcomes because these schools typically lack both the resources to ensure that their students obtain an effective education and the capacity to undertake effective reforms even when these reforms are well conceived.129 The harms from persistent and pervasive disparities in educational opportunity are not limited to schoolchildren, their families, and their communities. These disparities also harm nationwide interests in a strong economy and a just society. The United States needs to maintain international academic competitiveness to attract businesses and prevent the loss of jobs to other more educated nations.130 Yet, international assessments reveal that the performance of U.S. students is often average or below average when compared to other countries,131 which will make it difficult for U.S. students to compete successfully against students from many other nations. The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), an international assessment of performance in math, reading and science, was administered in 2012 to students in sixty-five education systems.132 The results showed that the average U.S. student who participated scored average in reading and science literacy and below average in math literacy when compared to other countries in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.133 Doctors Eric A. Hanushek, Paul E. Peterson and Ludger Woessman, professors of education at Stanford University, Harvard University and the University of Munich respectively, summarized the lackluster performance of U.S. students on international assessments in a 2013 book by noting that: The evidence of international comparison is now clear. American students lag badly and pervasively. Our students lag behind students not just in Asia, but in Europe and other parts of the Americas. It is not just disadvantaged students or a group of weak students who lag, but also American students from advantaged backgrounds. Americans are badly underrepresented among the world’s highest achievers.134 <<card continues>>
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<<card continues>> Although some challenge such conclusions from international assessments as overblown and simplistic,135 others conclude that these less than stellar outcomes indicate that the U.S.education system is failing to prepare many of its students to compete successfully for jobs with other students from around the world.136 Research reveals that the long-term vigor of the U.S. economy will depend on the advanced skills that are typically provided in higher education and that are needed for upper-level technical occupations.137 Although the U.S. higher education system historically has been considered world-class, the United States is facing substantial competition from other countries with their fast-growing higher education systems.138 As Thomas Bailey, Teachers College professor of economics and education, has summarized in his research: Occupational forecasts, analyses of job content, trends in wages, and changes in international competition all point to an increasing need in the United States for workers with high-level skills. Achieving increases in skill levels will be difficult as long as current gaps in educational attainment based on income, race, and ethnicity remain.139 In this environment, the U.S. economy and its competitiveness will be increasingly hindered by low college enrollment and completion rates for Hispanic and African American students who increasingly will make up a larger share of the workforce.140 Many U.S. students cannot compete successfully with students from other developed countries, and the lower achievement of U.S. students could cause comparatively slow growth for the U.S. economy in the years to come.141

#### Growing US debt will collapse the dollar and the foundations of US power – reducing inequality in education is the vital internal link to maintaining US leadership

Haass 17 [Richard Haass is president of the Council on Foreign Relations He received the 2013 Tipperary International Peace Award for peace works in Northern Ireland. Dr. Haass was director of policy planning for the Department of State, U.S. coordinator for policy toward the future of Afghanistan and U.S. envoy to the Northern Ireland peace process, special assistant to President George H.W. Bush and senior director for Near East and South Asian affairs on the staff of the National Security Council, vice president and director of foreign policy studies at the Brookings Institution, 01-10-2017, "A World in Disarray: American Foreign Policy and the Crisis of the Old Order," Part III, Section 12, Penguin Press]//Rank

All of which brings me to the debt problem. What makes this issue particularly difficult is that it is part of a class of what I would describe as slow-motion crises. Climate change is another. Slow-motion crises are just that: phenomena or processes that are under way and have potentially substantial or even devastating consequences that will kick in gradually or, even if suddenly at some point, only after the passage of considerable time. They are thus unlike an infectious disease outbreak or a financial collapse. 5 There is both good and bad news in this. The good news is that to a large degree we know where things are heading. We also have time to do something about it. We can see the iceberg in our path, and there is ample time to turn the ship around. The bad news is that slow-motion crises generate little or no sense of priority but rather tend to promote complacency. The temptation is to put them aside, to focus on today’s crisis, and to allow the urgent to take precedence over the important. The problem with this is that not only will we forfeit the opportunity to prevent a crisis from materializing, but we will also deny ourselves those remedies that are not severe. The medical equivalent would be to ignore the symptoms in a patient when the sickness was relatively easy to treat and to do something only when it became life-threatening. The problem is fairly straightforward. According to The 2016 Long-Term Budget Outlook of the Congressional Budget Office and the CBO’s January 2016 ten-year Budget and Economic Outlook: 2016 to 2026, the public debt of the United States is fast approaching $14 trillion. 6 It now is equal to roughly 75 percent of GDP and in a decade will rise to between 80 and 90 percent of GDP. <<card continues>>
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<<card continues>> Depending upon spending and revenue assumptions, it is a question of when and not if the amount of debt comes to exceed or far exceed GDP. This could well happen by 2030. The cost of servicing the debt will begin to rise rapidly, consuming an ever-larger percentage of GDP and federal spending. Some contend that this analysis of U.S. debt is too negative. 7 They tend to predict higher revenues, continued low interest rates, and larger than expected cost savings in the medical domain. Such a future is of course possible, but so too is a worse than expected future based on slower growth, higher rates, higher than expected medical costs owing to a larger aging population, and much higher than imagined costs associated with adapting to the many effects of climate change. The causes of the debt problem are somewhat more controversial but still fairly straightforward. Although the federal deficit is considerably lower than it was five years ago, it is once again increasing, due to greatly increased spending (in particular on entitlements) and low rates of economic growth. Some would say that taxes, or rather the lack of them, are to blame as well, but U.S. corporate rates are high by global standards and individual rates are not conspicuously low. All things being equal, the problem will not only not fix itself but will grow worse. There are two reasons. First, the principal driver of spending increases, spending on entitlements such as Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, will likely become more and not less of a factor as Americans retire in large numbers and live longer lives. Second, interest rates are near historic lows and are far more likely to rise than fall over future decades. Specific projections as to the size of the debt and what it will cost to finance necessarily vary depending on assumptions regarding economic growth, spending, taxation, inflation, and interest rates, but the trend is clear, and the trend is not our friend. Nor is time. The strategic consequences of growing indebtedness are many and worrisome. The need to finance the debt will absorb an ever-increasing number of dollars and an ever-increasing share of the U.S. budget. This will mean that proportionately fewer resources will be available for national security, including defense, intelligence, homeland security, and foreign assistance. There will as well be fewer dollars available for discretionary domestic programs ranging from education and infrastructure modernization to scientific research and law enforcement. What this portends is an increasingly sharp and destructive debate over guns versus butter while the two fastest-growing parts of the budget, debt service and entitlements, remain largely off-limits. Mounting debt will raise questions around the world about the United States. U.S. inability to deal with its debt challenge will detract from the appeal of the American political and economic model. It will make others less likely to want to emulate the United States and more wary of depending on it as it will raise questions about this country’s ability to come together and take difficult decisions. The result will be a world less democratic and increasingly less deferential to U.S. concerns in matters of security. To some extent this is already happening; U.S. failure to deal with its debt promises to accelerate a worrisome evolution. Mounting debt will leave the United States more vulnerable than it should be to the whims of markets and the machinations of governments. Already nearly half of U.S. public debt is held by foreigners, with China one of the two largest lenders. It is of course possible that China will be constrained by its stake in not seeing its own huge pool of dollars lose its value and by its need for the United States to continue to buy its exports. The result, according to this line of thinking, is the financial equivalent of nuclear deterrence. This may be true, but I for one am not sanguine that China would not decide to slow or stop accumulating U.S. debt as a signal of displeasure or even to sell debt amid, say, a crisis over Taiwan or one involving its claims in the South or East China seas. In such circumstances, Chinese leaders might well judge it to be worth paying a financial price to protect what they viewed as their vital national interests. <<card continues>>
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<<card continues>> Interestingly, it was American threats aimed at the pound sterling that more than anything else persuaded a British government that was fearful of the need to devalue its currency to back off its ill-fated venture to regain control of the Suez Canal in 1956. Mounting debt could absorb funds that could otherwise be usefully invested at home or abroad. This will in turn depress already modest levels of economic growth. Making matters worse is that high levels of debt and debt financing will increase concerns about the government’s willingness to maintain the dollar’s value or, worse yet, meet its obligations. This will cause foreigners in particular to demand high returns on their loans, something that will increase the cost of debt financing and further crowd out other spending and depress growth. This is a vicious, not a virtuous, cycle. Mounting debt limits American flexibility and resilience. There is no way of stating in the abstract what constitutes the right level of debt for the country or knowing with precision what level is sustainable. But the United States does not want to make high levels of debt the new normal, if only because it removes flexibility if, for example, there were to be another financial crisis that required large-scale fiscal stimulus or a major national security challenge that demanded a costly response. Keeping debt levels low enough to allow for a surge without triggering a debt crisis seems to be a prudent hedge and, as is the case with preventive medicine or insurance, worth paying a reasonable premium for. Let me just add one more prediction. Mounting debt will hasten the demise of the dollar as the world’s reserve currency. This will happen due to loss of confidence in U.S. financial management and the related concern that what the United States will need to do to finance its debt will be at odds with what it should be doing to manage the domestic and, indirectly, world economy. It is possible that such a move away from the dollar would have happened were it not for the EU’s problems and China not being prepared to free up the yuan. Granted, there is no alternative to the dollar on the immediate horizon, but the United States cannot depend forever on the weaknesses and errors of others, and a postdollar world will be both more costly (as it will require the United States to move in and out of other currencies) and one of less leverage when it comes to imposing dollar-related sanctions. 8 Medicare and Medicaid are even more responsible for the entitlement burden. Some changes that could help here include accelerating the move away from a system based on fee for service and toward one that reflects quality of outcomes, increasing copayments, limiting malpractice torts, and introducing some means testing of benefits. Congress should avoid false “solutions.” The sequester is one of them. It ignores entitlements and favors spending over investment and the present over the future. It should be jettisoned once and for all. The same holds for threats not to raise the debt ceiling. As every member of Congress knows or should know, failure to raise the debt ceiling does nothing to limit debt already incurred but does raise major doubts in markets and around the world as to whether the United States is reliable and serious. Ironically, failure to raise the debt ceiling would trigger reactions that would lead to an increase in rates, something that in turn would slow growth and exacerbate the debt burden. Congress needs to be similarly careful about defense spending. Current and projected defense spending is around 3 percent of GDP, far below historic averages for the past seventy years. What is more, it is an increasingly dangerous and precarious world, and if the world becomes messier, there is no way the United States will be able to wall itself off from consequences partly brought about by its doing less. Isolationism will once again prove to be folly. There is no other country willing and able to make a sizable contribution to order, and the world cannot order itself. Only the United States can play this role. This will require a military that possesses a range of capabilities, considerable flexibility, and an ability to surge. It must be able to handle contingencies and conflicts of different type, scale, and duration in different places (possibly simultaneously) and against foes ranging from dangerous terrorist organizations to powerful nation-states. More, not less, defense spending is required, especially if Congress continues to insist on keeping select bases and assembly lines open for reasons that have more to do with politics than national security. The good news is that the country can do more in the defense realm and tackle the debt challenge at one and the same time if it is willing to make some choices and spend its resources wisely. The argument that what the country is doing abroad explains the slow growth at home is simply untrue. Several pages back I noted what I thought could be done to raise rates of economic growth. I purposefully left one item off that list that I want to raise here. It is free trade. Trade pacts do many positive things, including create relatively high-paying export-oriented jobs, increase consumer choice, lower inflation, promote economic development around the world, bolster friends and allies, and create ties of interdependence that can constrain would-be foes. And, as noted, trade pacts contribute (however modestly) to economic growth; the consensus seems to be that once it went into effect, the Trans-Pacific Partnership would add up to half a percent a year to U.S. growth. 9 Trade pacts and trade more generally can also cause specific jobs to disappear. The smart response is not to deny Americans the strategic and economic benefits of trade but to help those whose jobs have disappeared. Several things can and should be done, including adopting a more aggressive posture in the WTO toward foreign governments that unfairly subsidize industries or “dump” products abroad, increasing the availability of wage insurance, making sure that critical benefits are more portable and extended for longer periods, and increasing opportunities and financial support for education and retraining.Trade pacts and trade more generally can also cause specific jobs to disappear. The smart response is not to deny Americans the strategic and economic benefits of trade but to help those whose jobs have disappeared. Several things can and should be done, including adopting a more aggressive posture in the WTO toward foreign governments that unfairly subsidize industries or “dump” products abroad, increasing the availability of wage insurance, making sure that critical benefits are more portable and extended for longer periods, and increasing opportunities and financial support for education and retraining. Technological innovation is an even bigger culprit when it comes to job disappearance. 10 The future promises more of the same, as such innovations as artificial intelligence, robotics, and 3-D printing add to productivity but eliminate some existing jobs, even if they also create new ones. <<card continues>>
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<<card continues>> Again, it will be essential to help citizens deal with the inevitable turbulence through various forms of assistance and a mix of education and retraining. 11 Education is a recurring theme when it comes to what the United States must focus on to put its domestic house in order. It is critical for economic growth, for assisting those workers hurt by trade and technological changes, and for attacking inequality. Much is being said and written about the danger of inequality. Yes, inequality is growing, but the real problem is not that a few are extraordinarily wealthy, but that many are poor and not seeing their living standards or prospects improve. The policy prescription is not to try to reduce inequality per se through massive subsidies and new taxes intended to redistribute wealth. This will surely fail, and any transfer of wealth will not increase the capacity of recipients to be productive but will decrease the productivity of those who are. Rather, the aim must be to make upward mobility a reality. This will come about only if there is more access to quality education, not just for young people but for all citizens as they go through their lives. The alternative, a country increasingly defined by class, would lead to lower economic growth and higher social friction, in turn producing more populism in American politics and less support for the sort of foreign policy that is required if this era is to be one of more stability than not. Education also merits mention in another sense. This book has argued that the world matters to Americans and the United States, and that what the United States chooses to do (and not to do) in the world matters in return. Understanding these realities and judging the policies being put forward requires a citizenry that is globally literate and that appreciates the potential benefits of global involvement and the potential risks that come from globalization as well as from either too much or too little involvement in the world—or, more accurately, from too much of the wrong kind of involvement and too little of the right kind. Including global civics as a matter of course in high school and college, offerings that made clear why the world matters and the choices that face the United States, would be a good investment in the country’s future.

#### Declining US economic leadership risks global conflict

Haass 13 – President of the Council on Foreign Relations, former director of policy planning for the Department of State, master’s and Ph.D. from Oxford University (Richard N, “The World Without America”, Project Syndicate, 4/30/13, <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/repairing-the-roots-of-american-power-by-richard-n--haass)//JSL>

But, like most temptations, the urge to gloat at America’s imperfections and struggles ought to be resisted. People around the globe should be careful what they wish for. America’s failure to deal with its internal challenges would come at a steep price. Indeed, the rest of the world’s stake in American success is nearly as large as that of the US itself. Part of the reason is economic. The US economy still accounts for about one-quarter of global output. If US growth accelerates, America’s capacity to consume other countries’ goods and services will increase, thereby boosting growth around the world. At a time when Europe is drifting and Asia is slowing, only the US (or, more broadly, North America) has the potential to drive global economic recovery. The US remains a unique source of innovation. Most of the world’s citizens communicate with mobile devices based on technology developed in Silicon Valley; likewise, the Internet was made in America. More recently, new technologies developed in the US greatly increase the ability to extract oil and natural gas from underground formations. This technology is now making its way around the globe, allowing other societies to increase their energy production and decrease both their reliance on costly imports and their carbon emissions. The US is also an invaluable source of ideas. Its world-class universities educate a significant percentage of future world leaders. More fundamentally, the US has long been a leading example of what market economies and democratic politics can accomplish. <<card continues>>
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<<card continues>> People and governments around the world are far more likely to become more open if the American model is perceived to be succeeding. Finally, the world faces many serious challenges, ranging from the need to halt the spread of weapons of mass destruction, fight climate change, and maintain a functioning world economic order that promotes trade and investment to regulating practices in cyberspace, improving global health, and preventing armed conflicts. These problems will not simply go away or sort themselves out. While Adam Smith’s “invisible hand” may ensure the success of free markets, it is powerless in the world of geopolitics. Order requires the visible hand of leadership to formulate and realize global responses to global challenges. Don’t get me wrong: None of this is meant to suggest that the US can deal effectively with the world’s problems on its own. Unilateralism rarely works. It is not just that the US lacks the means; the very nature of contemporary global problems suggests that only collective responses stand a good chance of succeeding. But multilateralism is much easier to advocate than to design and implement. Right now there is only one candidate for this role: the US. No other country has the necessary combination of capability and outlook. This brings me back to the argument that the US must put its house in order – economically, physically, socially, and politically – if it is to have the resources needed to promote order in the world. Everyone should hope that it does: The alternative to a world led by the US is not a world led by China, Europe, Russia, Japan, India, or any other country, but rather a world that is not led at all. Such a world would almost certainly be characterized by chronic crisis and conflict. That would be bad not just for Americans, but for the vast majority of the planet’s inhabitants.

#### Reducing inequity in K-12 education unlocks 70 trillion in long-term growth and will eliminate the US debt crisis

Edley et. Cuéllar 13 [Christopher Edley, Jr. and Mariano-Florentino Cuéllar- part of the The Equity and Excellence Commission (the Commission) which is a federal advisory committee chartered by Congress, operating under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA); 5 U.S.C., App.2. , For Each and Every Child, February 2, 2013, <https://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/eec/equity-excellence-commission-report.pdf>] Valiaveedu

While some young Americans—most of them white and affluent— are getting a truly world-class education, those who attend schools in high poverty neighborhoods are getting an education that more closely approximates school in developing nations. In reading, for example, although U.S. children in low-poverty schools rank at the top of the world, those in our highest-poverty schools are performing on a par with children in the world’s lowest-achieving countries.1 With the highest poverty rate in the developed world,2 amplified by the inadequate education received by many children in low-income schools, the United States is threatening its own future. A recent McKinsey report, for example, concluded that the inequities within the U.S. education system impose an economic impact on the country equivalent to a “permanent national recession.”3 To achieve the excellence and equity in education on which our future depends, we need a system of American public education that ensures all students have a real and meaningful opportunity to achieve rigorous college- and career-ready standards. A world-class education consists not solely of mastery of core subjects, but also of training in critical thinking and problem-solving, as well as in 21st-century concerns like global awareness and financial literacy. Such high levels of education are key to self-reliance and economic security in a world where education matters more than ever for the success of societies as well as individuals. <<card continues>>
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<<card continues>> But American schools must do more than ensure our future economic prosperity; they must foster the nation’s civic culture and sense of common purpose, and create the unified nation that e pluribus unum celebrates. So much depends on fulfilling this mission: the shared ideals that enable our governmental system to hold together even in the face of fractious political disagreements; the strength of our diversity; the domestic tranquility that our Constitution promises; and the ability to maintain the influence—as example and power—that America has long projected in the world. We neglect those expectations at our peril. We cannot have a strong democracy without an informed, engaged citizenry. Accordingly, a strong public school system is essential to a strong democracy. Public schools must be strengthened to tackle two uniquely 21st-century challenges. First, although the United States has many first-rate schools, even our top students don’t perform as well as top students in many other countries in mathematics.4 Second, the schools serving high concentrations of low-income students and students of color are at far higher risk of leaving their students unprepared for work and life in an era of global competition than are their white and middleclass peers.5 An additional challenge is that reform efforts to date have been poorly targeted. The truth is that in an era when work can be organized and carried out anywhere on the planet, we have failed to confront the price of these two gaps. There is no doubt that excellence and equity are vital to produce the additional 20 million postsecondary graduates by 2025 necessary to grow a 21st-century economy. Equity is a key strategy needed to shore up the entire nation’s standing in the global economy; we cannot compete successfully with one arm tied behind our back. Any goal of competitiveness and excellence must start with equity or be doomed to fail. Equally important, the weave of America’s social and moral fabric now includes powerful commitments to broad inclusion and universal opportunity. These values are self-evidently fundamental. They are not, however, well served by our education system. In this introductory section, we pinpoint two problems in our education system. As we do, we reveal a shocking picture of how the situation hurts our children’s lives and, in turn, the nation. Then we outline the five major elements of an equity and excellence agenda that we believe can surmount this challenge. Finding the Solution to America’s Achievement Gaps Today, far too many U.S. students—the future labor force—are no longer competitive with students across the developed world. In the OECD’s Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) rankings for 2009, the United States was 27th in math (not counting states or provinces that were ranked separately from their country).6 In terms of “advanced” performance on math, 16 countries produced twice as many high-achievers per capita as the United States. Indeed, in mathematics, only one in four of America’s 52 million K-12 students is performing on par today with the average student in the highest-performing school systems in the world—which are now in Singapore, Hong Kong, Finland, Taiwan and South Korea.7 If we accept this level of performance, we will find our economy on a low-growth path, because over the past half-century, the economies of countries with higher math and science skills have grown faster than those with lower-skilled populations.8 We will also erode our country’s ability to deliver on its promise of equal opportunity for all its people. Imagine what we could achieve if we made American public schools competitive with those of a higher-performing country such as Canada in mathematics (which means scoring approximately 40 points higher on PISA tests) over the next 20 years. As our higher-skill-level students entered the labor force, they would produce a faster-growing economy. How much faster? The potential is stunning. The improvement in our GDP over the next 80 years would exceed a present value of $70 trillion.9 That’s equivalent to an average 20 percent boost in income for every U.S. worker each year over his or her entire career. <<card continues>>
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<<card continues>> This would generate enough revenue to solve the U.S. debt problem that is the object of so much current debate. While the exact level of U.S. performance as compared to other countries may vary somewhat across international assessments,11 what remains clear is the nation continues to face a significant problem of inequality. We face this challenge as our public schools undertake to educate an enormously diverse student population in a country with rapidly changing demographics. In 2009, more than 39 percent of our public school students were African American or Hispanic—up from 33 percent just a decade earlier. In 11 states, non-Hispanic white students were already a minority, a trend that is likely to continue as the Hispanic populations in a number of states continue to rise.12 Yet when it comes to our country’s ability to close the achievement gap between students from different demographic groups, our record is dismal. In math, the average African American eighth-grader is performing at the 19th percentile of white students.13 The average Hispanic student is at the 26th percentile. In this age in which skills are dominant in the labor market, we are relegating a large and growing portion of our population to bleak economic futures. Concerns about disparities in income distribution will, with these basic realities, be an everpresent element of the U.S. future. The opposite side of the same coin is the huge loss to the American economy and to our future economic well-being from failing to develop fully the human potential of our population. Consider, for example, the consequences of addressing the achievement gap between white students, on the one hand, and African American and Hispanic students, on the other. If, on average, African American and Hispanic students performed academically at the level currently achieved by white students, overall student performance for the United States would rise from below the developed-country average to a respectable position ahead, for example, of Australia and Germany. If Hispanic and African American student performance grew to be comparable to white performance and remained there over the next 80 years, the historical evidence indicates that the impact would be staggering—adding some $50 trillion (in present value terms) to our economy.18 This amount constitutes more than three times the size of our current GDP and represents the income that we forgo by not ensuring equity for all of our students. In fact, simply achieving a 90 percent graduation rate for students of color would add as much as $6.6 billion in annual earnings to the American economy.19 Our education system, legally desegregated more than a half century ago, is ever more segregated by wealth and income, and often again by race. Ten million students in America’s poorest communities20—and millions more African American, Latino, Asian American, Pacific Islander, American Indian and Alaska Native students who are not poor—are having their lives unjustly and irredeemably blighted by a system that consigns them to the lowest-performing teachers, the most run-down facilities, and academic expectations and opportunities considerably lower than what we expect of other students. These vestiges of segregation, discrimination and inequality are unfinished business for our nation. Admittedly, many of these disadvantaged students enter school far behind their more advantaged peers. But instead of getting deadly serious about remedying that fact—by making sure such students are in high-quality early childhood and pre-K programs, attend schools staffed with teachers and leaders who have the skills and knowledge to help each student reach high standards, get after-school counseling or tutorial assistance or the eyeglasses they need to see the smart board—the current American system exacerbates the problem by giving these children less of everything that makes a difference in education. <<card continues>
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<<card continues>> As a result, we take the extraordinary diversity—including linguistic backgrounds and familial relationships—that should be our strategic advantage in the international economy and squander it. Given that low-income students, English-language learners and students of color together form a majority of our young people and the fastest-growing population in the nation—and that America’s future economic and civic vitality depends on their success in an age of global competition—this practice is not only unjust but also unwise

### Plan

#### Thus the plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase its funding of elementary and secondary education in the United States through Title I, Part A, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and create an equitable formula for distribution of funding that targets concentrated poverty and provides extra resources to states that adopt a progressive education funding formula.

### 1AC – Solvency

#### Contention 3 is Solvency:

#### The plan ramps up Title I funding to 45 billion a year – anything short can’t account for the scale of concentrated poverty.

Black, 17 - Professor of Law, University of South Carolina School of Law (Derek, “Abandoning the Federal Role in Education: The Every Student Succeeds Act”, 102 CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW [Vol. 105:101, SSRN)

Congress can then realign the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with its historic mission of improving academic achievement and equity for low-income students, and also can enact better mechanisms to achieve those goals. First, the Congress must increase the federal investment in education. This is necessary to help states meet the full academic needs of disadvantaged students and to offset the proportionally higher costs of districts serving predominantly low-income students. An increase in federal investment is also necessary if states are to accept the second step: strict prohibitions on states’ unequal distribution of educational resources. Strict prohibitions with no transition steps, however, would surely fail. Thus, Congress should require incremental steps toward equity, as well as alternative compliance measures for districts that might be high performing regardless of their resources. The final step is to expand preschool education to all low-income students—a goal that the Department of Education has pushed in recent years, but that states seemingly lack the capacity to reach alone. A short-term federal investment could immediately expand preschool and, in the long term, generate new savings that states could use to fund preschool and offset the costs of equity compliance in later grades. The following sections explore each of these points in full. A. Increase the Federal Investment in Education The federal financial stake in education should substantially increase and move states toward delivering low-income students the full supplemental funding necessary to provide adequate educational opportunities. Estimates suggest that for low-income students to achieve at levels comparable to their peers, they require 30 to 60 percent more resources than those necessary for middle-income students.. 333 The federal government has officially pegged 40 percent as the appropriate supplement.334 States are far from meeting this standard and, as Part III.A. demonstrates, are regressing in many locations. Skeptics primarily ask why the federal government should take on a larger financial commitment in an area traditionally of state concern and control. And relatedly, why not simply demand that states meet appropriate resource goals themselves? The answer to these concerns is threefold. First, some states appear to lack the resources to fund education adequately and equitably.335 Ironically, a few states fund education roughly equally across districts, but the actual funding level itself is relatively low.336 These states lag far behind the national average in terms of fiscal capacity.337 They devote a greater percentage of their states’ overall wealth to education, but because they are poor states, their extra effort still generates relatively low levels of education funding. 338 As one study found, the greatest funding inequities are between poor and rich states, not within individual states. 339 Second, many states with relatively high fiscal capacity have taken very little initiative in equalizing education.340 These states may fund education at relatively high levels, but funding can be wildly unequal across districts. In other words, many states fall into two different camps: one with a commitment to equity but no capacity for adequacy, and another with the capacity for adequacy but no commitment to equity. As Josh Weishart explained, adequacy and equity are interconnected, and one cannot realistically be achieved without the other.341 Third, helping low-capacity states necessarily requires federal assistance and motivating high-capacity states necessarily requires federal leverage. The federal government cannot get either for nothing. <<card continues>>
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<<card continues>> Both involve substantial additional money— enough to make the deal enticing for states. While Congress plausibly could demand more equity and adequacy from states pursuant to its congressional powers under the Fourteenth Amendment, 342 such authority has not been substantiated by courts or even remotely recognized by politicians. This leaves Congress’s power under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. As spending legislation, Congress can only secure states’ consent to conditions in exchange for money.343 Congress and President Bush clearly understood this relationship in passing the NCLB, as the NCLB drastically expanded the federal role in education but only in exchange for a major increase in federal funding.344 If Congress is to further equity and adequacy through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the future, it must do the same again. The federal government has the capacity to make this investment with relatively little effort. The current outlays for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act hover around $25 billion a year345—a miniscule number compared to the $938 billion in annual spending on health care.346 Federal spending on education altogether, which includes far more than just the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, is about 3 percent of the federal budget and is roughly equivalent to transportation or scientific research spending.347 In recent years, Congress has demonstrated the willingness to inject new funds into education to address short-term agendas. During the recession, Congress appropriated $4.3 billion to fund education innovation grants to states.348 Congress made an even bigger appropriation of $53.6 billion to cover the states’ budget shortfalls during the recession and to prevent massive teacher layoffs.349 Toward that end, Congress appropriated $53.6 billion with almost no strings attached.350 An annual federal investment of $45 billion, rather than the current $15 billion, would be enough to ensure that low-income students, particularly those attending schools with concentrated poverty, receive the additional funds they need.351 These federal funds alone, if properly targeted, would amount to a 20 percent supplement for low-income students and would put states halfway to the goal of a 40 percent supplement.352 This investment would afford the federal government the leverage to demand that states appropriately weight their funding formulas to meet the needs of disadvantaged students.353 At that point, existing and new Title I funds and state remediation could combine to provide a 40 percent supplement for low-income students. Equally important, these federal funds would create the leverage and capacity the federal government needs for states to comply with the equity provisions outlined in the following sections. Footnote 351 351 In theory, Congress probably could cover half of the cost of a 40 percent bump to all low-income students with $25 billion, but as the percentage of low-income students in a school increases, so will the necessary per-pupil expenditures. See generally Derek W. Black, The Congressional Failure to Enforce Equal Protection Through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 90 B.U. L. REV. 313, 344-46 (2010). This Article proposes a $45 billion investment, which would account for the effects of concentrated poverty. The data for that estimate comes from U.S. Census, Annual Survey of School System Finances: Per Pupil Amounts for Current Spending of Public Elementary-Secondary School Systems by State: Fiscal Year 2014, available at https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk. The methodology and calculations were devised and performed by Professor Bruce D. Baker, Rutgers University Graduate School of Education. The data are on file with the author.

### 1AC – Solvency

#### Funding is the major determinant of adequate outcomes – criticisms don’t account for the improved targeting in the plan’s formula

Black, 17 - Professor of Law, University of South Carolina School of Law (Derek, “Abandoning the Federal Role in Education: The Every Student Succeeds Act”, 102 CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW [Vol. 105:101, SSRN)

Third, the ESSA’s willingness to largely ignore input equality and adequacy assumes that inputs are of limited relevance to student outcomes. The precise connection between inputs and outcomes is surely complex and subject to disagreement, but courts and scholars consistently agree that spending money wisely matters to education outcomes. 294 A 1996 review of all relevant school funding studies found that per-pupil expenditures “show strong and consistent relations with achievement. . . . In addition, resource variables that attempt to describe the quality of teachers (teacher ability, teacher education, and teacher experience) show very strong relations with student achievement.”295 The precise effect of funding may differ based on how funds are allocated, but “a broad range of resources [are] positively related to student outcomes, with effect sizes large enough to suggest that moderate increases in spending may be associated with significant increases in achievement.”296 Recent studies have confirmed these findings.297 Most notably, based on three decades of data, a 2016 study found that a 20 percent increase in per-pupil funding, if maintained over time, results in low-income students completing almost a full additional year of education.298 That additional learning eliminates two-thirds of the gap in outcomes between low- and middle-income students.299

### 1AC – Solvency

#### A federal statutory duty to increase Title I funding is the only sustainable way to guarantee funding. The federal signal is vital to overcoming shifting state and local political coalitions that will undermine funding over time

Hinson, 15 – lawyer; JD at the University of Michigan; former researcher for the Southern Poverty Law Center (Elizabeth, “Mainstreaming Equality in Federal Budgeting: Addressing Educational Inequities With Regard to the States” v20 issue 2, <http://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1044&context=mjrl> italics in original

The next challenge for the United States federal government is to commit funds where fiscal formulas are devised. With the existence of a statutory duty, this budgeting is more likely to occur. Historically, a lack of resources has been the main cause of failed efforts to solve funding gaps between the poorest and wealthiest school districts.173 It is left to policymakers’ imaginations what successes might have been if programs had been fully funded. Thus, the creation of a duty becomes both the most essential ingredient and the most essential commitment of the federal government in establishing a mainstreaming equality scheme for school funding. Current policies that are a part of the No Child Left Behind Act and most other state funding schemes function as mere policy guidelines. Absent a formal duty to fund, these guidelines fall short in application. The United States is susceptible to ideological differences in its party system at the federal, state, and local levels. When considering the politics of local school districts, it becomes even more apparent that whatever funding scheme is implemented must be one that will overcome flux and change in both national and state political leadership and also in local school leadership. Northern Ireland chose the mainstreaming mechanism embodied in its Section 75 statutory duty precisely because it would be durable through different political arrangements.174 Northern Ireland’s statutory duty requires public authorities to regard the need to promote equality of opportunity between: (1) persons of different religious belief, political opinion, racial group, age, marital status or sexual orientation; (2) men and women generally; (3) persons with a disability and persons without; (4) persons with dependents and persons without.175 This statutory equality duty has implications for elementary and secondary education in Northern Ireland, as it applies to all public authorities, including the Department of Education.176 Each public authority is required to produce an Equality Scheme, outlining how they will implement Section 75.177 These schemes identify areas of concern, including those where equality-impact assessments will occur.178 For example, one such equality-impact assessment reviewing education curriculum found the lack of an explicit requirement to address racial equality issues in statutory curriculum and those findings were later factored into the curriculum review, which ultimately informed the content of the new statutory curriculum.179 A similar delineation of areas for impact assessments would allow for regular measurements of equity and adequacy for specific groups and for the effects of interlocking forms of disadvantage. Congress would regularly assess the effect of policies on layered disadvantage, focusing on the mechanisms and processes that deprive students of advantages otherwise available to those who are a part of the mainstream. Targeting layered disadvantage would function similarly to the policy of the New Targeted Social Need (New TSN) in Northern Ireland, which performs in addition to the mainstreaming equality provisions of Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act of 1998.180 Targeted social need (TSN) has been used in policies throughout the United Kingdom in order to counteract the divide of resources and jobs between the regions, as the South is much more prosperous than the North.181 In efforts to counteract the effects of such a divide, financial allocations have been budgeted based on indicators such as regional income, employment ratios, health deprivation and disability, education, skills and training, housing, geographical access to services, and child poverty.182 While such factors may be useful to Congressional assessments and budgeting formulas, factoring educational disadvantage in the United States must also encompass circumstances of cultural isolation and the ability to compete.183 <<card continues>>

### 1AC – Solvency

<<card continues>> Other indicators might include national origin, race, ethnicity, or gender based on gaps evidenced in assessment outcomes of these characteristics. Indicators should also consider interstate disparities, as well as economic stagnation as controlled by local circumstances, whether in the form of lack of industry, employment, chronic population imprisonment and low education levels. Poverty must not be thought of as a mere lack of resources, conditions and amenities, as originally defined in Title I, but also in terms of the extent of deprivation which leads *in effect* to people being excluded from mainstream society. Studies show that there can be no effective enforcement of a mainstreaming scheme without a statutory duty.184 In fact, most mainstreaming schemes have failed without the provision of an enforcement mechanism.185 Methods of enforcement may include a detailed statutory scheme, outlining for public authorities specific timelines and guidelines for implementation of the funding scheme and detailed instructions for implementation in related regulations. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education or other enforcement body, along with a congressional committee, would monitor the implementation of the legislation and its effectiveness. For example, Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act of 1998 created the Equality Commission.186 Schedule 9 of the Act outlines the specific roles of the Equality Commission, specifying that the Commission is to offer advice on and review the effectiveness of the duties: The Equality Commission for Northern Ireland shall— keep under review the effectiveness of the duties imposed by section 75; offer advice to public authorities and others in connection with those duties; and carry out the functions conferred on it by the following provisions of this Schedule.187 The enforcement body for the U.S. scheme would also report to Congress in a consultative capacity on the implementation and effects of the funding scheme. When the enforcement body suspects that a public authority has not carried out its duty under the statute, it may investigate.188 Congress may also consider employing a consultative element similar to that used in Section 75 as a means by which Congress can accept recommendations and reports from policy organizations also evaluating the effectiveness of the funding scheme. Specifically, Paragraph 5 of Section 9 requires: [b]efore submitting a scheme a public authority shall consult, in accordance with any directions given by the Commission— (a) representatives of persons likely to be affected by the scheme; and (b) such other persons as may be specified in the directions.189 Congress may additionally provide a provision of grants to consultative policy groups so that the study of the implementation of the mainstreaming funding scheme across the states may be monitored and studied.190 This is an essential element in the funding scheme because a detailed understanding and engagement with all communities is necessary to ensure all indicators listed within the funding scheme carry the adequate number of dollars to each student no matter the student’s county or region in the United States. Moreover, continual assessment and re-assessment of indicators of disadvantage and evaluations of layered disadvantage will be required in order to ensure that student needs are adequately met. Amid wide reports that funds for the federal Title I program have been insufficient to improve student achievement in identified schools under the No Child Left Behind Act,191 and the accompanying lawsuits in various states, it is imperative that Congress commit to a mainstreaming equality funding scheme for public education. Congress should also consider increasing the amount it already contributes to public education in order to counteract some of the fiscal inefficiencies at the local level and the opposition by state taxpayers to allow redistribution of funds between wealthy and poor school districts. Currently, less than eight percent of funding for public elementary and secondary education comes from the federal government.192 In designing a statutory duty for mainstreaming equality and the consequent allocation of targeted funds, Congress should prioritize interstate disparities, disbursing federal funds among the states in order to concentrate funds on a national basis and to combat interstate disparities. Funds would then also be disbursed according to a new formula which, unlike the current Title I-A formula, would target funds based on new definitions of layered disadvantage, as outlined above. The implementation must be effective, and thus the statute must also allow and fund a sufficient number of staff at the state education agencies to oversee the implementation of this specialized mainstreaming scheme. <<card continues>>

### 1AC – Solvency

<<card continues>> CONCLUSION Congress required that ESEA maintain a balance between federal power and local responsibility in order to pass both houses in a post-Brown political environment. Yet for decades since, this concept of local control has undermined the very intent of the Congressional legislation and has at the same time justified the wide disparities caused by local property taxes. State high courts that have invalidated property-tax finance systems properly held that expenditure disparities create wealth-based differences in educational opportunities. While the legislative responses to these decisions have given poor districts more revenue in order to reduce spending variations and enrich educational programs, some of the modified funding formulas do not ensure that substantive change will occur due to other obstacles at the local level. Title I’s provision for state coordination to serve disadvantaged populations has little force of its own because even if states have the resources for such coordination, their participation is at their own election.193 The statute does not mandate that states receiving Title I funds use those funds to serve low-income students in specific ways, but rather, the statute permits various uses for the funds and uses general terms such as “provide services.”194 In many cases, states work at different capacities in terms of implementing the systems required to enforce the federal legislation. Again, these frustrations often go to inadequate funding and insufficient human resources. Due to tensions over local control, other state education agencies are still reluctant to intrude too much in local schools, even low-performing ones.195 A new approach is required to combat the paralysis of poverty originally targeted by Title I legislation in 1965. However, the United States must reevaluate its definition of poverty and acknowledge that poverty in the United States is intricately linked to disadvantage as it relates to race and class and other discriminatory systems.196 A federal mainstreaming equality school funding scheme will create a moral imperative and mission at the federal level. The funding scheme will contribute the lion’s share of funding to those schools serving students categorized as disadvantaged. States will receive weighted funds based on this disadvantage, of which one consideration would be interstate disparities. To ensure fair interstate disbursement federal funds should be disbursed within states based on each individual schools’ assessed disadvantage rather than disadvantage by school district due to the extreme disparities which often exist within districts. This method will require school districts to change their budgeting methods. Instead of reporting district spending based on district averages and average per pupil expenditures, school districts will report actual spending for each school. As a result, targeted federal funds will arrive not at schools with already rich resources, such as veteran and high-paid teachers, but in the accounts of the most needy institutions. Through the implementation of a mainstreaming school funding scheme based on layered disadvantage and its multiplicative effects, long-time disparities between public schools in the United States may at last be countered and corrected.

## Equity Advantage Extensions

### Educational Inequality Increasing

#### The ESSA weakened Title I regulations on how money can be spent – which means it will accelerate inequality

Black, 17 - Professor of Law, University of South Carolina School of Law (Derek, “Abandoning the Federal Role in Education: The Every Student Succeeds Act”, 102 CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW [Vol. 105:101, SSRN)//DH

The randomized guarantee of output equality might be mitigated or cured if instead the ESSA’s goal was to ensure equal inputs and resources. Equal inputs are easier to achieve than equal outputs. Equal inputs, if implemented properly, may also be a better indicator of equal educational opportunity than raw outcomes.254 An initial premise of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was exactly that—to provide supplemental resources to disadvantaged students to bring their educational outcomes closer to that of their peers.255 The ESSA drifts further away from this focus on inputs. In conjunction with the prior Section, this means that the ESSA assures equality in neither inputs nor outputs. Some of the fault lies with historical holdovers. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has long contained a provision requiring comparable resources between Title I and non-Title I schools. In practice, however, nothing of the sort has been required in recent decades. During the early 1970s, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and its implementing regulations required that expenditures at Title I schools be within 5 percent of the expenditures at other schools within their district.256 That number was later changed to 10 percent and eventually abandoned altogether.257 In place of numerical measures of equality, recent versions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have required that Title I schools merely be “substantially comparable” to other schools in the district, based on school services “as a whole.”258 This vague and forgiving standard has not required meaningful equity between schools for some time. In addition, the comparability requirement does not apply across district lines, even though the largest funding inequalities exist between school districts. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has never purported to address interdistrict inequality and the ESSA does nothing to change this or any other significant equity demand. Instead, the ESSA retains the blunt statutory provision that “[n]othing in this subchapter shall be construed to mandate equalized spending per pupil for a State, local educational agency, or school.”259 Embedded in these weak equity standards is an even bigger and more troubling loophole for teacher salaries. Teacher salaries regularly comprise 80 to 90 percent of school budgets.260 In the past few iterations of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, schools’ total expenditures for teacher salaries have been exempted from analysis. Rather than examine salary expenditures, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has asked two questions: (1) whether there is a uniform salary schedule across the district, and (2) whether staffing ratios are roughly similar. In other words, so long as schools have similar student-teacher ratios and all first-year teachers, for instance, are equally compensated, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act treats the schools as substantially comparable. This standard completely ignores the fact that the teaching staffs at schools often look entirely different in terms of quality. Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, a district could assign all first-year teachers to a high-poverty school and all teachers with advanced degrees, national certifications, and several years of experience to a school serving predominantly middle-income students. This alone would likely create not only a huge quality gap between schools but also a huge funding gap. A uniform salary schedule that dictates much higher salaries for highly credentialed teachers would net hundreds of thousands of dollars in additional expenditures at the middle-income school. Yet, under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act’s weak equity standards and teacher loophole, this quality and funding gap is entirely permissible. Data reveals that districts regularly exploit this loophole. Schools serving large percentages of low-income and minority students are wildly unequal in their ability to attract, compensate, and retain quality teachers.261 <<card continues>>

### Educational Inequality Increasing

<<card continues>> On average, poor and minority students are exposed to inexperienced, uncredentialed, and unqualified teachers at twice the rate as other students.262 The financial consequences of this unequal distribution follow automatically. The Department of Education indicates that in districts with twenty or more schools, 72 percent of school districts spend less on teacher salaries in Title I schools less than in non-Title I schools in the district, with an average gap of over $2,500 per teacher.263 A separate study found that states and local districts would need to allocate $6.83 billion nationally to close the funding gap created by teacher salaries.264 That the ESSA continues these lax equity standards and loopholes is remarkable. Scholars, policy reports, the media, the U.S. Government Accountability Office, and even the Department of Education itself have emphasized how ineffectual the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been in ensuring equal treatment in school expenditures in recent years.265 Secretary John King recently remarked, “The current system is not fair. . . . ‘What we see, as we look around the country, is districts where they’re actually spending significantly more in their non-Title I schools than they’re spending in their Title I schools.’”266 A host of studies also demonstrate that access to quality teachers may have the largest impact on student achievement of any factor.267 For that reason, the Department of Education recently emphasized that unequal access to teachers may violate Title VI’s prohibition on racial discrimination.268 Yet, the ESSA ignored both issues of funding and teacher inequalities. In some respects, the ESSA asks even less than the NCLB in regard to equity. The ESSA relaxes both the maintenance of effort standard and the prohibition on supplanting local funds.269 Weakening these standards makes it easier for districts to mask their unequal funding practices. With fewer limits on how federal dollars are spent, districts can use federal dollars to fill the local funding deficits that districts create through their own fiscal policies.270 Districts might even expand funding inequalities and deficits in local expenditures because they have more flexibility with federal funds. As Part III.B will detail, Secretary King sought to block this eventuality through regulation but faced congressional rebuke for doing so.271

#### Best case is that the status quo will take decades to reduce educational inequality

Reardon,16 - Sean F. Reardon is a professor of education at Stanford; Jane Waldfogel is a professor of social work at Columbia; and Daphna Bassok is an associate professor of education at the University of Virginia. (New York Times, “The Good News About Educational Inequality, 8/28,https://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/28/opinion/sunday/the-good-news-about-educational-inequality.html

As encouraging as this new evidence is, we have a long way to go. Poor children still enter kindergarten nearly a year behind their richer peers. Even if school readiness gaps continue to narrow at the rate they did between 1998 and 2010, it would take another 60 to 110 years for them to be completely eliminated. Changes in parenting are not going to be sufficient to sustain or speed this progress, although more paid leave would help. Economic inequality still constrains poor children's horizons. Low-income and middle-class parents still struggle to find affordable, high-quality preschools. The elementary, middle and high schools that rich and poor students attend differ markedly in resources and quality. And it isn't clear that the recent reductions in school readiness gaps will automatically translate into greater equality in high school, college and beyond. If we don't do something about these larger problems, the progress we have made toward equality in early childhood may prove only a brief respite from ever-widening educational inequality. "Goodnight Moon," for all its charm and power, is no substitute for comprehensive social policy.

### Educational Inequality Increasing

#### High poverty schools get the least amount of funding

Baker et. al, 17 – Bruce Baker, EdD, is a professor in the Department of Educational Theory, Policy and Administration in the Graduate School of Education at Rutgers University. He is coauthor of Financing Education Systems, author of numerous peer-reviewed articles on education finance, and is on editorial boards of the Journal of Education Finance and Education Finance and Policy as well as a research fellow for the National Education Policy Center. (Bruce Baker, “Is School Funding Fair? A National Report Card,” Sixth Edition, Education Law Center, SRA)

Similar to previous years, funding levels continue to be characterized by wide disparities among states. In 2014, funding levels ranged from a high of $18,165 in New York, to a low of $5,838 in Idaho (See Figure 1). This means that, on average, students in Idaho had access to less than one‐third of the funding available to students with similar needs and circumstances in New York. These disparities suggest wide variation in the degree to which states are providing the resources required to deliver equitable opportunities for all students. Relative funding rankings have remained largely consistent over time. Despite recent fluctuations in the economy and attendant variations in spending, with only a few exceptions the lowest ranking states tend to remain in the bottom, and high spending states tend to remain at the top. The funding distribution measure addresses the key question of whether a state’s funding system recognizes the need for additional resources for students in settings of concentrated student poverty.5 In 2014, twelve states had progressive funding distributions, down from a high of twenty in 2008, and four less than 2013.6 Fifteen states had no substantial variation in funding between high poverty and low poverty districts, and twenty‐one states had regressive funding patterns, up from fourteen in 2013 (see Figure 2). The four most progressive states, Delaware, Utah, Minnesota and Ohio, provide their highest poverty districts, on average, with between 27% and 44% more funding per student than their lowest poverty districts. In contrast, the most regressive states provide significantly less funding to their highest poverty districts. In Wyoming, high poverty districts get 70 cents for every dollar in low poverty districts, while in Nevada, high poverty districts receive only 59 cents to the dollar.

### Education Key to Poverty

#### Education is critical to employment and overall economic opportunity--- statistics show a direct correlation between these three indicators

Meanes, 16 – Partner @Thompson Coburn, LLP; President @ National Bar Association 2014-15. J.D., University of Iowa; M.A., Clark Atlanta University; B.A., Monmouth College (Pamela J., “SCHOOL INEQUALITY: CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS: Allen Chair Issue 2016: SCHOOL DISCIPLINE POLICIES: EQUITY IN AMERICAN EDUCATION: THE INTERSECTION OF RACE, CLASS, AND EDUCATION,” University of Richmond Law Review, 3/16, Lexis, 50 U. Rich. L. Rev. 1075)//JLE

I. An Education Creates Economic Opportunity "Education, then, beyond all other devices of human origin, is the great equalizer of the conditions of men ... ." n11 - Horace Mann The importance of an education is manifest in its ability to open up opportunities for students. In 2014, the U.S. Department of Labor Bureau of Labor Statistics released a report analyzing the earnings and unem-ployment rates of individuals with different levels of educational attainment. n12 These statistics provide insight into the importance of equal access to education in the U.S. economy. In 2014, the unemployment rate for college gradu-ates holding a professional degree was 1.9%. n13 The unemployment rate for college graduates holding a bachelor's degree was 3.5%. n14 For [\*1078] individuals who earned a high school diploma and then either completed some college coursework or discontinued their education, the unemployment rate was 6%. n15 And 9% of high school drop-outs were unemployed. n16 The statistics are clear: young individuals who have not completed high school are two-and-a-half times more likely to be unemployed than college graduates. And those same young individuals are more than four times as likely to be unemployed than college graduates holding a professional degree. What does that mean in terms of economic opportunity? The same Department of Labor statistics paint a bleak picture. The median weekly earnings for college graduates holding a professional degree in 2014 was $ 1639; n17 for college graduates holding a bachelor's degree, the median was $ 1101; n18 for a young worker who earned a high school diploma and then joined the work force, the median was $ 668; n19 and for a worker who had failed to earn a high school diploma, the median was $ 488. n20 So a worker who failed to complete high school had a median weekly income of less than half of that of a college graduate holding a bachelor's degree, and less than one-third of that of a college graduate holding a professional de-gree. The correlation between education and economic opportunity is direct and clear. Education leads to economic power and opportunity. Conversely, a lack of education is tied directly to high unemployment rates, lower pay, and drastically reduced economic opportunity.

### Education Key to Poverty

#### Lower education reinforces poverty

Imoukhuede, 14 – Professor of Law, Nova Southeastern University - Shepard Broad Law Center (Areto, “Education Rights and the New Due Process” 47 Ind. L. Rev, <http://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1060&context=law_facarticles>

Irrespective of the overall or average adequacy of the U.S. education system, one point that is not in serious debate is the woeful race and wealth-based inequities in public education.34 Sadly, Julius Chambers’ statement regarding race, poverty and education is as true today as it was back in 1987: In America. . . the quality and quantity of education that children receive remain tied to the race and economic status of their family. Many black and poor children, through no fault of their own, continue to be deprived of training in even the most basic skills, such as reading, writing and arithmetic. This deprivation works a profound and lifelong injury to these neglected youths, and cripples their ability to participate in political and economic life. . . . . The United States is often romantically portrayed as a meritocracy. Yet, the continuing poverty of a disproportionate number of black children, their increasing isolation in largely segregated school systems, and the resistance of white citizens both to full integration and to adequate funding of all school districts, have perpetuated a system in which the potential achievement of a child is highly correlated with the race and economic status of his parents.35 More recently, education scholar, Linda Darling-Hammond’s research demonstrates that if anything, the racial inequities in education have only worsened. 36 In 2011, the four-year high school graduation rate remains stagnant at about 70 percent; the achievement gap between minority and White students in reading and math is larger than it was in 1988; and U.S. performance on international tests has continued to drop… . . . . . . . In the U.S., the impact of socio-economic factors on student performance is almost double what it is in Canada. . . . . In the U.S., White and Asian students score just above the average for the European OECD nations in each subject area, but African-American and Hispanic students – many of whom are in highly segregated schools that lack qualified teachers and up-to-date materials – score so much lower that the national average plummets to the bottom tier. Thus, the poor U.S. standing is substantially a product of unequal access to the kind of intellectually challenging learning measured on these international assessments.37

### Title I Formulas Increase Inequality

#### Title I’s funding formulas favor wealthier districts, and the comparability, maintenance of effort, and supplement-not-supplant standards are unenforced

Black, 15 – professor of law at the University of South Carolina (Derek, “Leveraging Federal Funding for Equity and Integration” THE ENDURING LEGACY OF RODRIGUEZ: CREATING NEW PATHWAYS TO EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY, ed: Robinson and Ogletree, p. 231-232)

The Federal Disregard for Inequitable State Practices While Congress exacerbates inequality and fails to meet student need, states are nor innocent. School finance victories in more than half of the states demonstrate many states' complacent and willful violations of students' rights to equal and adequate educational opportunities. States that have escaped liability are often no better; their courts simply have been unwilling to hold them accountable. The point here is not to detail these state failures but to point out how Congress is complicit in these violations. As David Sciarra recently characterized the relationship, Congress is the "great enabler."27 He and various others point out, during its bailout of state education systems during the recession of 2008, that Congress gave state education systems billions of dollars but then, in the face of blatant violations, did not enforce the equity rules put in place for those funds.28 This one-time failure, however, comes as no surprise considering that the previous three decades of ESEA enforcement were marked by a virtual absence of any equity standards to even enforce. Current Title I standards are so flexible that they do not prevent states and school districts from reducing their own education funds and replacing them with federal funds. The problem arises both from changes to the standards themselves and underenforcement of those standards. First, Title I includes a maintenance of effort standard that is designed to prevent states and districts from drawing down their local expenditures on education.29 But the numerical benchmark in the current maintenance of effort standard no longer provides any real check on school budgets. The current maintenance of effort standard only requires that school districts maintain their funding at 90 percent of the previous year. Because the federal government provides less than 10 percent of educational funds, it would not be very hard for a district to subvert the standard's purpose, particularly if a district drew down its funds and replaced them with federal funds over a two- or three-year period. The prohibition on supplanting funds is designed to prevent this, but the U.S. Department of Education has stopped enforcing the requirement. In the department's defense, the prohibition on supplanting funds requires speculation regarding future budgets and is labor intensive to monitor. Finding that those tasked with enforcing the standard are understandably confused by it, a 2003 GAO report recommended eliminating the supplement-not-supplant standard altogether, concluding that the more effective solution to state manipulation of federal funding would be to tighten the maintenance of effort standard.30 In the meantime, evidence suggests that some states and districts have taken advantage of the lax maintenance of effort standard and the department's underenforcement of the supplanting prohibition. A study of Texas and Colorado schools, for instance, found that "federal and other categorical funds, which were intended to provide additional opportunities, are used to fill in for inequitable distribution of foundational funds.”31 In other words, states and school districts were funding schools unequally and using federal funds to hide it. The practical ineffectiveness of the supplement-not-supplant and maintenance of effort standards could largely be overcome if Title I included strict equity requirements. Like other standards, however, Title I’s comparability standards are currently meaningless. Its regulations initially required that per-pupil funding at Title I schools be within 5 percent of non-Title I schools in the same district. Title I’s statutory language now explicitly rejects this requirement, stating that "nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to mandate equalized spending per pupil for a state, local education agency, or school."32 Title I, at best, expresses a symbolic commitment to equity with its general indication that "services . .. taken as a whole" at Title I schools must be “comparable" to those at non-Title I schools.33 <<card continues>>

### Title I Formulas Increase Inequality

<<card continues>> But the absence of any numerical benchmark for comparability leaves too much to interpretation and renders enforcement practically impossible. Even if these standards were subject to strict construction and enforcement, they are robbed of any potential vitality by Title I’s major exemptions and limitations. First, the comparability standards do not apply at all between school districts; rather, the current standards apply only within school districts. Yet, the largest inequities exist between districts, not within them. By limiting the comparability standards to within districts, our national funding gap for high-poverty districts of nearly $1,000 per pupil and gaps in excess of $2,000 per pupil in the worst offending stares evades all scrutiny. Second, within districts, the largest portions of school budgets are exempt from even meeting the weak requirement of substantial comparability. Title I exempts teacher salaries from comparability analysis, even though teacher salaries regularly account for 80 to 90 percent of school budgets.34 To be deemed comparable in regard to teacher salaries, a school district need only maintain a single salary schedule that applies to all schools in the district.35 Yet, real inequities arise not from variations in salary schedules but from the unequal distribution of teachers among schools. Under Title Is comparability standard, all of the twenty-year teachers with advanced degrees in a district could be placed at a single school and all the first-year teachers at an- other without violating comparability. Assume that a district had two elementary schools with twenty-five teachers at each school, that the salary gap between the experienced teachers and the new teachers was $30,000, and that half of the district's teachers were highly experienced. If the district assigned seventeen of its of twenty-five experienced teachers to one school, the district would have created a $270,000 funding gap between the schools, and Title I would call it "comparable" because the teachers at both schools were compensated on the same salary schedule. While this scenario may seem far-fetched, data indicates that it is a prevailing reality.36 Although not as significant in terms of money, central administration expenditures—such as gifted and talented, tutoring, and prekindergarten programs—also evade scrutiny because school districts generally fund these programs out of their central budgets rather than through individual school budgets.'7 Consequently, school districts are free to distribute these funds and programs among their schools any way they see fit. The result is two- fold. First, high-end programs for the "top" students are disproportionately available at middle-income schools. Students in high-poverty schools may still have the opportunity to participate in those programs, but their participation may require more personal initiative and come with higher transportation and time commitment burdens. Second, when middle-income schools see the success of supplemental Title I programs at other schools, they can petition their central administration to fund similar programs at their schools. This is not to suggest that middle-income schools should be deprived of these programs but that a district should be prohibited from pushing the cost of special programs for high-poverty schools onto the federal government while, at the same time, using local funds to supply those same programs at other schools. The result is that rather than receiving extra resources, high-poverty schools need federal money just to break even with other schools. In summary, Title I entirely ignores the most significant resource inequities, which occur between school districts, and sanctions the inequities that occur within districts by exempting the most important expenditures and permitting wide variances for the others.

### Title I Formulas Increase Inequality

#### Existing Title I formulas fuel inequities – the wealthiest schools receive the most funds

Hinson, 15 – lawyer; JD at the University of Michigan; former researcher for the Southern Poverty Law Center (Elizabeth, “Mainstreaming Equality in Federal Budgeting: Addressing Educational Inequities With Regard to the States” v20 issue 2, <http://repository.law.umich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1044&context=mjrl>

Components of the Title I funding formula limit the impact of the targeting provisions. Most of the funds allocated for Title I are allocated to school districts through the funding formula in Part A of the law.20 The Title I-A formula consists of four distinct components, each with different eligibility requirements.21 The Basic Grants component distributes funds to almost all school districts in the country, whereas the other three components—Concentration Grants, Targeted Assistance Grants, and Education Finance Incentive Grants (EFIGs)—distribute funds only to districts with somewhat higher concentrations or numbers of low-income children.22 The primary factor used in all the formula components is the number of low-income children residing in each school district.23 Another important factor is the average state per pupil expenditure, which has the effect of channeling more dollars per low-income child to districts in states with high average per pupil expenditure and fewer dollars to districts in states with low average per pupil expenditure.24 The U.S. Department of Education’s national assessment of Title I, published in 2007, has noted that the use of average state per pupil expenditures in the Title I formula may be another factor limiting the impact of the targeting provisions.25 Since many high-poverty districts are in low-spending states, such as Mississippi, Alabama, or Louisiana, the per pupil expenditure factor could blunt the impact of the targeting provisions.26 The EFIG component of the formula allocates funds first to states, and then sub-allocates those funds to districts within states.27 While the sub-allocations to districts are weighted based on concentrations of child poverty, the initial allocation to the state is not weighted.28 Meaning, the concentration of these dollars only occurs within states and not among them. In effect, this component cannot concentrate funds nationally. In a final illustration of the funding scheme’s limitations, Title I allows school districts to use average salary figures when comparing expenditures among schools and reporting those expenditures to the government.29 Due to the averaging of costs instead of reflecting the actual cost of salaries and budgets for each school, there is a transfer of funds from the less to the more advantaged school districts.30 Further, school districts divide budgets into portions that can be assigned readily to schools.31 Expenses for teachers and principals are allocated to the individual schools where those teachers and principals work.32 These expenses “typically make up more than 80 percent of each school’s allotment.”33 High-poverty schools may appear to receive the same basic education resources as low-poverty schools within a single school district when in fact they do not. Some of those monies are diverted to higher-salaried teachers at other schools because public school budgets do not reflect the actual cost of salaries and budgets.34 In effect, not all federal dollars make it to the children they were designed to help.35 This Article argues that because the United States has included no measure on the effects of disadvantages such as race, ethnicity, national origin, and cultural isolation, and no measure on child poverty, in both the ESEA and the NCLB Title I funding scheme, the United States has failed to address educational funding inequities in public schools. More specifically, this Article suggests that if socioeconomic redistribution of target funds were based on layered disadvantages and patterns of interstate disparities in funding, the outcomes reported in the present-day would likely reflect the goals of the Title I framers. Students in the United States are likely to benefit from a mainstreaming equality funding scheme as applied to the educational funding in Title I, or similar education funding legislation. Mainstreaming equality schemes require that public bodies assess the impact of their policies on equality of opportunity and monitor any adverse impact on the promotion of equality of opportunity.36 <<card continues>>

### Title I Formulas Increase Inequality

<<card continues>> This Article defends the thesis that Congress should implement a mainstreaming equality scheme as to school funding, define beneficiary groups based on characteristics additional to socioeconomic status, and consider interstate disparities, in order to eradicate educational inequities affecting the most disadvantaged students in the United States. Part I argues that efforts to combat the paralysis of disadvantaged groups have failed and that regardless of socioeconomic indicators, schools continue to fail student populations of color, thus making socioeconomic criteria alone ineffective to counteract inequities. Part II considers methodology for conducting mainstreaming, arguing that the goals and performance indicators in Title I or similar legislation should be directed towards measuring social impact and effectiveness among specifically defined groups based on layered disadvantage, which considers race, class, and other factors, and its multiplicative effects.

### Structural Violence Impacts

#### Deaths from structural violence are greater every year than from wars – changing laws that facilitate inequality is vital

Ansell, 17 - David A. Ansell, Senior Vice President, Associate Provost for Community Health Equity, and Michael E. Kelly Professor of Medicine at Rush University Medical Center (The Death Gap: How Inequality Kills, p. 7-10)

There are many different kinds of violence. Some are obvious: punches, attacks, gunshots, explosions. These are the kinds of inter- personal violence that we tend to hear about in the news. Other kinds of violence are intimate and emotional. But the deadliest and most thoroughgoing kind of violence is woven into the fabric of American society. It exists when some groups have more access to goods, resources, and opportunities than other groups, including health and life itself. This violence delivers specific blows against particular bodies in particular neighborhoods. This unequal advantage and violence is built into the very rules that govern our society. In the absence of this violence, large numbers of Americans would be able to live fuller and longer lives. This kind of violence is called structural violence, because it is embedded in the very laws, policies, and rules that govern day-to- day life.8 It is the cumulative impact of laws and social and economic policies and practices that render some Americans less able to access resources and opportunities than others. This inequity of advantage is not a result of the individuals personal abilities but is built into the systems that govern society. Often it is a product of racism, gender, and income inequality. The diseases and premature mortality that Windora and many of my patients experienced were, in the words of Dr. Paul Farmer, "biological reflections of social fault lines."9 As a result of these fault lines, a disproportional burden of illness, suffering, and premature mortality falls on certain neighborhoods, like Windora's. Structural violence can overwhelm an individual's ability to live a free, unfettered, healthy life. As I ran to evaluate Windora, I knew that her stroke was caused in part by lifelong exposure to suffering, racism, and economic deprivation. Worse, the poverty of West Humboldt Park that contributed to her illness is directly and inextricably related to the massive concentration of wealth and power in other neighborhoods just miles away in Chicago's Gold Coast and suburbs. That concentration of wealth could not have occurred without laws, policies, and practices that favored some at the expense of others. Those laws, policies, and practices could not have been passed or enforced if access to political and economic power had not been concentrated in the hands of a few. Yet these political and economic structures have become so firmly entrenched (in habits, social relations, economic arrangements, institutional practices, law, and policy) that they have become part of the matrix of American society. The rules that govern day-to-day life were written to benefit a small elite at the expense of people like Windora and her family. These rules and structures are powerful destructive forces. The same structures that render life predictable, secure, comfortable, and pleasant for many destroy the lives of others like Windora through suffering, poverty, ill health, and violence. These structures are neither natural nor neutral. The results of structural violence can be very specific. In Windora's case, stroke precursors like chronic stress, poverty, and uncontrolled hypertension run rampant in neighborhoods like hers. Windora's ill- ness was caused by neither her cultural traits nor the failure of her will. Her stroke was caused in part by inequity. She is one of the lucky ones, though, because even while structural violence ravages her neighbor- hood, it also abets the concentration of expensive stroke-intervention services in certain wealthy teaching hospitals like mine. If I can get to her in time, we can still help her. Income Inequality and Life Inequality Of course, Windora is not the only person struggling on account of structural violence. Countless neighborhoods nationwide are suffering from it, and people are dying needlessly young as a result. The mag- nitude of this excess mortality is mind-boggling. In 2009 my friend Dr. Steve Whitman asked a simple question, "How many extra black people died in Chicago each year, just because they do not have the same health outcomes as white Chicagoans?" When the Chicago Sun- Times got wind of his results, it ran them on the front page in bold white letters on a black background: "health care gap kills 3200 Black Chicagoans and the Gap is Growing." The paper styled the head- line to look like the declaration of war that it should have been. <<card continues>>

### Structural Violence Impacts

<<card continues>> In fact, we did find ourselves at war not long ago, when almost 3,000 Americans were killed. That was September 11,2001. That tragedy propelled the country to war. Yet when it comes to the premature deaths of urban Americans, no disaster area has been declared. No federal troops have been called up. No acts of Congress have been passed. Yet this disaster is even worse: those 3,200 black people were in Chicago alone, in just one year. Nationwide each year, more than 60,000 black people die prematurely because of inequality.10 While blacks suffer the most from this, it is not just an issue of racism, though racism has been a unique and powerful transmitter of violence in America for over four hundred years.11 Beyond racism, poverty and income inequality perpetuated by exploitative market capitalism are singular agents of transmission of disease and early death. As a result, there is a new and alarming pattern of declining life expectancy among white Americans as well. Deaths from drug overdoses in young white Americans ages 25 to 34 have exploded to levels not seen since the AIDS epidemic. This generation is the first since the Vietnam War era to experience higher death rates than the prior generation.12 White Americans ages 45 to 54 have experienced skyrocketing premature death rates as well, something not seen in any other developed na- tion.13 White men in some Appalachian towns live on average twenty years less than white men a half-day's drive away in the suburbs of Washington, DC. Men in McDowell County, West Virginia, can look forward to a life expectancy only slightly better than that of Haitians.14 But those statistics reflect averages, and every death from structural violence is a person. When these illnesses and deaths are occurring one at a time in neighborhoods that society has decided not to care about—neighborhoods populated by poor, black, or brown people— they seem easy to overlook, especially if you are among the fortunate few who are doing incredibly well. The tide of prosperity in America has lifted some boats while others have swamped. Paul Farmer, the physician-anthropologist who founded Partners in Health, an inter- national human rights agency, reflects on the juxtaposition of "unprecedented bounty and untold penury": "It stands to reason that as beneficiaries of growing inequality, we do not like to be reminded of misery of squalor and failure. Our popular culture provides us with no shortage of anesthesia."15 That people suffer and die prematurely because of inequality is wrong. It is wrong from an ethical perspective. It is wrong from a fair- ness perspective. And it is wrong because we have the means to fix it.

### Structural Violence Impacts

#### Structural violence is skyrocketing as inequality deepens – policy change focused on concentrated poverty is the key to reversing it

Ansell, 17 - David A. Ansell, Senior Vice President, Associate Provost for Community Health Equity, and Michael E. Kelly Professor of Medicine at Rush University Medical Center (The Death Gap: How Inequality Kills, p. 194-198)

The Chicago Transit Authority Blue Line train has a stop just in front of my hospital. The life expectancy around the Blue Line stop in Chicago's Loop, just east of Rush University Hospital, is 85 years. Three stops down the Blue Line from Rush is Mr. M's neighborhood, where life expectancy plummets to less than 69. No measured assessment of the health conditions in America's neighborhoods could fail to connect the marginalized existence of so many and the economic structures and racial discrimination that have enriched many at the expense of the poor. Even if you don't agree that structural violence is the root cause of our neighborhood ills, there can be no doubt that something is dreadfully wrong. Neighborhood and life conditions have deteriorated to the point where they drive patients like Mr. M to madness and, worse, suicide. And yet we are anesthetized by these neighborhood conditions. We have tolerated the wickedness of inequity as if it were a natural condition of a modern capitalist society. We avert our gaze so we do not have to endure the jarring emotional dissonance created by the juxtaposition of great wealth and mammoth poverty. Despite the evidence that structural violence inflicts terrible psychological stress on the poor, the City of Chicago's Health Department closed its mental health clinics a few years ago.5 At the same time, Chicago's jails and emergency rooms overflow with the mentally ill. Under what measure of fairness and justice can this be justified? Concentrated poverty and distress are mushrooming in the United States. For those on the short end of the wealth stick, the system is rigged. The negative impact of structural violence has skyrocketed as jobs, opportunities, and wealth have deserted more and more American neighborhoods in the twenty-first century. The United States now boasts more high- poverty neighborhoods in any time since the 1960s.6 Since 2000, the number of people living in high- poverty ghettos and slums nearly doubled, from 7.2 million to 13.8 million, while poverty became more densely concentrated. More than one in four African Americans and more than one in three Latinos now live in neighborhoods of extreme poverty. Contrast this to white America. One in thirteen white Americans lives in this concentrated poverty—nothing to celebrate, but disproportionate to the US black and Latino experience.7 Because white poverty is more dispersed than black and Latino poverty, the death gaps within the white community can be difficult to discern. While white America experiences better health overall than black America, some neighborhoods in white America are not inoculated against the impact of structural violence. A11 analysis by the Washington Post found that since 2000, American white women have been dying at higher rates expiring in their 30s, 40s, and 50s, an invisible crisis driven by the impact of postglobalization job loss on small-town America. In one of the hardest-hit groups—rural white women in their late 40s—the death rate has risen by 30 percent. As life has evolved in rural America, as jobs have been dispatched overseas, as poverty has swelled, more white men and women are dying prematurely. A greater proportion of Americans lived in poverty in 2015—a staggering 45 million—than in the late 1960s. Children are the hardest hit, with almost half of them below five years old living in poverty.8 Chicago is an epicenter for child distress, with the highest child poverty rate in the nation. While black and Latino men have been imprisoned at unprecedented rates, black women and their children have faced an epidemic of evictions because of poverty and racism.9 The wealth gap between whites and minorities is the largest it has been since 1989.10 The wealth gap for single women in America is even starker. Single black and Hispanic women have a median wealth of $100 and $120 respectively; the median for single white women is $41,500. Nearly half of all single black and Hispanic women have zero or negative wealth, meaning that their debts exceed their total assets. <<card continues>>

### Structural Violence Impacts

<<card continues>> These statistics demonstrate graphic inequity, but we should not forget that the preponderance of poverty in the United States is among whites.11 We have performed enough analyses. There are no more observations or judgments to make. If we were studying the impact of structural violence on health and longevity in a randomized clinical trial, the experiment would have been halted long ago on ethical grounds. It is time to act. It is time for healing. Act We can act on behalf of the poor. We can choose to neither objectify nor dismiss their experiences. We can insist on and pursue their right for health and longevity. We can speak up against structural violence. We can demand political and policy solutions to mitigate or eliminate the structures that impart violence. We can advocate for a fair and equitable health-care system organized around the precept of health as a human right. We can expect our institutions to do more to serve the interests of America's high-poverty communities and their residents. We can expect our leaders and policy makers to hold all our institutions to greater accountability for the lives of the poor. Finally, we can act personally to preferentially serve the poor. To speak against the forces of structural violence- racism; economic exploitation; mass incarceration; the lack of safety, good education, and decent-paying jobs—requires us to make the invisible visible. That means we have to acknowledge and address the distress in our high-hardship communities. We can seek to understand all the ways in which racial and anti-poor bias is explicitly and implicitly built into our institutions and then work to overcome these biases. To act against structural violence first requires us to expose the conditions that curtail life and hasten death in our midst.

## Competitiveness Advantage Extensions

### Inequality Hurts Economy

#### Education inequality keeps the disadvantaged failing and drains the economy by overburdening social service spending

Belfield and Levin 7 [*Clive R*., assistant professor of economics at Queen College of the City University of New York, *Henry M.*, Professor of Economics and Education and director of the National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, Brookings Institution Press, November 13, 2007, “The Price We Pay,” pg. 1-2//bpuch]

Is excellent education for all America’s children a good investment? We know that education is expensive, but poor and inadequate education for substantial numbers of our young may have public and social consequences that are even costlier. The contributors to The Price We Pay examine the costs of investing in services to provide excellent education and—equally important—the costs of not doing so. A person’s educational attainment is one of the most important determinants of his or her life chances in terms of employment, income, health status, housing, and many other amenities. Unlike other attributes, such as family background and personal characteristics, educational attainment can be chosen by the individual and influenced by public policy. In the United States we share a common expectation that all citizens will have access to high quality education that will reduce considerably the likelihood of later lifetime inequalities. Yet large differences in educational quality and attainment persist across income, race, and region. Even with similar schooling resources, educational inequalities endure because children from educationally and economically disadvantaged populations are less prepared to start school. They are unlikely to catch up without major educational interventions on their behalf. In the United States we typically view educational inequality as a challenging public policy issue because of its implications for social justice. If life chances depend so heavily on education, then it is important that educational inequalities be redressed in order to equalize opportunities in a democratic society. But beyond the broader issue of fairness, such inequalities may create costly consequences for the larger society, in excess of what it would take to alleviate the inequalities. An excellent education for all of America’s children has benefits not only for the children themselves but also for the taxpayer and society. A copious body of research literature has established that poor education leads to large public and social costs in the form of lower income and economic growth, reduced tax revenues, and higher costs of public services such as health care, criminal justice, and public assistance. Therefore we can view efforts to improve educational outcomes for at-risk populations as public investments that may yield benefits considerably in excess of investment costs.

### Inequality Hurts Economy

#### Demographics mean the US economy will collapse- improving education is the only way to raise productivity enough to forestall it

Tienda and Alon 7 [*Marta*, Professor of Demographic Studies and Professor of Sociology and Public Affairs at Princeton University, former director of the Office of Population Research, *Sigal*, Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Tel Aviv University, Brookings Institution Press, November 13, 2007, “The Price We Pay,” pg. 48-49//bpuch]

The United States is facing a unique moment in its demographic history, for two reasons. First, as the third largest nation in the world, behind prosperous China and India, the United States has a vital resource that gives it a productive advantage over its industrialized peers—namely, people. In contrast with several western European nations that have been coping with the challenges of below-replacement fertility for several years, the United States sees its population continue to grow, albeit slowly, owing to high levels of both immigration and fertility. 1 Population growth replenishes the labor force with new workers, but in today’s global economy, the quality of workers matters as much as the quantity. Second, because of the increased salience of migration as a component of population growth, the U.S. population is among the most diverse in the world. 2 When its white non-Hispanic population fell below 50 percent, Texas became the fourth state to be declared a “majority minority” state, joining California, New Mexico, and Hawaii. 3 Population diversification will continue well into the future, even as immigration ebbs, because a larger share of new births will be to foreign-born women. Not only were immigration and births to immigrant women responsible for about 60 percent of demographic growth during the 1990s, but currently white women have below-replacement fertility, whereas the total fertility rate of Hispanic women is around 3.1. 4 Although immigration outpaced births as a component of Hispanic population growth during the 1980s and 1990s, during the first decade of the twenty-first century Hispanic births were projected to surpass net immigration from Latin America by approximately 1.6 million. 5 The components of demographic growth have direct implications for changes in the sizes of the labor force and the school-age population and for old-age dependency burdens. In 2005, for example, the U.S. Bureau of the Census announced that school enrollment surpassed the previous all-time high of 48.7 million set in 1970 by the baby boom generation. 6 The recent schoolage population bulge, produced largely by high immigrant fertility, represents a potential demographic dividend that can help assuage population aging, but that dividend can be realized only with appropriate educational investments. Viewed as returns on an investment portfolio, dividends reaped from population growth depend crucially on the caliber of investments made throughout the educational career, but especially during the early years. 7 That the most ethnically diverse youth cohorts in U.S. history are coming of age with an aging white majority also poses formidable social and policy challenges because, on average, the fastest growing cohorts are more likely to have parents with little education and lower incomes than are the cohorts they are replacing. 8 Census 2000 revealed that the median age of the population reached a new high of 35.3 years, rising 2.5 years since 1990. 9 The challenges of population aging could become acute as the baby boom cohorts increase their dependency on the Social Security earnings of the young, especially if racial and ethnic educational gaps are not closed. At the same time, the costs of underinvesting in education pose a serious risk not only to youths themselves—because the returns on investments in schooling are higher now than in the past—but also to a nation facing greater international competition for goods, services, and highly qualified labor. 10

### Inequality Hurts Economy

#### The plan is key to resolve fading US educational competitiveness – resolving educational inequality is key

Niazov 16 [Anya Niazov, Graduate Student at DePaul University,4-1-2016, "Empowering School Leadership across Nations: A Comparative Study of Differences Between Leadership Practices and Their Relationships with Empowerment Amongst Administrators and Teachers in Eight Large Urban Secondary School Districts in the United States and Canada,” DePaul University University Libraries, [http://via.library.depaul.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1089&amp;context=soe\_etd]//Rank](http://via.library.depaul.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1089&amp;context=soe_etd%5d//Rank)

If this country is a leader in so many other ways, why do American schools, in general, lag behind other nations’ as evidenced by the results of international tests? The modern world is becoming more connected and interdependent. The goals, curricula, and the structure of school systems across the globe are becoming more like each other in order to meet the increasingly common educational needs of modern society (Fowler, 2013; Baker & LeTendre, 2005). Students from all countries either are or will soon be competing not only with those from their own localities, but internationally (OECD, 2010). Given this new connected and information-driven world, the jobs of tomorrow will go to the most educated students from around the world (Paine & Schleicher, 2011). Therefore, the requirement for high quality education has become essential for students’ and nations’ long-term success. A nation’s education system plays a major role in defining whether students will be prepared for the global world (Tucker, 2011). In this context of cross-national education, it is increasingly important to establish the relative accomplishment of national education systems in order to assess their current status and determine how they can improve. While international comparative educational tests such as the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) have limitations, they do serve as an important role as a barometer for assessing national areas of educational strength and weakness. In this dissertation, I focus on this view of the tests as an instructive guide to the relative success and efficacy of various national school systems rather than attempting to use the data to make an economic argument. These international tests have consistently shown that U.S. students perform at average to below average levels compared to other nations (OECD 2012; Tucker 2011). By comparison, nations such as Japan, Singapore, Finland and Canada are top performers on these evaluations (Tucker, 2011). These nations have structured educational reforms to focus on limited, clear learning goals that emphasize depth over breadth, fair resource distribution, supports for teachers, and reorganizing schools to promote learning (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Furthermore, these countries have designed educational frameworks based on research from abroad and then tailored them to implement their own curricula, cater to their students, and provide a comparative advantage (Tucker, 2011; Fowler, 2013; Darling-Hammond, 2010). Many argue that the U.S. educational system is still adequate because the best U.S. students are still competitive with the best from other nations (Bracey 2009; Baker 2007). However, educational inequity, particularly differences between rich and poor students, is among the biggest shortcomings of the U.S. educational system compared to other nations. U.S. urban schools where poverty is common are among the most severely affected, and students from these schools lag behind poor students in other developed countries where the achievement gap between rich and poor is much less prominent (Darling-Hammond, 2011). As multiple scholars (Baker & LeTendre, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2010; Turgut, 2013) argue, the U.S. should try to learn from higher achieving nations in order to improve its educational system. This notion of learning from others is one of the underlying ideas that have motivated me to pursue this line of research. Many U.S. educators and policymakers have focused on educational standards, testing and accountability, while largely ignoring the effective implementation of classroom practices from abroad (Kliebard, 2004). The incentive to look outside exists both at the levels of competition as well as inspiration. <<card continues>>
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<<card continues>> It might serve U.S. policy makers and educators well to attempt to learn from the successes of other countries—for inspiration and as a way to improve U.S. comparative international rankings on international tests of achievement. Critics cite issues related to test methodologies, cultural differences, systemic differences and differing rates of childhood poverty as barriers to meaningful interpretation of cross-national comparative tests (Crossley, 2009; Cavanagh, 2012). While most of the nations deemed as high- performing by test data are more economically and culturally homogenous (e.g., Finland, Singapore, Korea) with very different cultural values, one high-performing nation, Canada, has enough similarities to the U.S. that cross-national comparisons may not have as many inherent difficulties and can be particularly informative (Levin, 2011; Mehta & Schwartz, 2011). The U.S. and Canada have many over-arching similarities including occupational structures, a high standard of living, diverse demographics, decentralization, and geography (Merry, 2013). Furthermore, Gaffield (1994) notes that U.S. and Canadian schools have much in common including a similar history rooted in mass schooling, having developed their schools with similar sociocultural purposes, having populations that include significant socioeconomic, ethnic, and social diversity, and having decentralized local schools without a national curricula. Given these similarities along with the different educational outcomes noted by international tests, I argue that comparing aspects of the U.S. and Canadian education systems [1] is likely to demonstrate differences and [2] that they will derive largely from differences at the school level rather than being primarily attributed to cultural or systemic differences.

### Education Key to Competitiveness

#### Educational inequality is the vital internal link – no other action will have as large of an effect. Robust studies confirm the economic benefits of the plan

Lynch 15 [Robert G. Lynch, Ph.D., State University of New York at Stony Brook, Professor of Economics at Washington College, January 2015, "The Economic and Fiscal Consequences of Improving U.S. Educational Outcomes," Washington Center for Equitable Growth, [http://equitablegrowth.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/10153405/0115-ach-gap-report.pdf]//Rank](http://equitablegrowth.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/10153405/0115-ach-gap-report.pdf%5d//Rank)

This study addresses a key challenge confronting the United States—how to promote both widely shared and faster economic growth. It does so by analyzing and describing the effects of raising educational achievement, especially for those not at the top of the economic ladder. The results of this analysis, which are consistent with a large body of research across a variety of academic disciplines, demonstrate that improving the education of future workers accelerates economic growth and can promote more equal opportunity over the long run. The result: stronger, more broadly shared economic growth, which in turn raises national income and increases government revenue, providing the means by which to invest in improving our economic future. Since the early 1970s, economic growth in the United States has been relatively slow and income inequality has risen rapidly. Over this same period, income growth has been so sluggish and unevenly distributed that families on the bottom and middle rungs of the income ladder experienced stagnating or declining incomes even as earnings among those at the top increased sharply. In contrast, the years immediately following World War II and continuing into the early 1970s were characterized by relatively rapid and broadly shared growth. Those at the top earned substantially more than those across the middle and bottom of the income spectrum, but high, middle, and low-income earners all saw their incomes grow at about the same rate. A restoration, then, of the economic growth pattern that characterized the first three post-war decades would result in both greater and more widely shared economic growth—equitable growth. In order to address this key challenge confronting the United States, this study empirically quantifies the economic and tax benefits of raising the educational achievement of children from less advantaged socioeconomic backgrounds. In general, there are large gaps in the educational outcomes among children from families with lower and higher socioeconomic status. These gaps contribute to subsequent economic inequality, with the relatively poor performance of children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds reducing U.S. economic growth. Thus, closing income or class-based educational gaps would promote faster and more widely shared economic growth. The study shows the consequences of raising the educational achievement of children from the bottom three quarters of families who are most socioeconomically disadvantaged to more closely match those of children born into the top quarter of families. Observing the impact of three different scenarios that all have 2015 as their starting date, the analysis quantifies various outcomes over the next 35 years—to 2050, when the pressure of supporting the retired baby boomers will have largely abated—and over the next 60 years—to 2075, when the benefits of narrowing achievement gaps under the three scenarios will have been fully phased in. Specifically, the study quantifies how much greater U.S. economic growth (measured by gross domestic product, or GDP, the total value of goods and services produced in our economy) and tax revenues would be. The analysis also assesses the reductions in economic inequality that result from the narrowing of education gaps. In all three scenarios we use the 2012 scores on the Programme for International Student Assessment, or PISA, math and science achievement tests as our indicator of academic achievement.1 For each scenario, a simulation model is used to estimate the economic effects of potential policy reforms that raise U.S. PISA scores—effects that improve the educational achievement of U.S. children and reduce disparities in educational outcomes among them. <<card continues>>
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<<card continues>> The results of this modeling suggest the extent to which appropriate policies could enhance economic growth, raise tax revenue, and reduce economic inequality. (See the Methodology section on page 45 for details on the simulation model and data used in this report.) In the first and most modest scenario, we examine the consequences of simply raising the educational achievement of U.S. children so that it matches, instead of lags behind, the average of the 34 economically advanced nations who are members of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Specifically, we raise the achievement scores of U.S. children from the bottom three quartiles of disadvantaged families just enough so that the national average educational achievement of all U.S. children on the PISA tests matches the average educational achievement of children from the OECD nations. This raises the combined U.S. math and science PISA score from 978 to 995 (the OECD average) and improves the nation’s relative ranking from 24th to 19th best out of the 34 OECD nations, or roughly to the middle of the pack on par with France. (See Table 1, and for a complete breakdown by OECD member country see table 6 on page 29.) In the second, middle-range scenario, we explore the effects of raising the achievement of U.S. children to match that of the children of our neighbors to the immediate north in Canada. This adjustment lifts the combined U.S. math and science PISA score from 978 to 1044 (the Canadian average) and improves the nation’s relative ranking from 24th to 7th, tied with Canada. In the third and most ambitious scenario, the economic consequences of completely closing educational achievement gaps between U.S. children from lower and higher socioeconomic backgrounds are estimated. In particular, the PISA test scores of the bottom three quartiles of socioeconomically disadvantaged U.S. children are raised so that they match the PISA test scores of the most advantaged quartile of U.S. children. This increases the combined U.S. math and science score to 1,080 and raises the U.S. academic standing to third best among the OECD countries, behind only South Korea and Japan. The paper then summarizes the reductions in disparities in educational outcomes under each of the three scenarios. It reports the gap in outcomes on the PISA tests scores between children in the top and bottom quartile of family socioeconomic status as a percentage of the average PISA score. (See Table 2.) Under scenario one, the education gap is reduced from 18.6 percent to 16 percent, and the U.S. ranking on equity improves from 21st to 11th out of the 34 OECD nations. Under the second scenario, the gap falls to 13.2 percent and the U.S. ranking rises to 6th. The third scenario completely closes the educational achievement gap between students from different socioeconomic background, and the United States ranks first among the OECD countries in the equality of educational outcomes. The paper then demonstrates how the reduction in educational achievement gaps in the United States translates into stronger economic growth over the next 35 years and 60 years. Tables 3 and 4 summarize the economic consequences of raising academic achievement and narrowing educational achievement gaps. Under scenario one, the inflation-adjusted size of the U.S. economy in 2050 would be 1.7 percent, or $678 billion, larger. The cumulative increase in real GDP (after factoring in inflation) between 2015 and 2050 would amount to $2.5 trillion in present value, or PV, the current dollar value that is equivalent to the future GDP increases calculated by the model, which allows for a comparison of future values of GDP to current values of GDP. 2 This amounts to an average of over $72 billion per year. The economic effects of raising and narrowing achievement gaps build upon themselves so that over time the growth consequences are increasingly magnified. By 2075, when the effects of policy reforms required to reach this first scenario are fully phased in, the U.S. economy would be 5.8 percent, or $4.1 trillion, larger than it would otherwise be, and the cumulative increase in GDP over the 60-year period from 2015 to 2075 would amount to $14 trillion in present value, an average of $234 billion per year. <<card continues>>

### Education Key to Competitiveness

<<card continues>> If American children matched the academic achievement of Canadian kids, then economic growth would be significantly larger. In 2050 the U.S. economy would be 6.7 percent, or $2.7 trillion, larger. The cumulative increase in GDP between 2015 and 2050 would amount to nearly $10 trillion in present value, $285 billion on average per year. In 2075, the real U.S. GDP would be 24.5 percent, or $17.3 trillion, larger, and the cumulative increase between 2015 and 2075 would sum to over $57 trillion in present value GPD, an average of $956 billion per year. Finally, if achievement gaps between children from different socioeconomic backgrounds were completely closed, then the U.S. economy would be 10 percent, or $4 trillion, larger in 2050. The cumulative increase in GDP by 2050 would amount to $14.7 trillion in present value, or $420 billion per annum. In 2075, once policy reforms have fully taken effect, the real U.S. GDP would be 37.7 percent, or $26.7 trillion, larger, and the cumulative increase in present value GDP over 60 years would sum to $86.5 trillion, an average of over $1.4 trillion per year. These results demonstrate that investments targeted at raising academic achievement and narrowing achievement gaps generate large returns in the form of economic growth. The increases in present value economic growth described above suggest the size of potential policy investments that would pay for themselves in the form of growth over the next 60 years and beyond. Narrowing or closing achievement gaps would also have significant positive consequences for future federal, state, and local revenues. Over the first 35 years, these would sum to $902 billion in PV federal, state, and local revenues under scenario one, $3.6 trillion under scenario two, and $5.3 trillion under scenario three. Over 60 years, the consequences would be significantly larger. Federal, state, and local revenues would sum to $5.2 trillion (scenario one), $21.5 trillion (scenario two), and $32.4 trillion (scenario three), all expressed in present value. (See Table 4.) Thus, public policy investments that raised academic achievement as described under the three scenarios and that cost less than an average of $87 billion, $358 billion, and $540 billion over each of the next 60 years would more than pay for themselves in budgetary terms. To put these revenue figures in perspective, consider that the entire budget for the federal Department of Education in 2013 was $72 billion. Keep in mind, as well, that these revenue increases are not a function of tax rate increases. Instead they are the additional revenues that would accrue to governments because U.S. GDP would be larger and Americans would be earning more income and paying taxes on their additional income. The increased growth and subsequent revenue increases will enable us to more easily sustain public retirement benefit programs such as Medicare and Social Security. Improving educational outcomes, for example, would lift Social Security tax contributions by $256 billion, $1 trillion, and nearly $1.5 trillion under the three scenarios by 2050.3 Similarly, Medicare tax revenues for the Hospital Insurance Fund would increase by $77 billion, $306 billion, and $452 billion under the three scenarios from 2015 to 2050, providing a substantial boost to Medicare solvency.4 Revenues for Social Security and Medicare would be substantially larger by 2075. The benefits of closing educational achievement gaps also would reduce income inequality. These effects are calculated under the three scenarios for children who complete their schooling 20 years from the start of the necessary policy reforms (in 2035) because it is assumed that it takes 20 years for the academic reforms to be fully phased in. Children who complete their schooling prior to 2035 would experience only a part of the increase in lifetime earnings. (See Table 5.) Under scenario one, the lifetime earnings of children from the bottom three quartiles of socioeconomic status would increase by an additional 4.3 percent. Under scenario two, all children would earn more, although the increases are smallest for children with the highest socioeconomic status and thus income inequality would be reduced. Finally, under the third scenario, the increase in lifetime earnings for children in the bottom three quartiles of socioeconomic status would be very large: 22 percent, 17 percent, and 9.3 percent respectively. <<card continues>>
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<<card continues>> As explained in greater detail later in the report, these economic and tax benefit projections understate the impact of raising achievement gaps for at least four reasons. First, under scenarios one and three, they assume that educational achievement improvements are limited to children in the lower three quartiles of socioeconomic status, but in the real world policies that increase these children’s educational achievement are likely to improve all children’s achievement and further enhance growth. Second, the model does not take into account any of the social benefits—such as better health outcomes—that are likely to occur as a result of educational improvement. Third, the model may be understating growth effects because it assumes that improvements in the educational achievement of children in the bottom three quartiles of socioeconomic status have the same impact on growth as do equal sized improvements in the educational achievement of the average child. Yet there is evidence that raising skills at the bottom improves growth more than raising skills at the top.5 Finally, the model does not calculate the potential positive effects on children born to future parents who, because of improved academic achievement, will have higher incomes and thus be able to provide them better educational opportunities. If the model properly accounted for all of these factors, the benefits of improving educational achievement would be larger than those estimated in this study. Yet by a similar logic, the projections overstate the reductions in economic inequality. Helping the most disadvantaged students improve their educational outcomes will likely improve the educational outcomes of all children and thus raise the incomes of the most advantaged children as well as temper reductions in income inequality.

### Education Key to Competitiveness

#### Education is vital to competitiveness

Klein and Rice, 12 – Joel I. Klein is CEO of the education division and executive vice president in the office of the chairman at News Corporation, where he also serves on the board of directors. Condoleezza Rice is a professor of political economy in the Graduate School of Business, the Thomas and Barbara Stephenson senior fellow on public policy at the Hoover Institution, and a professor of political science at Stanford University. (U.S. Education Reform and National Security, Independent Task Force Report of the Council on Foreign Relations, <https://www.cfr.org/report/us-education-reform-and-national-security>

The U.S. education system is not adequately preparing Americans to meet the demands of the global workforce. When the U.S. government first measured educational attainment in 1947, only about half of Americans graduated from high school, compared to about 75 percent today.6 In the mid-twentieth century, it was possible to build a meaningful career without completing high school. Today, this is not the case: the gaps in income and achievement between those with and those without college degrees are large and growing (see Figure 1), as are the educational opportunities available to the children of parents with and without education.7 Economists and employers predict that in the coming years, a growing number of U.S. citizens will face unemployment because of disparities between the workforce’s education and skills and those needed by employers. Nobel Prize–winning economist Michael Spence recently explained that globalization is causing “growing disparities in income and employment across the U.S. economy, with highly educated workers enjoying more opportunities and workers with less education facing declining employment prospects and stagnant incomes.”8 International competition and the globalization of labor markets and trade require much higher education and skills if Americans are to keep pace. Poorly educated and semi-skilled Americans cannot expect to effectively compete for jobs against fellow U.S. citizens or global peers, and are left unable to fully participate in and contribute to society. This is particularly true as educational attainment and skills advance rapidly in emerging nations. A highly educated workforce increases economic productivity and growth. This growth is necessary to finance everything else that makes the United States a desired place to live and a model for other countries. The opportunity of obtaining a top-rate education has historically attracted many immigrants to the United States from around the world. In turn, immigrant populations have contributed greatly to economic and social development in the United States. As a 2009 CFR-sponsored Independent Task Force report on U.S. Immigration Policy noted, “One of the central reasons the United States achieved and has been able to retain its position of global leadership is that it is constantly replenishing its pool of talent, not just with the ablest and hardest working from inside its borders, but with the best from around the world.” Too many schools have failed to provide young citizens with the tools they need to contribute to U.S. competitiveness. This, coupled with an immigration system in need of reform, poses real threats to the prospects of citizens, constrains the growth of the U.S. talent pool, and limits innovation and economic competitiveness.

### US Economic Collapse Impact

#### US economic declines kills heg and causes war – addressing debt is key

Khalilzad 11 – Former US ambassador and director of policy planning at the Defense Department with a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago (Zalmay, “The Economy and National Security”, National Review, 2/8/11, <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad)//JSL>

Today, economic and fiscal trends pose the most severe long-term threat to the United States’ position as global leader. While the United States suffers from fiscal imbalances and low economic growth, the economies of rival powers are developing rapidly. The continuation of these two trends could lead to a shift from American primacy toward a multi-polar global system, leading in turn to increased geopolitical rivalry and even war among the great powers. The current recession is the result of a deep financial crisis, not a mere fluctuation in the business cycle. Recovery is likely to be protracted. The crisis was preceded by the buildup over two decades of enormous amounts of debt throughout the U.S. economy — ultimately totaling almost 350 percent of GDP — and the development of credit-fueled asset bubbles, particularly in the housing sector. When the bubbles burst, huge amounts of wealth were destroyed, and unemployment rose to over 10 percent. The decline of tax revenues and massive countercyclical spending put the U.S. government on an unsustainable fiscal path. Publicly held national debt rose from 38 to over 60 percent of GDP in three years. Without faster economic growth and actions to reduce deficits, publicly held national debt is projected to reach dangerous proportions. If interest rates were to rise significantly, annual interest payments — which already are larger than the defense budget — would crowd out other spending or require substantial tax increases that would undercut economic growth. Even worse, if unanticipated events trigger what economists call a “sudden stop” in credit markets for U.S. debt, the United States would be unable to roll over its outstanding obligations, precipitating a sovereign-debt crisis that would almost certainly compel a radical retrenchment of the United States internationally. Such scenarios would reshape the international order. It was the economic devastation of Britain and France during World War II, as well as the rise of other powers, that led both countries to relinquish their empires. In the late 1960s, British leaders concluded that they lacked the economic capacity to maintain a presence “east of Suez.” Soviet economic weakness, which crystallized under Gorbachev, contributed to their decisions to withdraw from Afghanistan, abandon Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, and allow the Soviet Union to fragment. If the U.S. debt problem goes critical, the United States would be compelled to retrench, reducing its military spending and shedding international commitments. We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the higher risk of escalation. The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars. American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. <<card continues>>

### US Economic Collapse Impact

<<card continues>> Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions. As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of great-power competition. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, the United States is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression.

#### US economic weakness kills heg and independently causes war

Lieberthal and O’Hanlon 12 – Senior Fellow with degrees from Dartmouth and Columbia, Senior Fellow with several degrees from Princeton (Kenneth G., Michael E., “The Real National Security Threat: America’s Debt”, Brookings, 7/10/12, <https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/the-real-national-security-threat-americas-debt/)//JSL>

Lastly, American economic weakness undercuts U.S. leadership abroad. Other countries sense our weakness and wonder about our purported decline. If this perception becomes more widespread, and the case that we are in decline becomes more persuasive, countries will begin to take actions that reflect their skepticism about America’s future. Allies and friends will doubt our commitment and may pursue nuclear weapons for their own security, for example; adversaries will sense opportunity and be less restrained in throwing around their weight in their own neighborhoods. The crucial Persian Gulf and Western Pacific regions will likely become less stable. Major war will become more likely.

### Answers To: Trump Kills Leadership

#### Trump doesn’t kill leadership

Hunt 17 – Ph.D. in American Studies from the College of William & Mary (Edward Hunt, "The American Empire Isn’t in Decline", Jacobin, 3-13-2017, <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/03/obama-trump-mattis-united-states-empire/)//JSL>

Despite these concerns, officials have been willing to give Trump a chance to lead the country. Over the past few months, state leaders have done everything in their power to prepare Trump for his new position. Notably, Obama played a lead role in welcoming Trump to Washington. Just days after the election, he complimented the president-elect on his willingness to cross the ideological divide. “I don’t think he is ideological,” the outgoing president said. “I think ultimately he’s pragmatic in that way. And that can serve him well, as long as he’s got good people around him and he has a clear sense of direction.” In the following weeks, Obama also requested that people around the world give Trump a chance. People should not “just assume the worst,” Obama said. It would be better to “take a wait-and-see approach,” and allow Trump the opportunity to run the country. Politicians, Obama stressed, often make promises that they don’t keep. “My simple point is that you can’t assume that the language of campaigning matches up with the specifics of governing, legislation, regulations, and foreign policy,” Obama said. He continued: “I can’t guarantee that the president-elect won’t pursue some of the positions that he’s taken. But what I can guarantee is, is that reality will force him to adjust how he approaches many of these issues. That’s just the way this office works.” Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter provided similar reassurances. “America’s interests remain the same,” he insisted. “So, we still have ISIL to fight, we still have Russia — that isn’t gonna change, the world isn’t gonna — isn’t gonna change.” Establishment officials have also been willing to accept the new leadership and look for silver linings in Trump’s cabinet. For instance, they were pleased that Trump chose Gen. Mattis to be the next secretary of defense. Mattis is “a friend, and I hold him in the highest regard,” Carter commented shortly after the nomination’s announcement. Trump’s secretary of state pick, Exxon CEO Rex Tillerson, was also met with applause. The man is “superbly qualified,” former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates promised. “He is deeply knowledgeable about the international scene and geopolitics and importantly would be an informed and independent adviser to the president.” So far, a number of Trump’s establishment critics have found continuity in the new administration’s foreign policy. Early last month, Obama’s former advisor David Axelrod tweeted that a number of the Trump administration’s earliest moves bore striking resemblance to Obama’s policies: “Much of what @realDonaldTrump admin has done in foreign policy in the past 36 hours is Obama policy, just delivered thru clenched teeth.” The New York Times has also begun to moderate its tone. Since early February 2017, new headlines have included: “Trump Embraces Pillars of Obama’s Foreign Policy,” “Trump Foreign Policy Quickly Loses Its Sharp Edge,” and “From ‘America First’ to a More Conventional View of U.S. Diplomacy.” In short, the establishment, at least for now, seems confident that it can continue having its way with the world. Despite all of the post-election quaking about Trump, which was greased by the ongoing concerns about Russia, China, and ISIS, establishment officials and their supporters seem to believe that Trump is starting to understand what they mean when they say that the United States is indispensable to the world order. As always, they are speaking the words of empire, and they are determined to keep it. “I know some people are looking at the world and saying, ‘Oh my God, the world order is coming apart,’ and this and that,” Secretary of State John Kerry commented during his final days in office. “No, it isn’t, folks. And it won’t.” The empire, in other words, is here to stay.

### Answers To: Trump Kills Leadership

#### Even under Trump, American hegemony persists

Dougherty 17 - senior writer with work in Politico, The Washington Monthly, and New York Times Magazine (Michael Brendan Dougherty, "America Doesn’t Have a Successor", National Review, 6-2-2017, <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/448245/donald-trump-american-leadership-united-states-still-hegemonic)//JSL>

There is a frantic, almost panicked desire to see dramatic declines in U.S. power and prestige because its people elected Donald Trump. The people have to learn their lesson, after all. But the reality-based community has lost touch with the real world. America remains a hegemonic force: It has the largest and best equipped military that secures peace and prosperity from Europe to the South China Sea, the most prestigious university system, the largest consumer market, and it remains the source of so much innovation. The most powerful and important country on earth is led by Donald Trump. This may be unpleasant, uncomfortable, and a little scary. The world may hate it. Most days, I do. But it does not mean that the United States ceases to be powerful and important. An American-led world order might feel queasy with Donald Trump at the helm. But the deckhand doesn’t prove the captain is nuts by chopping down the main mast himself, or declaring the ship sunk at the first gust of hot air.

### Answers To: Trump Kills Leadership

#### Trump has assumed a conventional role in foreign policy and US leadership

Pletka, 4/26/17 – Danielle Pletka is the vice-president for foreign and defense policy studies at the American Enterprise Institute. She earned her B.A. at Smith College and her M.S. at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University. (Danielle Pletka, “On foreign policy, Trump has become — gasp — a normal president,” April 26, 2017, The Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/on-foreign-policy-trump-has-become--gasp--a-normal-president/2017/04/26/197b0372-2542-11e7-b503-9d616bd5a305\_story.html?utm\_term=.01fabc85a825, SRA)

The presidency of the United States is a mighty office, and the weight of it has shaped many men. The best among them have had the breadth of mind to set aside fixed tropes, face the world as it is and allow both the exigencies of leadership and the potential for America to do good to guide them. Others have been prisoners of their own dogma and bequeathed to their successors a world of trouble. The question, then, is which man is Donald Trump? On foreign policy, candidate Trump promised little ideology and plenty of anecdote-driven reactionism. Not enough jobs? Get ’em back. Terrible Iran deal? Tear it up. Allies free-riding on U.S. defense largesse? Send ’em a bill. Fighting unnecessary wars? Stop. Far from a doctrine, Trump offered a smorgasbord of retorts and one-liners that added up to what many worried would be a dangerous isolationist, protectionist era in U.S. politics. But 100 days into his term, President Trump has been far more conventional than many dared hope. Many of his promises, from labeling China a currency manipulator to staying out of Syria to making nice with Russia, appear to be on hold — which should surprise no one. Consider each recent president and contrast the candidate with the man in office: George H.W. Bush promised a more “realist” global posture than Ronald Reagan but ended up proclaiming a “new world order.” Bill Clinton rejected that, insisting it was “the economy, stupid,” but ended his tenure with his secretary of state arguing that the United States is “the indispensable power.” George W. Bush promised a more “humble” presidency but after 9/11 invaded Afghanistan and Iraq, inaugurating a far-from-humble “freedom agenda” to promote democracy in the Middle East. Barack Obama promised to “end this war” in Iraq and wrap up the conflict with the Taliban, but joined NATO in invading Libya, recommitted troops to Iraq after withdrawing them, continued the war in Afghanistan and sent Special Operations forces and others to Syria and Yemen. In short, the foreign policy promises of presidential candidates are rarely gospel. The world has a way of upending even the best-laid campaign platforms. And so, despite telling Obama to “stay the hell out of Syria,” Trump blasted an air base used for a chemical weapons attack on Day 76 of his presidency. He has overturned Obama’s non-policy of “strategic patience” with North Korea, recognizing that Pyongyang has used the past eight years to advance its nuclear and missile programs to the point of threatening the continental United States. Trump has sent his secretary of state to tell Russian President Vladimir Putin to drop Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad, recommitted to NATO in the face of growing Russian predations, confirmed Iranian compliance with the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and otherwise behaved like — dare we say it? — a normal president. And though Trump has stuck by his pledge to withdraw from the Trans-Pacific Partnership, he also indicated he will pursue bilateral trade agreements, a far cry from a reversion to Smoot-Hawley some feared. Where Trump has neither flipped nor flopped is on his strident anti-refugee, anti-immigration posture. The president followed through on pledges to limit immigration from states of terrorism concern, to put in place “extreme vetting” and to ban refugees from Syria. While implementation of those executive orders is suspended pending litigation, the White House appears bent on staying true to that campaign promise. Similarly, Trump seems as uninterested as president as he was as a candidate in picking personal fights with foreign despots such as Russia’s Putin or Turkey’s Recep Tayyip Erdogan. So after nearly 100 days, what more do we know about Donald Trump, commander in chief? Is he settling into a more nuanced security policy, guided by the likes of Cabinet members Jim Mattis and Rex Tillerson and advisers Gary Cohn and H.R. McMaster? Or is this only a temporary blip before other factions in the White House pull the clearly mercurial, impulsive leader back to fulfilling his hyperbolic campaign agenda? All we know now is what we see and don’t see. What we have seen from Trump in his early days as president is a man who is owning his burdens, one who wants to rebuild the deterrent power of the United States, one who is shocked by the horrors of war and one who is game to push back on enemies. All to the good.But what we don’t see is a man who is game to threaten other leaders’ personal power, viz. Putin and Erdogan. Nor, most important, do we have a sense of his worldview or the policies that underpin his initial tactical steps. On national security, at least, it will be those policies, and not the occasional phone call or airstrike, that will make or break this president in the world.

## Solvency Extensions

### Federal Action Key

#### Federal action is key – local resistance undermines state-level funding.

Kleven 10—Professor of Law, Thurgood Marshall School of Law (Thomas, “Federalizing Public Education,” Villanova Law Review, 9/4/10, Lexis, 55 Vill. L. Rev. 369)//JLE

Some aspects of today’s unequal education could be addressed on the state level. If states would redraw local school district boundaries to be more racially and class inclusive, that might reduce performance gaps. If states would shoulder the full cost of public education, that could redress the inequalities of the present reliance on local financing. Without federal financing, however, the inequalities among the states will persist. So at a minimum federalizing public education seems necessary to address those educational inequalities, like school financing, that are beyond state but are within federal control. Federalization might be better suited, as well, to address some matters within state control for reasons of efficiency or due to political factors that impede reforms more so at the state than at the federal level. But with or without federalization, the advantage to the well-off of the right to opt for private schooling, which I assume will continue due to its perceived centrality to parental child-rearing, will remain.49 And the educational advantage of being born into a well-off and well-educated family will likely continue for as long as the society’s class hierarchy and parental child rearing endure.50 B. The Inadequacy of the Current Federal Role Recognizing the inability to assure all children a comparable education absent even more fundamental systemic reform than the federalization of education, a sketch of the role the federal government currently plays in the provision of elementary and secondary education is instructive in assessing what its role should be. The federal involvement began to increase substantially with the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.51 The federal government now provides about ten percent of the funds for public education in the United States.52 Although most of this money is intended to benefit lower income and disadvantaged children,53 the effectiveness of the federal effort in improving and equalizing educational opportunities has been questioned.54 In addition, a series of statutes promote equal educational opportunity in other respects, including requirements that states and localities receiving federal money not discriminate on the basis of race, gender, national origin, or handicapped status, and that they act affirmatively to respond to the educational needs of those groups.55 While often quibbling about the details, most commentators believe these measures have contributed significantly to the equalization of educational opportunities.56 Nevertheless, they have left in place the generally inegalitarian system noted above. The most recent federal intervention in education is the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).57 NCLB represents the federal government’s most intensive effort to date to impact the overall quality of education.58 Its stated goal is to ensure that all students achieve proficiency in the core academic skills of reading and mathematics.59 Toward that end, states receiving federal money must adopt proficiency standards to be achieved by 2014, and must demonstrate through standardized testing annual progress in meeting those standards, and in particular, in narrowing the performance gap of poor and minority students.60 States failing to make adequate annual progress are initially to receive additional federal aid to be targeted toward that end, and with continuing failure face sanctions including requirements that inadequate teachers be replaced, stu dents be allowed to transfer to higher performing schools, and failing schools be closed.61 While some have praised NCLB as contributing at least potentially to improving educational opportunity,62 others have criticized it as ill-designed and unlikely to be effective.63 Principal criticisms are that it provides insufficient funding to enable states and localities to meet its goal;64 that it fails to establish meaningful standards for evaluating student performance;65 that it encourages states, in order to avoid sanctions, to set inadequate standards and to induce poorly performing students to drop out of school;66 that it promotes rote learning to enable students to pass standardized tests at the expense of teaching them to reason and think critically;67 and that it is a Trojan Horse designed to undermine public education and foster privatization.68 However, even if successful, NCLB will leave much of the inequality of the existing system in place. At a minimum, full federal funding seems essential to providing a comparable education for all students. Even if all students meet adequate minimum performance standards, funding inequalities will likely persist and result in superior educational opportunities for those living in more well-off states and localities. Moreover, that federal intervention has historically been needed over the past forty-five years or so to induce states to redress unequal opportunity in various aspects of education, suggests that the political process at the federal level may in general be better suited than at the state level to bring about more nearly comparable opportunity. Comparable opportunity requires that the well-off subsidize the education of the less well-off, and that those whose children do not have costly special needs subsidize the education of children who do. The federal government seems the appropriate level to undertake redistributive measures for two reasons: first, the progressivity of the federal tax system, as against the regressivity of the sales and property taxes on which states and localities heavily rely;69 and, << card continues>>

### Federal Action Key

<<card continues>> business interests to thwart redistribution more persuasively by threatening to leave a state than to depart the country.70 In addition, lack of comparable educational opportunity primarily prejudices disadvantaged people who also lack comparable political power due to poverty or historical discrimination or being relatively few in number. Reforms of the magnitude required to approach comparable educational opportunity will likely require a massive reform movement instigated by coalitions among the disadvantaged and less powerful.71 Such coalitions seem more likely to be effective at the federal level where greater numbers can be brought to bear and more attention shone on the needed changes.C. The Need for Greater Federal Intervention Under the inegalitarian conditions prevailing in this society, the requirements of equitable sharing and comparable educational opportunity demand a greater federal role than to date. Let’s consider three possible forms the federalization of education could take. I assume for the time being that the federal government will not institute a nation-wide voucher system, and that most children will continue to attend traditional public schools or government-funded charter schools. The three models, with federal intervention at its least in the first model and increasing thereafter, are: (1) full federal financing of the existing state and local system; (2) the federal takeover of the states’ primary role in superintending a decentralized system of public schools that are federally funded but of which locally elected governments and officials are responsible for day-to-day management pursuant to federal standards; and (3) the total federalization of public education with schools being financed by the federal government and run by a federal agency based in Washington, D.C. 1. (1) Full Federal Financing One means of federal financing is through block grants, with the federal government providing funds to states to be spent only on education but with no other strings attached, and with states being responsible for disbursing the funds to local education agencies. This approach would work only if the federal money were used to institute comparable educational programs within and among the states. This seems unlikely without additional federal control.72 Within states, the political power of the well-off might tilt the distribution of federal money in their favor. Even if the money were distributed in an evenhanded way, it seems likely that well-off states and localities would, as they now do, choose to raise additional funds to enhance the quality of their children’s education beyond what the less well-off states and localities could afford. Federal strings requiring an evenhanded distribution of the funds and forbidding supplementation might prevent these deviations. However, states and localities would still have the right to decline federal money and operate free from federal control. Whether any would do so in order to avoid federal strings is hard to say. Because state residents would still have to pay federal taxes for education, there would be an incentive to accept the money. On the other hand, if evenhandedly distributed federal money were less than what individual states or localities were previously spending, some might forego it in order to provide their children the advantage of a superior education. If not, and if states and localities are better suited than the federal government to administer public education due to the arguable advantages of state and local control in responding to children’s diverse needs, then block grants with strings requiring evenhanded distribution and prohibiting supplementation might advance the goal of comparable educational opportunity. 2. (2) Federal Takeover of the States’ Role The federal takeover of the states’ current role in superintending public education would effectively make local school districts agencies of the federal government, at least for purposes of providing public education. In addition to financing education and supplying funds directly to local districts, the federal government would supplant the states in regulating the quality of education provided by the local districts. Decisions as to whether and to what extent to regulate curriculum, teacher qualifications, and other aspects of the educational process would now be in federal hands, presumably via a federal department of education operating much like today’s state school boards. Whether state or federal oversight of local school districts is preferable seems an open question. On the one hand, state elected and appointed officials may be more responsive than federal officials to their children’s educational needs, a state-local partnership may operate more efficiently than a federal-local partnership, and state oversight may enable needed experimentation with a greater variety of educational approaches than under a more uniform federal approach. On the other hand, as discussed above, it may be easier to overcome entrenched political power impeding needed reforms at the federal than at the state level. For example, state initiatives to bring about more racial and class integration have been limited and largely unsuccessful, due in large part to the political power of suburban areas in state legislatures.73 Perhaps the federal government could achieve greater success, as with the federal promotion of equal educational opportunity in other respects today.

### Spending Key to Outcomes

#### Critics of funding are based upon outdated evidence with flawed methodologies. Funding is the necessary enabler for all education reform and is supported by an overwhelming consensus of studies

Baker 17 (Bruce D. Baker, Professor in the Department of Educational Theory, Policy, and Administration in the Graduate School of Education at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, former Associate Professor of Teaching and Leadership at the University of Kansas, holds an Ed.D. in Organization and Leadership from the Teachers College of Columbia University, 2017 (“Does Money Matter in Education? Second Edition,” Albert Shanker Institute, <http://www.shankerinstitute.org/sites/shanker/files/moneymatters_edition2.pdf//SR>)

Based on the studies reviewed in this brief, there are a few things we can say with confidence about the relationship between funding, resources and student outcomes. First, on average, even in large-scale studies across multiple contexts, aggregate measures of per-pupil spending are positively associated with improved and/or higher student outcomes. In some studies, the size of this effect is larger than in others, and, in some cases, additional funding appears to matter more for some students than for others. Clearly, there are other factors that moderate the influence of funding on student outcomes, such as how that money is spent. But, on balance, in direct tests of the relationship between financial resources and student outcomes, money matters. Second, schooling resources that cost money, including class size reductions and increased teacher compensation, are positively associated with student outcomes. Again, these effects are larger in some cases and for some populations. On balance, though, there are ways to spend money that have a solid track record of success. Further, while there may exist alternative uses of financial resources that yield comparable or better returns in student outcomes, no clear evidence identifies what these alternatives might be. Third, sustained improvements to the level and distribution of funding across local public school districts can lead to improvements in the level and distribution of student outcomes. While money alone may not be the answer, adequate and equitable distributions of financial inputs to schooling provide a necessary underlying condition for improving the adequacy and equity of outcomes. That is, if the money isn’t there, schools and districts simply don’t have a “leverage option” that can support strategies that might improve student outcomes. If the money is there, they can use it productively; if it’s not, they can’t. But, even if they have the money, there’s no guarantee that they will use it productively. Evidence from Massachusetts, in particular, suggests that appropriate combinations of more funding with more accountability may be most promising.

### Spending Key to Outcomes

#### Money matters – literature consensus is confirmed by the most recent research

Robinson, 16 - \* Professor, University of Richmond School of Law (Kimberly, “No QUICK Fix FOR EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE: THE VIRTUES OF INCREMENTAL SHIFTS IN EDUCATION FEDERALISM” 27 Stan. L. & Pol'y Rev. 201 2016, Hein Online) italics in original

Before turning to this analysis, it is worth noting that in focusing on the need for reforming school funding systems, I build upon the research that finds that money spent well matters for student outcomes. 40 In my recent book coedited with Professor Charles J. Ogletree, Jr. we note that the school finance debate has largely moved beyond questioning whether money matters to a consensus that money spent well does, in fact, matter.4 Further evidence that money matters is presented in a 2016 study finding that when children from low-income families are provided with lower pupil-to-teacher ratios and a more equitable distribution of staffing, they experience better academic outcomes and exhibit a smaller gap in achievement with their more affluent peers.42 This study also found that greater spending leads to smaller class sizes. 3 Other research indicating that money spent well matters can be found in a study by C. Kirabo Jackson and his associates published by the National Bureau of Economic Research. The study found that [a]lthough we find small effects for children from affluent families, for low-income children, a 10% increase in per pupil spending each year for all 12 years of public school is associated with 0.46 additional years of completed education, 9.6% higher earnings, and a 6.1 percentage point reduction in the annual incidence of adult poverty. The results imply that a 25% increase in per pupil spending throughout one's school years could *eliminate* the average attainment gaps between children from low-income . . . and nonpoor families...4I Further research also confirms the positive effect of increased funding for obtaining particular resources and student outcomes. 45 In addition, a compelling body of research indicates that states that have implemented substantial changes to the distribution and/or level of education funding typically observe significant improvements in student achievement.46

### Spending Key to Outcomes

#### School finance decisions are the single most important reform determining educational opportunity

Bowman, 17 - Vice Dean of Academic Affairs and Professor of Law, Michigan State University (Kristi, “THE FAILURE OF EDUCATION FEDERALISM” last revision: 4/27/17, <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2876889>)

That said, scholars increasingly are coming to understand that the impact of these state-level decisions can be far-reaching. In 2016, University of California-Berkley and Northwestern University economists Julien Lafortune, Jesse Rothstein, and Diane Whitmore Schanzenback concluded: [W]e find that reform events – court orders and legislative reforms – lead to sharp, immediate, and sustained increases in mean school spending and in relative spending in low-income school districts. Using test score data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress, we also find that reforms cause gradual increases in the relative achievement of students in low-income school districts, consistent with the goal of improving educational opportunity for these students. . . . Finance reforms are arguably the most important policy for promoting equality of educational opportunity since the turn away from school desegregation in the 1980s.27 Two years earlier, in 2014, economists C. Kirabo Jackson, Rucker Johnson, and graduate student Claudia Persico, also from Northwestern University and the University of California-Berkley, similarly determined: Consistent with prior research, we find that court-mandated reforms were effective at reducing spending inequality between high- and low-income districts within a state and that this was achieved by increasing spending for the lowest-income districts. . . . Looking to legislative reforms, our findings differ from many others in that we find that legislative reforms were somewhat effective at reducing spending gaps. . . . Event-study and instrumental variable models reveal that a 20 percent increase in per-pupil spending each year for all 12 years of public school for children from poor families [born between 1955 and 1985] leads to about 0.9 more completed years of education, 25 percent higher earnings, and a 20 percentage-point reduction in the annual incidence of adult poverty; we find no effects for children from non-poor families. The magnitudes of these effects are sufficiently large to eliminate between two-thirds and all of the gaps in these adult outcomes between those raised in poor families and those raised in non-poor families. 28 These findings are consistent with earlier work and analysis by leading school finance expert Michael Rebell and others concluding that decisions by courts and legislatures are critically important in equalizing school funding, and also that school funding increases are especially significant if education is to be anything close to a great equalizer.29 Ideally, state legislatures would fund schools at a level that is both adequate and equitable, but in at least thirty states, total funding for public schools was less in FY2014 than prior to the recession in FY2008. 30 Furthermore, a 2016 report by the Education Law Center documents that states continue to vary radically in their level of funding fairness within the state.31

### Spending Key to Outcomes

#### High poverty students require additional resources – most states provide them with less than low poverty districts

Robinson, 16 - \* Professor, University of Richmond School of Law (Kimberly, “No QUICK Fix FOR EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE: THE VIRTUES OF INCREMENTAL SHIFTS IN EDUCATION FEDERALISM” 27 Stan. L. & Pol'y Rev. 201 2016, Hein Online)

Research reveals that students from disadvantaged backgrounds are more expensive to educate because they bring different challenges and needs to classrooms and schools than students from more privileged backgrounds.54 Such challenges can include greater mobility, less exposure to complex language, less adult attention, unmet health needs, and inadequate nutrition. 55 Furthermore, students from disadvantaged backgrounds within urban areas also are oftentimes faced with greater crime and substance abuse in their neighborhoods and greater instability at home.56 Most researchers agree that districts should provide additional resources to enable students within high-poverty districts to master the content of challenging academic standards. 57 Given this research the natural conclusion is that school funding systems should direct more funding to districts serving substantial populations of disadvantaged students as compared to districts with smaller populations of disadvantaged students.58 However, the Education Law Center's 2016 report Is Funding Fair?: A National Report Card (also known as the The National Report Card) reveals that most state funding systems are inadequate in light of this well-supported research. This analysis of 2013 state funding data found that fourteen states provided less funding to districts with higher concentrations of students in poverty, that is, their funding systems were regressive. 59 Eighteen states did not vary their funding level based upon concentrations of student poverty. 60 Only sixteen states provided additional funding for disadvantaged students; that is, their funding systems were progressive. 61 This indicates that at least thirty-two states chose to implement funding systems that did not provide low-income students the resources that they need to compete effectively with more advantaged students.62 This failure to provide increased funding when districts possess greater numbers of disadvantaged students persists even though most states include some adjustment for the additional cost of educating disadvantaged students.6 3 These adjustments too often are insufficient to address the greater needs of children from low-income homes, particularly within schools of concentrated poverty. 64 The National Report Card found that only one state (New Jersey) is well positioned across all four measures of funding fairness-funding level, funding distribution, effort, and coverage of public school students-and two states (Wyoming and Vermont) scored well on three of the four measures. 65 Other research and school funding cases similarly find that less funding is oftentimes allocated to high-poverty districts. The Equity and Excellence Commission noted that "[t]he majority of states do not provide additional funding for students living in high concentrations of poverty. '66 A four-year study of the Pennsylvania funding system found that from 2010-2013, the 100 lowest-poverty districts had the highest revenue for each year and that funding in these low-poverty districts continued to rise while it stagnated in the highestpoverty districts. 67 Another study of states where low-poverty districts receive greater funding than students in high-poverty districts found that New York allocates over $2,000 per pupil in state aid to the wealthiest districts in the state, which are some of the wealthiest districts in the United States.68 Furthermore, these state aid payments "effectively more than double the funding gap between the lowest- and highest-poverty districts in New York. 69 In addition, the districts with greater property wealth in Texas have received billions in state aid to lower tax rates in response to a court ruling. 70

### Spending Key to Outcomes

#### Funding is vital to every other component that makes a difference on schooling – teacher retention, literacy programs and tutoring

Black 10 [DEREK BLACK- Associate Professor of Law and Director, Education Rights Center, Howard University School of Law, “UNLOCKING THE POWER OF STATE CONSTITUTIONS WITH EQUAL PROTECTION: THE FIRST STEP TOWARD EDUCATION AS A FEDERALLY PROTECTED RIGHT”, WILLIAM AND MARY LAW REVIEW, 2010, <http://wmlawreview.org/sites/default/files/black.pdf>] Valiaveedu

School quality and student achievement, rather than money, must be our primary concern in evaluating education, but money is far from irrelevant to school quality and student achievement. Critics of school funding reform regularly charge that school funding increases are often squandered and fail to produce tangible results.45 Based on these historic critiques, even the Rodriguez Court assumed that money and educational quality are disconnected.46 This premise, however, has been undermined by more recent evidence and scrutiny. Michael Rebell, reviewing cases since Rodriguez, finds that no state court addressing the issue has ever found that money does not affect educational opportunities.47 Most poignantly, after evaluating the evidence on both sides of an adequacy case at trial, one conservative judge wrote, “Only a fool would find that money does not matter in education.”48 Rob Greenwald analyzed thirty-eight different studies regarding the relationship between money and educational outcomes and found that positive student outcomes correlate with higher per pupil spending.49 New Jersey, where the supreme court has forced the state to direct additional funding to low performing school districts, provides an excellent example. Between 1999 and 2007, a period of major finance reform in New Jersey, the overall student scores on the statewide fourth grade mathematics assessment rose twenty-six points, with the greatest increases occurring in those school districts receiving supplemental funding.50 Moreover, “the achievement gap between those districts and the rest of the state declined by more than one-third.”51 Gordon MacInnes attributes the closing of the achievement gap to districts’ ability to focus new financial resources on early childhood education and reading.52 New Jersey is not alone. Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, and New York have made similar gains in conjunction with school funding litigation and reform.53 In particular, studies show that access to core inputs such as high quality teachers, early reading programs, and tutoring have a significant impact on student achievement.54 But the ability of low performing and high minority school districts to secure these services is entirely dependent on money.55 For instance, school districts that serve these student populations would need to provide salaries anywhere from around 50 to 100 percent higher than they currently offer to attract and retain high quality teachers.56 Thus, money necessarily determines the quality of instruction that many students receive. And when states have created inequalities in these respects for low-income, minority, or rural children, state supreme courts have consistently found these students have been deprived of their constitutional right to a basic quality education.57 Rebell succinctly makes the point by saying “money matters,” and rhetorically adds that, if money did not matter, parents would not move to the suburbs and spend high amounts of money per pupil, nor would others pull their children from public schools and spend even larger sums in private schools.58

### Spending Key to Outcomes

#### Hanushek is wrong – he uses false studies and is all rhetoric as opposed to our empirical evidence

Baker 17 (Bruce D. Baker, Professor in the Department of Educational Theory, Policy, and Administration in the Graduate School of Education at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, former Associate Professor of Teaching and Leadership at the University of Kansas, holds an Ed.D. in Organization and Leadership from the Teachers College of Columbia University, 2017 (“Does Money Matter in Education? Second Edition,” Albert Shanker Institute, <http://www.shankerinstitute.org/sites/shanker/files/moneymatters_edition2.pdf//SR>)

Main sources of doubt The primary source of doubt to this day remains the above-mentioned Eric Hanushek finding in 1986 that “there appears to be no strong or systematic relationship between school expenditures and student performance.”117 This single quote, now divorced entirely from the soundly refuted analyses on which it was based, remains a mantra for those wishing to deny that increased funding for schools is a viable option for improving school quality. Add to this statement the occasional uninformative and inflammatory anecdote regarding urban district spending and student outcomes in places like Kansas City or New Jersey, or the frequently re-created graphs showing spending and achievement over the past few decades, and one has a rhetorical war against an otherwise overwhelming body of empirical evidence.118 While research evidence regarding the importance of funding and specific schooling resources for improving student outcomes has become clearer with time, Hanushek and a handful of peers have become even more entrenched in their views, as reflected in recent public testimony. Rhetoric among detractors has continued to drift from the cloud of doubt to a rock of certainty. That is, certainty that money has little or no role in improving school quality, and that school finance reforms that infuse additional funds only lead to greater inefficiency, having little or no effect on either equity or adequacy of schooling. Notably, Hanushek asserts (now and then) that it’s not that money doesn’t matter at all, but rather that additional money doesn’t matter on top of the already high levels of spending that currently exist across all U.S. schools. To summarize, the current dogma of Hanushek includes the following core tenets: 1. Because schools already spend so much and do so with such great inefficiency, additional funding is unlikely to lead to improved student outcomes. 2.How money is used matters much more than how much money is spent. 3.Differences in the amount of money some schools have than others are inconsequential, since those with less may simply make smarter spending decisions. According the recent rhetoric of Hanushek, these principles are ironclad. In his own words, they are “conventional wisdom” on which “virtually all analysts” agree. They are “commonly believed,” “overall truth” and backed by an “enormous amount of scientific analysis,” “substantial econometric evidence” and “considerable prior research.” For example, in the winter of 2015, in the context of school funding litigation in New York state, Hanushek opined: “An enormous amount of scientific analysis has focused on how spending and resources of schools relates to student outcomes. It is now commonly believed that spending on schools is not systematically related to student outcomes.”119 Yet, the enormous amount of scientific analysis to which Hanushek referred in his expert testimony was primarily referenced to a 2003 summary of much of his prior work from the 1980s, work which has been discredited on numerous occasions,120 including by research produced in the last 12 years. Similarly, in the same context (Maisto v. State of New York), Hanushek proclaims: “There has been substantial econometric evidence that supports this lack of relationship.” Hanushek again backs his claims with the same short list of dated self-citation.121 In an even more recent attempt to rebut a new, major study finding positive effects of school finance reforms,122 Hanushek (2015) makes the following version of the same claim: “Considerable prior research has failed to find a consistent relationship between school spending and student performance, making skepticism about such a relationship the conventional wisdom.”123 <<card continues>>

### Spending Key to Outcomes

<<card continues>> This time, he anchored that claim only to his 2003 piece (by hyperlink to the “prior research” phrase) on the failure of input-based schooling policies, 124 choosing to ignore entirely the considerably larger body of more rigorous work I summarize in my 2012 review on the topic. The extension of these claims that nearly everyone agrees there’s no clear relationship between spending and student performance is the assertion that there is broad agreement that how money is spent matters far more than how much money is available. As phrased by Hanushek in the context of New York state school finance litigation: “Virtually all analysts now realize that how money is spent is much more important than how much is spent.”125 As with the prior declarations, this one is made with the exceedingly bold assertion that virtually all analysts agree on this point—without reference to any empirical evidence to that point (a seemingly gaping omission for a decidedly empirical claim about a supposedly empirical truth). Further, “how money is spent” is constrained by whether sufficient money is there to begin with. While common sense dictates that how money is spent clearly matters, thus making this part of the statement widely agreeable, this does not preclude the relevance of how much money is available to spend. Perhaps most disconcerting is that Hanushek has recently extended this argument to declare that equity gaps in funding, or measures of them, aren’t an important policy concern either. Specifically, Hanushek proclaims: “It also underscores how calculations of equity gaps in spending, of costs needed to achieve equity, or of costs needed to obtain some level of student performance are vacuous, lacking any scientific basis” (p. 4).126 Put differently, what Hanushek is opining by declaring calculations of equity gaps to be vacuous and lacking scientific basis is that it matters not whether one school or district has more resources than another. Regardless of any spending differences, schools and districts can provide equitable education—toward equitable outcome goals. Those with substantively fewer resources simply need to be more efficient. Since all public schools and districts are presently so inefficient, achieving these efficiency gains through more creative personnel policies, such as performance-based pay and dismissal of “bad teachers,” is easily attainable. Of course, even if we assume that creative personnel policies yield marginal improvements to efficiency, if schools with varied levels of resources pursued these strategies with comparable efficiency gains, inequities would remain constant. Requiring those with less to simply be more efficient with what they have is an inequitable requirement. This argument is often linked in popular media and the blogosphere with the popular book and film Moneyball, which asserts that clever statistical analysis for selecting high-productivity, undervalued players was the basis for the (short-lived) success in 2002 and 2003 of the low-payroll Oakland Athletics baseball team. The flaws of this analogy are too many to explore thoroughly herein, but the biggest flaw is illustrated by the oft-ignored subtitle of the book: The Art of Winning an Unfair Game. That is, gaining a leg up through clever player selection is necessary in baseball because vast wealth and payroll differences across teams make baseball an unfair game. The public’s interest in providing equitable and adequate funding for education is likely greater than ensuring equitable and adequate baseball payrolls. Put more bluntly, the education of present and future generations should not be an unfair game. From judges to scholars, critics of Hanushek have characterized his evidence as “facile,” based on “fuzzy logic,”127 and “weak and factually tenuous.”128 Two recurring examples used by Hanushek to illustrate the unimportance of funding increases for improving outcomes are the “long-term trend” or “time trend” argument and anecdotal claims of the failures of input-based reforms in New Jersey. Baker and Welner (2011) tackle in depth the fallacies of Hanushek’s New Jersey claims.129 Here, I point to Hanushek’s own, albeit facile, unacknowledged self-debunking of his New Jersey claims. But first, I address the long-term trend claim. Again, from recent testimony in New York state, Hanushek provides the following exposition of the long-term trend assertion: “The overall truth of this disconnect of spending and outcomes is easiest to see by looking at the aggregate data for the United States over the past half century. Since 1960, pupil‐teacher ratios fell by one‐third, teachers with master’s degrees over doubled, and median teacher experience grew significantly (Chart 1).4 Since these three factors are the most important determinants of spending per pupil, it leads to the quadrupling of spending between 1960 and 2009 (after adjusting for inflation). <<card continues>>
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<<card continues>> At the same time, plotting scores for math and reading performance of 17‐year‐ olds on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP, or “The Nation’s Report Card”) shows virtually no change since 1970 (Charts 2 and 3).5”130 This claim, like many of Hanushek’s, is made with language of astounding certainty—the “overall truth” as it exists in the mind of Hanushek. This claim is commonly accompanied by graphs showing per-pupil spending going up over time, pupil-to-teacher ratios going down and national assessment scores appearing relatively flat, much of which is achieved via the smoke and mirrors of representing spending and outcome data on completely different scales, and via the failure to adjust appropriately for the changing costs and related obligations of the public education system and for the changing demography of the tested population.131 Oversimplified visuals are used to make the proclamation that student achievement shows “virtually no change,” a statement discredited on closer inspection.132 Jackson, Johnson and Persico (2015) provide additional examples of how such facile analyses lead to fallacious conclusions.133 As explained by Baker and Welner (2011),134 Hanushek for years has cited the failures of New Jersey’s school finance reforms as the basis for why other states should not increase funding to high-poverty schools. In litigation in Kansas in 2011, Hanushek proclaimed: “The dramatic spending increases called for by the courts (exhibit 34) have had little to no impacts on achievement. Compared to the rest of the nation, performance in New Jersey has not increased across most grades and racial groups (exhibits 35-40). These results suggest caution in considering the ability of courts to improve educational outcomes.”135

### Answers To: Alternate Causalities

#### School finance is the vital internal link to education

Edley et. Cuéllar 13 [Christopher Edley, Jr. and Mariano-Florentino Cuéllar- part of the The Equity and Excellence Commission (the Commission) which is a federal advisory committee chartered by Congress, operating under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA); 5 U.S.C., App.2. , For Each and Every Child, February 2, 2013, <https://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/eec/equity-excellence-commission-report.pdf>] Valiaveedu

That said, these districts are unusual. The common situation in America is that schools in poor communities spend less per pupil—and often many thousands of dollars less per pupil—than schools in nearby affluent communities, meaning poor schools can’t compete for the best teaching and principal talent in a local labor market and can’t implement the high-end technology and rigorous academic and enrichment programs needed to enhance student performance. This is arguably the most important equity-related variable in American schooling today.

#### Teachers are uniquely key to educational achievement--- the plan is key to promoting teachers

Edley et. Cuéllar 13 [Christopher Edley, Jr. and Mariano-Florentino Cuéllar- part of the The Equity and Excellence Commission (the Commission) which is a federal advisory committee chartered by Congress, operating under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA); 5 U.S.C., App.2. , For Each and Every Child, February 2, 2013, <https://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/eec/equity-excellence-commission-report.pdf>] Valiaveedu

Teachers, together with principals, are the single most important in-school factor affecting student achievement.51 America needs and our children deserve the best teacher workforce in the world: one held in high regard by our citizens, recruited from among the best and the brightest, well trained and supported on the job, and competitively compensated for their effectiveness and hard work. Most important, teachers and instructional teams must have the professional development, time, collaboration and teaching resources to understand each student’s learning needs in order to match instruction, time and attention necessary to meet them. We need strong leaders to support each teacher’s growth and to organize resources in ways that enable them to work together in great schools that meet all children’s learning needs. Given the many equity challenges facing our schools, none seems more crucial—or more daunting—than the need to improve teachers’ capacities to teach all children well and, in particular, to ensure that there is a stable supply of excellent teachers and school leaders in our highest-need schools. To create and retain such a workforce, we must not only have excellent school leadership and an adequate and equitable funding stream to ensure well-resourced learning environments for every child, but we must also have policies and practices that develop, select and fairly distribute a highly effective teacher workforce to all schools. In state after state, school finance suits have challenged the fact that schools serving low-income and minority students have disproportionately high numbers of teachers who are inexperienced, untrained and teaching in subjects for which they have little or no training. This drives extraordinarily high rates of teacher turnover, producing instability and chaos in the instructional program. <<card continues>>

### Answers To: Alternate Causalities

<<card continues>> These conditions are often directly linked to disparities in school funding, which produce significant disparities in educator salaries and working conditions.52 It should be no surprise that the best teachers over time gravitate to more affluent schools with better pay and working conditions, and where children seem easier to teach because they come to school without the many overt challenges that children from poor families face. Those who choose to teach in poor communities often do so despite the additional hurdles they will encounter. We do far too little to ensure that schools in poor communities are staffed with teachers who can be effective with the toughest challenges. While there are thousands of great teachers working their hearts out in these schools despite tremendous obstacles, they often do so in a system woefully designed to support and scale up their efforts. Unlike several decades ago, major urban school systems today too often pay teachers much less than surrounding affluent suburbs and offer substantially poorer teaching conditions: larger class sizes; less access to books, computers, and other curriculum and instructional materials; and fewer instructional supports. Their schools have less, yet their students need more. Poor rural districts often have even larger differentials in funding, salaries and conditions. The policy response to these intolerable conditions has too often been to lower the standards for entry into teaching rather than to directly address student needs. So the most challenging schools have teachers who are less well qualified, on average, by any standard: academic ability, content background, experience, preparation, certification and education level. Our system is not designed to serve America’s best interests. There is little dispute about the need to fix all this. And the commission is confident that people acting in good faith, with a full appreciation for the urgency required, can bridge their differences about how to do it. Yet, the necessary political will and drive elude us. Attracting, developing and retaining talented teachers is key to our strategy and central to a system that provides competitive salaries and excellent working conditions for well-qualified, highly effective teachers who will work in affluent and low-income districts alike.

### Answers To: Regulatory Flexibility Turn

#### Their turns assume flat funding, not the plan’s new spending

Canavero, 16 - SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (Steve, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education (“SUPPLANTING THE LAW AND LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY THROUGH REGULATORY FIAT” 9/21, <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-114hhrg21538/pdf/CHRG-114hhrg21538.pdf>

Mr. CANAVERO. Certainly. Thank you, Representative Thompson. In my testimony, I did mention career and technical education, career and technical academies, magnet schools. These are not provisions within the exceptions that are currently listed within the regulations. My concerns are as follows: they are expensive. Magnet school programs are expensive. Career and technical academies are expensive. Career and technical education is expensive, and rightfully so given the infrastructure that needs to be built out in order to provide students the opportunity for either real world experience in a career/tech-ed or skill based work, or whether it is in a magnet school specifically focused on law, for example, or culinary. Magnet schools themselves, if my memory serves me correctly, began in the 1970s in response to there was a clear opportunity to increase or decrease segregation in our schools, and they provided an opportunity, open enrollment opportunity to students. Typically, they are theme based. An opportunity to enroll students outside of a traditional attendance boundary. That is indeed what we see across our State, is that there are-they have waiting lists. We could do and obviously fill more. If we utilized the level funding test, in my testimony, my fear is that school districts will be incentivized to lower the offerings at magnet schools or career and technical education programming in order to equalize the funding across, even though those opportunities are made available to and many students participate in the magnet school and career/tech academies across our State from low-income. Mr. THOMPSON. Just to follow up on that, you mentioned the cost of career and technical education. Truly, if we are meeting market demands and we are educating, and my understanding was career and technical education, the dropout rate there is much lower than in traditional education settings, but there is a cost, if it is welding, medicine related, agriculture, machining. If those are where the costs occur obviously with this equalization that the Department of Education is trying to pursue, essentially if you do not have state-of-the-art equipment, you are not really preparing the students with the competencies to go right into the workforce. That is my concern. Is that accurate? Mr. CANAVERO. Representative Thompson, that is accurate, and that is the genesis really and the nature of my testimony. Again, reflecting absent additional dollars in the system, you would need to make decisions that may mean that you have to lower or reduce course offerings or reduce expansion of magnet programs or reduce career and technical academies or reduce career/tech ed in order to meet the fiscal test proposed.

### Answers To: Regulatory Flexibility Turn

#### They exaggerate the impact of compliance costs and equity benefits outweigh

King, 16 – Liz King, Leadership Conference Director of Education Policy at The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights on behalf of 30 civil rights organizations (Letter to Secretary of DOE John King, reprinted in “SUPPLANTING THE LAW AND LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITY THROUGH REGULATORY FIAT” 9/21, <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-114hhrg21538/pdf/CHRG-114hhrg21538.pdf>

On behalf of The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights and the 30 undersigned organizations, we urge the Department of Education (the "Department") to issue strong regulations clarifying the means by which school districts must demonstrate their compliance with the "supplement, not supplant" requirement in Title I of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA),' the most recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. This requirement, present in the law since 1970, ensures that districts serving high percentages of low-income students are able to provide supplemental programs and services to help mitigate the effects of concentrated poverty and truly help all students succeed with the aid of federal funds. Without robust clarity in regulations for the oversight of this provision of the law, the integrity of federal Title I dollars will be undermined and low-income students will be deprived of the supports and services they need and deserve. We believe that the Department has both the authority and the responsibility to ensure that this provision is properly implemented and we urge regulatory language that will help states to effectuate the purpose of this provision of the law. Historically, Title I funds have been awarded to school districts solely on the condition that they be used to provide additional supports and services for educationally disadvantaged students. That purpose was clarified in a statutory requirement added after 1965, in direct response to reports of the misuse of funds by school districts in the law's first years.2 For example, in the 1968-1969 school year the Sumter County U2 school district in South Carolina, used Title I funds to provide libraries for Black schools which were comparable to those provided in White schools. Where White students benefitted from state and local funds, Black students benefitted only from federal funds. In fact, South Carolina's ESEA director at the time admitted that much of the state's Title 1 money was spent to patch funding inequities to make schools for Black children comparable to those for White schools. Similarly in Mississippi, the Title I allotment was used to build and equip cafeterias and libraries, to hire teachers, and to provide instructional materials and books to Black students that had long been available to White students. While the recently-enacted ESSA does amend the provision by prohibiting the use of the previous "individual services" compliance test, it does continue to insist that federal funds be supplemental. We urge the Department to measure compliance by examining actual school level expenditures, which builds upon the law's new reporting requirements.' In order for federal funds to be considered supplemental, each Title I school must receive from state and local sources at least as much per-pupil funding as the average of non-Title 1 schools in the district. Unless Title 1 schools are receiving an equitable base of funds from non-federal sources to ensure that the federal funds are truly supplemental, then Title I funds are being used to supplant by filling in gaps of funds the schools should be receiving. This is a violation of the law. A comparison of spending between each Title 1 and the average of non-Title 1 schools allows for considerable variability among both Title I and non-Title I schools in state and local expenditures, therefore not running afoul of the law's prohibition against requiring the equalization of spending.4 Compliance with an "actual expenditures test" also recognizes the reality that equitable means fair, not equal—underscoring the law's aim to ensure that students impacted by concentrated poverty have the unique supports and services that will address their needs. This also preserves flexibility for districts to use weighted student funding, formulas for staffing and materials, or any other methodology for allocating state and local funds to schools. Although there has been some confusion on this point, the law's prohibition on requiring a methodology applies to the method by which state and local funds are allocated, not the method by which districts demonstrate compliance.5 During the negotiated rulemaking process, concerns were raised about the potential "disruption" that compliance with this provision may cause. While we appreciate that administrative challenges may arise in the implementation process, we know that the process of moving from inequity to equity or from injustice to justice has never been without disruption. While we recognize the need to make reasonable accommodations for changes in policy, the federal government must no longer be expected to subsidize the inequitable funding of public schools serving high numbers of low-income students who are disproportionately likely to be students of color and English Learners. The integrity of Title I funds must be preserved to fully realize the aim of ensuring equity and equal access to quality educational opportunities.

### Answers To: Regulatory Flexibility Turn

#### New funding is vital to state enforcement of equity mandates

Black, 17 - Professor of Law, University of South Carolina School of Law (Derek, “Abandoning the Federal Role in Education: The Every Student Succeeds Act”, 102 CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW [Vol. 105:101, SSRN)

This Article proposes three steps to cure the ESSA’s flaws and further the Elementary and Secondary Education Act’s original mission. First, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act must, in the short term, mandate that states fund schools serving predominantly low-income students at a level equal to or higher than other schools and, in the long term, that they fund such schools at proportionately higher levels. One of the most consistent findings of the past fifty years is that attending a school serving high concentrations of low-income students negatively affects educational outcomes—regardless of a student’s individual race or socioeconomic status.30 An equity mandate would also incentivize states to deconcentrate poverty and thereby minimize the number of instances they would need to afford schools proportionately more funds. Curing funding inequalities between schools, however, may be out of immediate reach for most states. Therefore, Congress should afford states a transition period to incrementally progress toward those goals or, in the alternative, allow states to demonstrate that their low-income students are achieving at appropriate levels notwithstanding unequal resource allocations. Because states are unlikely to accept ambitious equity standards in exchange for the currently low federal funding, the second step is for the federal government to substantially increase its own funding for low-income students. A substantial additional investment would strongly incentivize states to accept the first proposal and allow the federal government to directly ensure that low-income students receive the additional resources necessary to close achievement gaps. Researchers and the federal government indicate that low-income students require 40 percent more resources than other students.31 By increasing annual federal funding for low-income students from the current $15 billion to $45 billion, the federal government could cover half of the cost of low-income students’ additional needs (although a lesser number could still create the leverage necessary for states to act). 32 Compared to other expenditures, including recent temporary federal funds for education, this increase would still be a modest expenditure.

#### Empirically – funding is a sufficient incentive to change state behavior

Black, 17 - Professor of Law, University of South Carolina School of Law (Derek, “Abandoning the Federal Role in Education: The Every Student Succeeds Act”, 102 CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW [Vol. 105:101, SSRN)

353. By comparison, the Department of Education’s offer of $4.3 billion in Race to the Top funds was enough to motivate forty-six states to apply for the grants, and thirty-four to enact new laws to make them eligible to apply, including lifting caps on charter schools, moving toward the Common Core, and changing teacher evaluation systems.

### Answers To: Regulatory Flexibility Turn

#### States will say yes – federal spending has disproportionate influence

Robinson, 7 - Assistant Professor of Law, Emory School of Law; J.D., Harvard Law School (Kimberly, “The Case for a Collaborative Enforcement Model for a Federal Right to Education”, University of California, Davis Law Review [Vol. 40:1653, <https://lawreview.law.ucdavis.edu/issues/40/5/articles/DavisVol40No5_Robinson.pdf>

Others may argue that this Article’s approach would not achieve its goal because most states would choose to reject the funding offered under the proposed statute. However, states have typically acquiesced to congressional conditions to financial assistance and have not opted out.490 If Congress adopts this proposal, the states may similarly choose to work with the federal government rather than forego financial assistance. In this regard, it is noteworthy that although NCLB is the most intrusive federal education statute in American history, “[s]tates are responding to federal policy [in NCLB] in a way not seen since the mid-1970s, when they rose to the challenge of implementing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972.”491 Thus, states may continue this pattern of cooperation even if Congress increases its involvement in education. Furthermore, any suggestion that the states will reject the funding offered under the proposal underestimates the influence that federal funds have over education. Federal funds remain only a small fraction of revenue for education, typically estimated at between seven to ten percent.492 However, districts must use most state and local funding for expenses determined by law; therefore, federal money wields disproportionate influence because it often represents the largest source of money available to districts for innovative reforms and special programs.493 Consequently, states will remain reluctant to relinquish the limited funds available for school districts to develop creative approaches and new plans for their schools.