## Framing (1:10)

#### Moral theories are tested based on how well they fit into our intuition. Sinnott-Armstrong 92.

**Sinnott-Armstrong** (Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter. “An Argument for Consequentialism” 1992) :

“**The most common way to [We] choose among moral theories is to test** **how well they cohere with our intuitions** or considered judgments about what is morally right and wrong, about the nature or ideal of a person, and about the purpose(s) of morality.1 Another kind of intuition is often overlooked. **We also have intuitions about principles of practical and moral reasoning**, such as those captured by deontic logic. In order to be principles of reasoning rather than substance, these principles must be consistent with all substantive moral theories. But consistency is not enough. We want the deeper kind of coherence that comes only with explanation. **A moral theory that simply reports the principles behind common moral reasoning but cannot explain why these principles are so common** or so plausible **is inferior** in this respect to another moral theory which not only includes the principles but also explains why they are true. Why is the explanatory theory better? **Because we want a moral theory to help us understand moral reasoning, and such understanding is gained only when our principles are explained**. Without such understanding, our intuitions do not seem justified, and we cannot know whether or how to extend our principles to new situations. These are reasons to prefer a moral theory that explains our principles of moral reasoning.”

#### The principle of moral-substitutability prescribes moral value to actions that a prerequisites to other moral actions. Sinnott-Armstrong 2.

“**I have a moral reason to feed my child** tonight, both because I promised my wife to do so, and also because of my special relation to my child along with the fact that she will go hungry if I don't feed her. **I can't feed my child tonight without going home soon, and going home soon will enable me to feed her tonight. Therefore, there is a moral reason for me to go home soon.** It need not be imprudent or ugly or sacrilegious or illegal for me not to feed her, but the requirements of morality give me a moral reason to feed her. This argument assumes a special case of substitutability: (MS) **If there is a moral reason for A to do X, and if A cannot do X without doing Y, and if doing Y will enable A to do X, then there is a moral reason for A to do Y**. I will call this 'the principle of moral substitutability', or just 'moral substitutability’.”

#### Thus, we must reject all other frameworks because they fail to explain the theory of moral-substitutability, an intuitive theory that explains the essence of morality.

#### Thus, the standard is utilitarianism – minimizing pain and maximizing pleasure. Prefer additionally:

#### Actor specificity: Government actions will inevitably lead to trade-offs between citizens since they benefit some and harm others; the only justifiable way to resolve these conflicts is by benefitting the maximum possible number of people since anything else would unequally prioritize one group over another. Several impacts: a. Answers util indicts since non-consequentialist moral theories prevent any action which is worse than not being able to use util b. Takes out indicts about calculability since governments already use util which proves it is possible to do so

#### Reductionism is true – Science proves no personal identity exists. This means we’re only blobs of pain and pleasure, so state of affairs come first. Olson 10

Olson, Eric. [Professor of Philosophy at the University of Sheffield] Oct 28, 2010 “Personal Identity” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/identity-personal/#PsyApp

Whatever psychological continuity may amount to, a more serious worry for the Psychological Approach is that you could be psychologically continuous with two past or future people at once. **If your cerebrum**—the upper part of the brain largely responsible for mental features—**were transplanted, the recipient would be** psychologically continuous with **you** by anyone's lights (even if there would also be important psychological differences). The Psychological Approach implies that she would be you. If we destroyed one of your cerebral hemispheres, the resulting being would also be psychologically continuous with you. (Hemispherectomy—even the removal of the left hemisphere, which controls speech—is considered a drastic but acceptable treatment for otherwise-inoperable brain tumors: see Rigterink 1980.) What **if we** did both at once, **destroy**ing **one hemisphere and transplant**ing **the other**? Then too, **the one who got the transplant**ed hemisphere **would be** psychologically **continuous with you,** and according to the Psychological Approach would be you. But now **suppose** that **both hemispheres are transplanted,** each **into a different empty head**. (We needn't pretend, as some authors do, that the hemispheres are exactly alike.) **The two recipients**—call them Lefty and Righty—**will** each **be** psychologically continuous with **you**. The Psychological Approach as I have stated it implies that any future being who is psychologically continuous with you must be you. It follows that you are Lefty and also that you are Righty. **But that cannot be**: Lefty and Righty are two, and **one** thing **cannot be** numerically identical with **two things**. Suppose Lefty is hungry at a time when Righty isn't. If you are Lefty, you are hungry at that time. If you are Righty, you aren't. If you are Lefty and Righty, you are both hungry and not hungry at once: a contradiction.

## Harms

#### Standardized tests have been used to actively discriminate against minorities. Rampages.

“Standardized Testing and its Effect on Minorities.” Rampages. <https://rampages.us/theurbanmuse/univ-112-portfolio/standardized-testing-and-its-effect-on-minorities/> Accessed 13 September 2019.

Decades of **research** have **documented** the ***biases*** in standardized testing **with students of color** bearing the burden of that discrimination. Although in recent years test makers have attempted to address concerns about bias by establishing review committees to review the test questions for bias, and by using statistical procedures, significant problems remain in the content of the questions (Woestehoff, 2010). Some examples of bias: Discriminatory item selection, Jay Rosner, executive director of the Princeton Review Foundation, reported in 2003 that **potential SAT questions that were being answered correctly more by African-American students** than white students **were being rejected by the test makers**. This was done **to ensure** that the **test results showing Africa-American scoring lower** than whites **would be consistent** from year to year (Woestehoff, 2010). There has also been reports of accidental bias, in 2001 a Latina, bias reviewer, was reviewing questions prepared for the Iowa Test of Basic Skills came across a question that showed a picture of a couch out on the porch and asked, “What does not fit?” To her, the way she grew up everyone had a couch outside. Dr. Shapiro’s review on human development and the use of cognitive processes can vary based on social and cultural backgrounds. He states that **if a test shows unidimensionality** (measurement of one psychological dimension/trait/construct/attribute/skill/ability/etc). of cognitive processes **and includes some culturally-based approaches**, then **the test becomes culturally biased**. Which reveal that these tests can indeed affect curriculum and in-class instruction as well as impact teaching and learning for all students but have **[It has] the most damaging effect on minority students** (Paul Nichols and Brenda Sugrue, “The Lack of Fidelity Between Cognitively Complex Constructs and Conventional Test Development Practice,” Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, Summer 1999).

#### Different cultures mean that even unintentional bias negatively hurts minority students that is found in all standardized testing. Jaschik 10.

Jaschik, Scott. “New Evidence of Racial Bias on SAT.” Inside Higher Ed. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2010/06/21/new-evidence-racial-bias-sat>. Accessed 13 Sept 2019.

Scott Jaschik,**Editor**, is one of the three founders of *Inside Higher Ed.* With Doug Lederman, he leads the editorial operations of *Inside Higher Ed,*overseeing news content, opinion pieces, career advice, blogs and other features. Scott is a leading voice on higher education issues, quoted regularly in publications nationwide, and publishing articles on colleges in publications such as*The New York Times, The Boston Globe, The Washington Post, Salon,* and elsewhere. He has been a judge or screener for the National Magazine Awards, the Online Journalism Awards, the Folio Editorial Excellence Awards, and the Education Writers Association Awards. Scott served as a mentor in the community college fellowship program of the Hechinger Institute on Education and the Media, of Teachers College, Columbia University. He is a member of the board of the Education Writers Association. From 1999-2003, Scott was editor of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Scott grew up in Rochester, N.Y., and graduated from Cornell University in 1985. He lives in Washington.

The focus of both studies is on questions that show "differential item functioning," known by its acronym DIF. A DIF question is one on which students "matched by proficiency" and other factors have variable scores, predictably by race, on selected questions. **A DIF question has notable differences between black and white** (or, in theory, other subsets of students) **whose** educational **background** and skill set **suggest** that **they should get similar scores**. The 2003 study and this year's found no DIF issues in the mathematics section. But what Freedle found in 2003 has now been confirmed independently by the new study: that some kinds of **verbal questions have a DIF for black and white students**. **On** some of the **easier** verbal **questions**, the two studies found that a **DIF favored white students**. **On** some of **the most difficult verbal questions**, **the DIF favored black students**. Freedle's theory about why this would be the case was that easier questions are likely reflected in the cultural expressions that are used commonly in the dominant (white) society, so **white students have an edge** based not on education or study skills or aptitude, but **because they are** most **likely growing up around white people**. The more difficult words are more likely to be learned, not just absorbed. While the studies found gains for both black and white students on parts of the SAT, **the white advantage is larger such that** the studies suggest scores for black students are being held down by the way the test is scored and that **a shift to favor the more difficult questions would benefit black test-takers**. The new study is based on data for students who enrolled at the University of California system across several administrations of the SAT -- with versions used subsequent to Freedle's article. (The new research is the result of a study the authors undertook at the request of University of California officials, and they note in the paper that despite the request for information from the University of California, it took two years for the College Board to provide the data needed.) While the new study found the same DIF that Freedle did, an attempt to find a DIF for Latino students failed to show one. But, the authors write, that doesn't minimize the significance of their findings that back the study from 2003 that the College Board has said wasn't accurate. "Although our findings limit the phenomenon observed to the verbal test and the African American subgroup, these findings are important because they show that **the SAT**, a high-stakes test with significant consequences for the educational opportunities available to young people in the United States, **favors one ethnic group over another**," write Santelices and Wilson. "Neither the specifics of the method used to study differential item functioning nor the date of the test analyzed invalidate Freedle's claims that the SAT treats African American minorities unfairly

#### Poorer students are structurally disadvantaged on standardized tests because they can’t afford proper preparation programs. Peters 19.

Peters, Megan. “standardized Tests unfairly favor wealthy students in college admissions”. The Sacramento Bee. <https://www.sacbee.com/opinion/op-ed/soapbox/article224538095.html> Accessed 13 Sept 2019.

**Students from better-off** and better-educated **families** typically **take** intensive — and **expensive** — **prep courses that boost** their **scores** on these tests. Higher scores increase their chances of getting into a university and winning scholarships. **Students from families who**[**can’t afford prep courses**](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__economix.blogs.nytimes.com_2009_08_27_sat-2Dscores-2Dand-2Dfamily-2Dincome_&d=DwMFaQ&c=clK7kQUTWtAVEOVIgvi0NU5BOUHhpN0H8p7CSfnc_gI&r=_X5uCqA9VIXpcWjBgnleTw&m=xuEfWtj8Qg3w95sWLG_C9r0YszhIS44kWUalch9gmVk&s=qX9P5ovxjul8xUvZv0Biak7Hh6G3R7f-bYr-HIJBCjU&e=)**or are unaware** of the importance of the tests tend to **get lower scores, which reduce their chances at admission and aid**. This reality distorts the fairness of university admissions and financial aid, and it is spurring a growing movement among elite universities to try to do away with traditional standardized tests. Most universities, however, remain under enormous strain to use the tests to evaluate the growing applicant pool. For the foreseeable future, most universities have little choice but to use the SAT or ACT to help them sift through the mountain of applications. The University of California system — one of the biggest targets for applicants in our increasingly diverse state — still requires an SAT or ACT score from all freshman applicants. **Private** high **schools** often **promote prep courses as an integral part of their offerings**. But California public school districts, already short on resources, understandably do not see prep courses as an essential part of a rigorous academic curriculum. **This puts public high school students** from non-college-educated households **and minority groups at a disadvantage**. They find it harder to gain entry into private universities and the [University of California system](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__admission.universityofcalifornia.edu_counselors_freshman_profiles_index.html&d=DwMFaQ&c=clK7kQUTWtAVEOVIgvi0NU5BOUHhpN0H8p7CSfnc_gI&r=_X5uCqA9VIXpcWjBgnleTw&m=XF4hBmmMPM18cKqJW0ApF8taB2E3KwrRMRNu1WEsVcg&s=B-QA-M7V4zSd4LZhnvH4LFYRDx1T3rw76qs_APM4vic&e=), which was built to serve the best students in the state regardless of income. **As a result**, the best upward-mobility mechanism — **higher education — is not available to those who need it most.**

#### Selective colleges are critical for minority graduation – empirics prove. Carnevale 19.

Carnevale PhD et al 19 [Anthony P. Carnevale, research Professor and Director of the Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, PhD public finance economics from Syracuse; Jeff Strohl, Director of Research, PhD economics from American; Martin Van Der Werf, former reporter and editor at The Chronicle of Higher Education, award-winning reporter, columnist and editor at The St. Louis Post-Dispatch and The Arizona Republic; Michael C. Quinn, Research Analyst, MA public policy from Georgetown; Kathryn Peltier Campbell, Senior Editor/Writer and Postsecondary Specialist, MA English from Virginia] “SAT-Only Admissions: How Would It Change College Campuses?” Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce

In addition, since Black and Latino students have lower median SAT scores than Whites, an overreliance on the SAT puts Black and Latino students at a disadvantage in admissions, even though the test results mean little about whether they will actually succeed in college. That’s particularly unfortunate because **Black and Latino students** stand to **benefit strongly from attending selective colleges**: a Black or Latino student with **a score above 1000** on the SAT **has an 81 percent chance of graduating at a selective college, but only a 46 percent** chance of graduating **at an open-access college**.10 Unfortunately, **the overwhelming majority of Black and Latino students attend open-access colleges, severely diminishing their opportunities to graduate.**

standardized testing.

#### Standardized

#### testing harms minorities when applying to colleges, keeping them in the cycle of poverty and without education. Bhagwat 2. Bhagwat 2,: Bhagwat, Neil [George Washington University] “Standardized Testing.” May 15, 2017.

**Standardized testing is** also **discriminatory against certain races** such as African Americans and Latinos, which compounds the negative effects caused by the bias. Races such as African Americans and Latinos are put at a disadvantage **when it comes to testing because they come from** much **poorer backgrounds** than other races. **The median** household **income of whites is around $20,000** to $30,000 **higher than** the medium household income from **African Americans and Latinos**. This data is not surprising because both races came into the United States from a disadvantaged background. African Americans came as slaves while Latinos came as laborers. On the contrary, many whites arrived to this country educated, so they already have a better background. **Education level starts a cycle**. **If one’s family is more educated**, then **they will receive more income**, therefore he will **be[ing] put at an advantage** when it comes to standardized testing, and thus his [their] own education. Since Blacks and Latinos did not go through this cycle while Whites did, they are hurt by not being as prepared for tests. Consequently, the scores of African Americans and Latinos are being reflected upon this cycle of wealth and education. The average SAT Reading test score of Blacks and Latinos is 429/800 while the average SAT Reading test score is 528 for whites. A 99-point difference is nothing to ignore, as it is enough of a difference for colleges to differentiate between students. **We have spent over 100 years fighting for equal rights for African Americans**, **yet they are still denied the rights of fair educational opportunities** due to

## Solvency

#### I defend the plan Resolved: In the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized testing in undergraduate admissions decisions. Hernandez 1.

Hernandez 1:Hernandez, Theresa E. [Scholar of higher education policy working toward her doctorate at the University of Southern California.], "Abolish Standardized Testing for College Admissions." *HuffPost*, June 2018.

As of January 2018, over **1,000 colleges and universities have stopped requiring SAT or ACT scores for undergraduate applicants**. The conversation also extends to the graduate level, where institutions are grappling with whether to use standardized tests, which ones and how. In particular, the Inclusive Graduate Education Network and the Alliance for Multicampus, Inclusive Graduate Admissions, are promoting and studying the effects of inclusive holistic review practices. These projects are also exploring what factors of an application are most important for admission to graduate school versus success in graduate school. (Full disclosure: I am affiliated with IGEN and AMIGA, but the opinions here are mine and do not necessarily represent these projects or anyone affiliated with them.)  The NACAC report contrasts with Measuring Success: Testing, Grades, and the Future of College Admissions, a recent book published by scholars tied to the testing industry, which argues **test-optional policies are either ineffective at increasing diversity or do no better than** similar **institutions that require these tests**.  Unfortunately, this debate sidesteps a serious issue: the urgent need to seek solutions beyond the ways that selective college admissions are conducted today. We need to pay attention to the deeper purposes that selection criteria serve — and for whom. **The use of standardized tests** in admissions **disproportionately exclude** people of color and other **marginalized groups**. The truth is that overwhelming research has shown that performance on these tests is better at predicting demographic characteristics like class, gender and race than educational outcomes. **This disproportionately excludes racial minorities, women and low-income persons** from selective colleges.  For many practitioners in higher education, these tests are simply the most efficientand common metric for evaluating students. But efficiency can no longer be an excuse for maintaining a flawed system. The only result we can expect from that course of action is efficiently maintaining the status quo of inequality. The makers and advocates of standardized tests promote the notion that equality requires we use a singular metric to evaluate everyone in the same way. But **one common tool cannot** equitably **measure the potential of people who have been afforded different chances in life**. Our limited resources must be redirected to finding better ways to reach equitable outcomes, which will require offsetting prior inequality of opportunity and resources. […] Even if standardized tests perfectly predicted achievement, they would be doing so on the basis of accumulated resources that have helped children from privileged backgrounds to reach the levels of success that they have by the time they take the test. These testing disparities do not represent students’ potential to learn and achieve.  As Jerome Karabel documented in The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, standardized tests played a devious role in the history of admissions at selective institutions. Selection criteria like the SAT/ACT and GRE come out of historical actions that have defined merit purposefully to exclude students based on their social identities, including religious affiliation.  Add to that history generations of underfunded schools and a bevy of other racial and class-based discriminations that continue to hamper the achievements of racially minoritized and low-income students. To accept any “predictive” measure that perpetuates these inequalities, even indirectly, is a disservice to communities of color and poor people today and robs future generations of their potential.  For the United States to live up to its highest potential, we have to stop turning away students from the possibilities of higher education just because their backgrounds have not afforded them the same opportunities or the resources needed to take advantage of earlier opportunities. To that end, researchers like Estela Bensimon highlight the responsibility of our educators and educational institutions to better serve marginalized students in order to support the success of all students.  So how do we move forward? Some research indicates that **holistic review may be better at judging a student’s potential** given the context of their prior experiences.  Many highly selective institutions such as Harvard, Yale and Columbia already claim to practice a version of holistic review due to the U.S. Supreme Court’s backing of this approach in affirmative action cases. However, these options are largely used and researched in tandem with standardized tests that produce racially and class-based disparate outcomes.  We have inherited a society built on grave injustices, and we perpetuate them through both intentional acts and failures to redress what has been done. Higher education, from college to graduate school, can provide the opportunities and resources for people to make the most of their potential but only if we make access to it more equitable. **The only way forward is to enact policies and practices**, especially in education, **that are corrective**and redistributive. The time has come to end the perpetuation of systemic inequity through institutional practices that appear facially neutral, but which have a disparate impact by race and class. **Ending the use of standardized tests at all levels of admissions is one of the ways we can do so.**

#### Eliminating tests is feasible and increases diversity—Hampshire proves. Lash 15.

Lash MA/JD 15 [Jonathan, Director of World Resources Institute, a DC-based environmental think tank, where he previously served as president. Jonathan is a widely recognized environmental leader who chaired President Bill Clinton's Council on Sustainable Development and was the State of Vermont’s Environmental Secretary and Commissioner. He holds a law degree and master’s degree in education from Catholic University of America and a bachelor’s from Harvard College. President, Hampshire College], "Results of Removing Standardized Test Scores from College Admissions," hampshire.edu, https://www.hampshire.edu/news/2015/09/21/results-of-removing-standardized-test-scores-from-college-admissions 9-21-2015

In our admissions, **we review an applicant’s whole academic and lived experience**. We consider an applicant’s ability to present themselves **in essays and interviews**, review their **recommendations from mentors**, and assess factors such as their community engagement and entrepreneurism. And yes, we look closely at high school academic records, though in an unconventional manner. We look for an overarching narrative that shows motivation, discipline, and the capacity for self-reflection. **We look at grade point average (GPA)** as a measure of performance over a range of courses and time, **distinct from** a one-test-on-one-day **SAT/ACT score**. A student’s consistent "A" grades may be coupled with evidence of curiosity and learning across disciplines, as well as leadership in civic or social causes. Another student may have overcome obstacles through determination, demonstrating promise of success in a demanding program. Strong high school graduates demonstrate purpose, a passion for authenticity, and commitment to positive change. We’re seeing remarkable admissions results since disregarding standardized test scores: Our yield, the **percentage of students who accepted** our invitation to enroll, **rose** in a single year from **18% to 26%**, an amazing turnaround **The quantity of applications went down but the quality** went up, likely because we made it harder to apply, asking for more essays; Our applicants collectively were more motivated, mature, disciplined and consistent in their high school years than past applicants **Class diversity increased to 31% students of color**, the most diverse in our history, **up from 21% two years ago** The percentage of students who are the **first-generation** from their family to attend college **rose from 12% to 18% in this year’s class**. Our “No SAT/ACT policy” has also changed us in ways deeper than data and demographics: Not once did we sit in an Admissions committee meeting and "wish we had a test score." **Without the scores, every other detail of the student’s application became more vivid**. Their academic record over four years, letters of recommendation, essays, in-person interviews, and the optional creative supplements gave us a more complete portrait than we had seen before. Applicants gave more attention to their applications including the optional components, putting us in a much better position to predict their likelihood of success here.

#### The plan results in more rigorous applications that boost the effectiveness of admissions decisions. McCubbin 18.

McCubbin PhD 18 [Erin Margaret, this was her PhD thesis] Success in College: Is It Possible Without the Use of Standardized Test Scores?” PhD Thesis in the field of Curriculum, Teaching, Learning, and Leadership College of Professional Studies Northeastern University, March 2018

A replicable model for colleges and universities. When a college takes the time to distinguish themselves in the application process, it makes it easier for students to identify their potential fit at the school. Recently, **the trend has been to homogenize college applications to make it easier** and more efficient **for students to apply** (Alon & Tienda, 2007; Belasco, Hearn, & Rosinger, 2015; Lemann, 1999; Posselt, Jaquette, Bielby, & Bastedo, 2012). **The result has been** a sharp **increase in the number of colleges who use** platforms like the **Common Application**, which boasts a single, generic essay that a student can send to any college who uses the platform and requests it. There are some customization features on the Common Application available to colleges in terms of supplements, but **generally schools are** heavily **constrained in** terms of **the structure of their application**. Most colleges who utilize the **Common Application** have indeed s**een an increase in applications, but it has become** increasingly **harder to weed through** them and to predict yield. While the Common Application has made it easier for students to apply, **that ease has led to** a bloated application pool and **overwhelmed application readers** who must rely on things like standardized test scores to cut the pool to a manageable load (Belasco, Hearn, & Rosinger, 2015; Lewin, 2013). Hampshire seems to have found the right formula to cut through the noise. While eliminating the use of standardized test scores in the admission process might not be the right choice for all schools, the practice of intentionally identifying the right kind of student who is successful on a particular campus should be (Duckworth et al., 2011; Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2002; Scales, 2006). For the schools who are currently overwhelmed with the number of applications they recieve and struggle to single out the students who are not only good fits but who will also ultimately choose to attend**, the first step is to take a look inward**. **The answer** to efficiency **is not ease, it is intentionality**. Blanketly eliminating standardized test scores may not be the answer for every school because each school has a different formula to determine what makes a student academically and socially thrive on their campus. By conducting their own version of a Thriver Study, **a school can identify what unique qualities make a student successful on their campus and** intentionally **craft their application to identify those things**.