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#### **Brown vs. Board of Education didn’t end segregation, it just shifted form – from disciplinary tactics to remedial schooling, tools of racialization continue to be utilized by white educators in order to maintain segregation under new names. Refuse to accept post-racial frameworks that start with a level playing field – the historic effects of racism in education never left.**

Knoester and Au 17 Matthew Knoester & Wayne Au (2017) Standardized testing and school segregation: like tinder for fire?, Race Ethnicity and Education, 20:1, 1-14, DOI: 10.1080/13613324.2015.1121474 TJHSSTAD

White resistance to desegregation and racial equality The Brown ruling must be seen as a hard-fought victory for Civil Rights, as it ended state-sanctioned segregation in schools. Yet despite the positive effects of desegregated schooling found in research, it is important to note that white resistance to desegregation – and to separate but equal educational resources for black children – has also caused significant harm to black children and communities throughout each of the major periods of segregation, desegregation and re-segregation of schools. In Race Ethnicity and Education 3 recent years significant attention has been paid in educational research to the negative repercussions of how Brown was carried out and how white resistance often prevented meaningfully integrated schooling. Particularly harmful to black communities was the shuttering of black schools, the firing of black teachers, and the unequal treatment of black students in multiracial schools that accompanied efforts at desegregation in many locations (Jones 2015). Brown v. Board of Education may have ended state-sanctioned school segregation, but it did not end white supremacy, the effects of which continue to be felt. In a recent book focusing on this topic, Horsford (2011, 81) reminds us of the words of Dr Martin Luther King, Jr.: ‘We have fought long and hard for integration, as I believe we should have, and I know that we will win. But I’ve come to believe we’re integrating into a burning house.’ In the context of desegregated schools, Horsford describes how black students, teachers, and school leaders were treated in southern states in the decades following the Brown decision. Nearly all of the black schools were closed in these years, more than 38,000 black teachers lost their jobs, as did hundreds of black principals and other school administrators. Further, students, who were once taught by caring teachers committed to the black community of which they were a part, often found themselves in hostile environments (see also Walker 2000, 1996). Cecelski (1994) documented the process of school desegregation and the strong resistance from the black community to the closing of two black schools in North Carolina. Cecelski (1994, 9) wrote, ‘black students repeatedly encountered hostile attitudes, racial bias in student disciplining, segregated bussing routes, unfair tracking into remedial and other lower-level classes, low academic expectations, and estrangement from extracurricular activities.’ Other scholars have pointed out that while many schools may appear to be racially desegregated statistically, all too many of these schools are segregated within themselves, through the use of tracking and other forms of separation (Gamoran 1987; Gamoran and Mare 1989; Oakes 1985, 1990). Horsford (2011, 65) argued: School desegregation was an important and necessary step in eliminating the state-sanctioned segregation that limited educational access and opportunities to black children throughout the United States. Separate schools were, in fact, never equal. It is important, however, to note the unintended, or arguably, intended, consequences (Tillman 2004) of desegregation that have diminished the promise of Brown in the eyes of many black Americans who discovered that the law was neither neutral, meritocratic, nor colorblind. These negative experiences of black children in desegregated schools are part of the ‘burning house’ to which Dr King referred. In response to what should be done about the problem, Dr King reportedly said, ‘We’re just going to have to become firemen’ (Horsford 2011, 91). In this article, we further interrogate the promise and problems associated with the history of segregation, desegregation, and re-segregation in the US. There is hardly a more troubling issue in education than that of segregation. The lack of meaningful racial integration in schools remains a problem for the same reasons articulated by the Warren Court in 1954, ‘separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.’ This is true because white individuals and communities historically and presently monopolize political, economic, social, and educational power. While white supremacy – or the belief that white people should continue to monopolize this power due to personal or cultural merit – ensures that separate educational facilities for black children will not offer educational opportunities equal to those for white children (Bell 1995; Lipsitz 1998; Mills 1997; Roithmayr 2014). Due to white resistance to school desegregation, as well as resistance to integrated housing and jobs, and the active but piecemeal dismantling of laws supporting desegregation, the levels of racial segregation in schools have nearly returned to their pre-Brown era (Orfield 2009). At the same time, there has been an increase in school choice schemes and greater pressures placed on schools to increase test scores. These laws have facilitated segregation even within integrated cities and neighborhoods (Frankenberg, Siegel-Hawley, and Wang 2011; Garcia 2008; Glenn 2011; Knoester 2011; Wells 2002). What might it mean to ‘become firemen,’ in the words of Dr King? In the following sections we focus on two key challenges that may be considered ‘tinder for the fire’: (1) The vestiges of white supremacy in educational institutions and policies; and (2) The use of powerful managerial tools such as standardized tests tied to high-stakes decisions, which both serve to racially code schools and to place 4 M. Knoester and W. Au enormous pressure on schools with low test scores (generally those with large numbers of children of color and living in poverty) to teach to the test. Here we pose the question: How might we fight the fires of these two key causes of segregation and racial inequality in education today?

#### **Technologies of oppression such as standardized testing become normalized – this outweighs: epistemic centers like the university or debate are where knowledge is produced, meaning the discourse and stereotypes within educational spaces spillover. Interrogating and exposing tools of oppression within the education system is a necessary prerequisite for action.**

Ferri and Connor 05 Tools of Exclusion: Race, Disability, and (Re)segregated Education Article in  Teachers College Record · March 2005 Beth A. Ferri Syracuse University 52 PUBLICATIONS   1,125 CITATIONS   David Connor City University of New York - Hunter College 80 PUBLICATIONS   1,479 CITATIONS TJHSSTAD

In these connected histories, individuals deemed undesirable were kept out of the schools and classes of those with more power. As noted, technologies of power manifest themselves in many forms, including excessive and biased testing, educational norms determined by the dominant group, and stigmatizing labels, all contributing to the re-segregation of classrooms along the 468 Teachers College Record same axes of power. Taken together and accepted without question, these technologies of difference construct and fortify existing rationales behind exclusive practices and continue to create new forms of containment to maintain traditional divisions among students. Many unarticulated assumptions undergird thinking about desegregation and inclusion. Implicit in the discourse of exclusion are perceptions of Black and disabled people as unequivocally inferior. Such widespread deficit-model perceptions are deeply entrenched in the cultural imagination and are evident in oppressive legislation, educational practice, as well as in the distorted portrayals of ‘‘others’’ in academic scholarship, literature, media, and film (Adams, 2001; Bell, 1992; Fleischer, & Zames, 2001; Gould, 1996; Thomson, 1997). Recently, however, concepts of ‘‘race’’ and ‘‘disability’’ have become challenged by scholars within the fields of Critical Race Theory and Disability Studies as long-standing socio-cultural constructs. Lawrence (1993) writes . . .race is a social construction. The meaning of ‘Black’ or ‘White’ is derived through a history of acted-upon ideology. . .the cultural meaning of race is promulgated through millions of ongoing contemporaneous speech acts. . . segregation and White supremacy . . .constitutes and maintains a culture in which non-Whites are excluded from full citizenship (p. 62). A similar argument is made by disability studies scholars who critique the fiction of normalcy and disability, and instead characterize these concepts as mutually dependent social (rather than biological) constructions (Davis, 1995; Linton, 1998; Oliver, 1996). The exclusion of both groups from full citizenship can, therefore, be seen as a form of containment. How might the notion of containment be linked to the idea of change? If, generally speaking, educational change is perceived by the dominant group as a form of loss (Guskey, & Huberman, 1995) what are people who advocate maintaining exclusive practices fearful of losing? West (1993) argues that ‘‘. . .White America has been historically weak-willed in ensuring racial justice and has continued to resist fully accepting the humanity of blacks’’ (p. 3). As Bell (1995) confers, ‘‘. . .few are willing to recognize that racial segregation is much more than a series of quaint customs that can be remedied effectively without altering the status of Whites’’ (p. 22). These statements convey that Whites’ fears and Blacks’ hopes are diametrically opposed: each group perceives the potential changes integration may bring very differently. If Black people are seen as equal to Whites, then White people lose their historical positioning, replete with unexamined privileges, and in doing so, their sense of superiority. Similarly, if disability is Tools of Exclusion: Race, Disability, and (Re)segregated Education 469 ‘‘a social state rather than a biological difference’’ (Barnes, Mercer, & Shakespeare, 1999, p. 37) then ability and normalcy must also be socially constructed, rather than innate. Therefore, blocking the access of Black people and people with disabilities to all levels of society rests on a central, but often unarticulated, assumption of superiority by the dominant group. This very superiority is threatened by integration, which historically has evoked many fears, including an increased competition for jobs, miscegenation, and ‘‘pollution’’ of the nation’s gene pool. Thus, access appears to literally diminish White and able-bodied presence, and therefore, power. Schools uphold and reinforce the dominant beliefs of society. As such, they are examples of racism and ableism in practice, although they are rarely portrayed in this way. The power manifested within them is masked by purported neutrality. Foucault underscored how technologies of power are accepted ‘‘only as a condition that it masks a substantial part of itself. Its success is proportional to its ability to hide its own mechanisms’’ (1990, p. 86). The ‘‘undesirability’’ of Black children and/or children with disabilities in schools is indicative of the values of our larger society, which seeks to deny access by containing individuals in markedly asymmetrical positions of power. However, this legacy is coming under increased scrutiny, reflected in recent research sponsored by the Civil Rights Project at Harvard University (see Losen, & Orfield, 2002). Of course, technologies of exclusion, including ability testing, tracking, labeling, and special education, have played a major part in the resegregation of our schools. By engaging critically with how desegregation and inclusion were framed in these different but connected histories, we gain a deeper understanding about the resistance to integrated schooling for all students and about the unchanging nature of public education. Moreover, we have come to see how linear, evolutionary notions of progress enable people to avoid, delay, and refuse change more than they encourage its gradual acceptance. From our current vantage point, 50 years since Brown and nearly 30 years since P.L. 94.142 (IDEA), perhaps the lesson is to be alert to individual and institutional reactions to change. Looking at these histories simultaneously shows how easily racism and ableism function as twin tools of exclusion and how inclusion and desegregation are intimately connected. As powerful laws are established, which threaten the status quo, those whose own power has been displaced seek to regain their former status. In contrast, those once overtly marginalized continue to find their access inhibited in new ways. In other words, the status quo is maintained, although it may emerge in different ways, as in the case of overrepresentation of students of color in special education or academic tracking. Under the guise of gradualism, unquestioned discourses of exclusion are allowed to thrive or transmogrify. This leads us to conclude that until the population becomes 470 Teachers College Record committed to sharing power on a more equal basis, true diversity within our democracy can only remain an ideal out of reach.

#### Thus, the ROB is to challenge dominant forms of knowledge production.

#### I affirm the resolution: In the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. I reserve the right to clarify on issues of implementation and specification in CX. If they don’t ask, grant me an automatic I-meet on any shells they read because I never had a chance to meet them. **The resolution as a value statement inherently lacks consequences – nothing happens when we endorse the aff. Therefore, it is a question of the ethicality of the resolution itself – the aff is an ethical orientation against standardized tests.**

#### The myth of meritocracy and objectivity that standardized tests stand to serve for mask structural inequalities and construe certain groups as failures, allowing supremacists to justify their hierarchies within a meritocratic framework that was created by and for the privileged. Our criticism of standardized testing ruptures the normative notions of fairness that testing perpetuates and is thus a necessary first step towards exposing and deconstructing structural inequalities in our education system and beyond.

Au 15 See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/284791564 Meritocracy 2.0: High-Stakes, Standardized Testing as a Racial Project of Neoliberal Multiculturalism Article  in  Educational Policy · November 2015 DOI: 10.1177/0895904815614916 No Project View project Wayne Au University of Washington Bothell TJHSSTAD

* Mark students as failures – inflicts self doubt
* Cycles of structural violence – students always seen as inferior because the playing field seems neutral with tests

Meritocracy, Objectivity, and Standardized Testing as a Racial Project As the above quotation from DuBois illustrates, one of the things that Black educational leaders challenged was the bias behind standardized IQ testing— a challenge worth making based on the racialized and class-based test scores (Giordano, 2005; Gould, 1996; Tyack, 1974). However, despite these challenges, with the support of leading psychologists and popular opinion, such standardized testing was seen as providing an objective measure of intelligence and ability. In turn, this presumptive objectivity provided the foundation for the idea that standardized testing provided a fair and accurate measurement of individual effort, paving the way for psychologists, philanthropists, and educators to sort students using test scores and ultimately serving ideologically to deny structural inequalities (Au, 2013). The logic of test-based structural denial works thusly: If standardized tests provide for the fair and objective measurement of individuals, then standardized testing holds the promise that every test taker is objectively offered a fair and equal chance at educational, social, and economic achievement. Problems like racism and class privilege are thus supposedly neutralized through testing. As Sacks (1999) notes, these logics were advanced in the early years of standardized testing, where such tests were seen as a means for challenging class privileges. This is the root of the idea that standardized testing, both historically and today, can be a means of challenging inequality, and it is the way that standardized testing helps uphold the ideology of meritocracy in the United States. The ideology of meritocracy asserts that, regardless of social position, economic class, gender, race, or culture (or any other form of socially or institutionally defined difference), everyone has an equal chance at becoming “successful” based purely on individual merit and hard work. Consequently, the ideology of meritocracy also asserts that failure is due to an individual person’s (or individual group’s) lack of effort and hard work (Lemann, 1999; Sacks, 1999). As a racial project, if standardized tests provide an objective measure, then low test scores and the educational failure of working class, children of color is due to their own deficiencies (personal, cultural, racial, or otherwise), lack of hard work, or what has been referred to in one of the most recent educational fads, a lack of “grit” (Horn, 2012; Thomas, 2014). This construction of standardized testing as an objective measure of merit was, as Downloaded from epx.sagepub.com by guest on December 16, 2015 Au 47 Karier (1972) explains, built by those in power who believed in the superiority of their own talents: Most testers refused to admit the possibility that they were, perhaps, servants of privilege, power and status, and preferred instead to believe and “hope” that what they were measuring was, in fact, true “merit.” This was also an act of faith, a faith based on the belief that somehow the “prestige hierarchy of occupations” and the people in it who provided the objective standard upon which the tests were based, were there not because of privilege, wealth, power status and violence, but because of superior talent and virtue. This was a fundamental axiom in the liberal’s faith in meritocracy which emerged in twentieth century American education. (p. 169) In this way, and continuing to think through standardized testing as a racial project, we are reminded of the material construction of these tests. They were (and are) created, administered, interpreted, analyzed, reported on, and made sense of by actual people—people with social, cultural, racial, and economic locations, vested interests, questioned or unquestioned assumptions, biases, histories, and so forth. To understand standardized testing as a racial project (both the fundament of testing historically and its modern progeny in high-stakes, standardized testing), then, we have to understand the ways that testing was used to shape “what race means in a particular discursive or ideological practice and the ways in which both social structures and everyday experiences are racially organized, based on that meaning” (Omi & Winant, 2015, p. 125, emphasis in original). As such, with the empirical evidence provided by presumptively “objective” standardized tests, Whites and wealthy elites could mask their own structural advantages, deny the existence of systemic racism, justify racial hierarchies, and structure specific racial groups as less intelligent and inferior (Au, 2009b, 2013), all under the guise of “naturally” occurring aptitude among individuals (Bisseret, 1979) competing within a meritocratic framework. It is important to take a moment and note that test-based, racialized notions of IQ are not simply archaic ideas thrown to the dustbins of history. In the modern era for instance, using standardized test scores for their data, Herrnstein and Murray (1996) claimed that there was an intelligence hierarchy of races, where African Americans were the least intelligent of all races, followed by Latinos, Whites, and Asian Americans who, according to the authors, were supposedly the most intelligent. As another example, Rushton and Jensen (2005) have more recently asserted that genetically based racial differences in IQ are real (Jensen is professor emeritus of educational psychology at University of California, Berkeley), and others such as Barrow Downloaded from epx.sagepub.com by guest on December 16, 2015 48 Educational Policy 30(1) and Rouse (2006), a senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago and a professor of economics and public affairs at Princeton, respectively, explicitly rely on the work of Herrnstein and Murray (1996) as a baseline for their analysis of the relationship between race, education, and pay. As such raced-based and biological notions of IQ are not artifacts of the early 20th century but are instead still living among us in mainstream discourse and in the academy.

#### **Standardized tests are intrinsically unfair – they presume the creation of a standard per particular interests and don’t eliminate bias or subjectivity from the admissions process, rather disguise it as “scientific”. Marginalized individuals are always worse equipped to naturalize to norms created by white males.**

SD 11 The Social Production of American Identity: Standardized Testing Reform in the United States Posted on [April 18, 2011](http://sdonline.org/34/the-social-production-of-american-identity-standardized-testing-reform-in-the-united-states/) by [sdonline](http://sdonline.org/author/sdonline/) – if u want to see all authors click about us and everyone is on there <http://sdonline.org/34/the-social-production-of-american-identity-standardized-testing-reform-in-the-united-states/> Socialism and Democracy is indexed by the following indexing and abstracting services: Public Affairs Information Service Bulletin; Sociological Abstracts; Historical Abstracts; America: History and Life (articles and book reviews); International Bibliography of Peridoic Literature; International Bibliography of Book Reviews; Political Science Abstracts; University Microfilms International; International Political Science Abstracts; University Microfilms International; Alternative Press Index; Left Index. It is distributed in the New York City metropolitan area by Ubiquity Distributors, in the Southwest by Fine Print Distributors, Inc., and nationally by Ingram Periodicals. TJHSSTAD

Testing not object – completely arbitrary

People with social locations make the tests – assume knowledge of certain type of culture

Marginalized individuals inevitably excluded from the subject knowledge tests look for

Previously, Blacks were almost universally denied access to the upper echelon American universities thanks to systematic and arbitrary discrimination. Hypothetically, after the invention of the SAT as a so-called meritocratic measuring tool, if Blacks were able to succeed on this one exam, they would be granted access to the university system and the concomitant network of opportunity. Yes, the tests were difficult, and the standards were high, but the standards were the same for all students, Black or White. When these possibilities unfortunately and predictably failed to materialize, just as emancipation did not immediately follow the American Revolution, and the constraining qualities of standardized testing were realized, Black discontent increased. Although Lemann’s conception of meritocracy is extremely problematic, he does recognize some of the weaknesses of the SAT-induced meritocracy. For example, he writes, “If you create an organized system to distribute opportunity, then there might be complaining about its unfairness, complaining of a kind that is impossible when there is no system at all.” Race, forever the ultimate contradiction between theory and practice in America, was not unexpectedly the central tension generated by SAT outcomes. From the beginning, Blacks fared significantly worse than Whites on the SAT.23 But Blacks were not the only segment of the population unable to realize the promise of freedom that the SAT represented. Results invariably determined that socioeconomic status was the single most important factor in scoring well on the SAT. For example, it was recently estimated that every additional $10,000 earned by a household translated into a score of thirty points higher on the SAT, a significant result to say the least. Although over time there were attempts to reformulate the SAT to compensate for these types of bias, discrepancies continued. A recent study done at the University of Maryland reported that “the SAT is not as valid for women as for men (as it) consistently underpredicts” the future college performance of females. The study continues: Whereas the SAT and other standardized tests tend to measure componential intelligence-the ability to interpret information in a hierarchical and taxonomic fashion in a well-defined and unchanging context-research findings suggest that individuals who experience bias tend to demonstrate their abilities through experiential and contextual intelligence.24 According to Gloria Joseph, Black female culture counters and transcends these “biases,” more aptly referred to by Joseph as “multiple structures of oppression.” She constructs a Black, female pedagogy according to the following four alternative learning styles: the use of dialogue in assessing knowledge claims, the centrality of personal expressiveness, the ethics of personal accountability, and concrete experience as a criterion of meaning. These Black female modes of learning as described by Joseph are antithetical to the learning styles that ensure success on the SAT.25 This is telling: the SAT, although designed to more fully systematize and reorder U.S. society, and thus redefine American identity, failed to stray from past definitions of what it meant to be American. Sure, after the implementation of the SAT Blacks and other peripheral groups were able to gaze upon increased opportunity. But this gaze was merely an apparition for most. The SAT, consistent with other integration projects, did not accommodate Black or female identities-in this case, differing learning styles. In order for a more fully integrated society to emerge from the SAT, the onus was placed upon Blacks to accommodate to American identity. The SAT further entrenched a seemingly elusive White identity as the de facto American identity. Lemann, although critical of the size and shape of the so-called meritocracy, and unimpressed by who was and was not allowed to “earn” their way into the new hierarchy, falters by framing the argument in terms of a concept as deceptive as “meritocracy.” The men of the SAT, specifically Chauncey, believed that testing offered a scientific and rational method for organizing society more effectively. But Conant, Chauncey, and their like, who supported the notion that a single standardized test offered “proof” of aptitude, failed to recognize that a standardized “intelligence” test is every bit as biased against certain people as is a standardized “achievement” test. If a test is “standardized,” that test is a measurement of a “standard” as defined by particular interests. Familiarity with language, style, and other subjective qualities unavoidable in the creation of a standardized test, is a clear advantage. More often than not in the United States, and the SAT is no exception, a standardized test represents the normalization of whiteness, richness, and maleness. For women, people of color, and poor Americans, not to mention people unfamiliar with the New England culture from which the test emerged, the SAT has been a cruel message of future tidings within the American “meritocracy.” The SAT sets a standard that people then must strive for, and those who are better equipped to assimilate to the norm the test represents are also deemed better equipped to be successful in the larger economy. The truth is that the SAT became the method for weeding out the unwanted through “science” rather than prejudice. Despite recognizing some of the faults of the SAT, Lemann fails to explicitly designate this essential reality. A national testing apparatus may have eliminated some of the arbitrariness of teachers, administrators, and those who decided the fate of college applicants, but it replaced the old intolerance with a new form of arbitrariness justified as empirical, rational, and even scientific.26

#### **A focus on how testing will be abolished footnotes the more important discussion about the purposes testing serves to begin with. Tests are not predictors of knowledge, rather a tool used to justify a flawed system.**

Hernandez 18 Theresa A., <https://www.huffpost.com/entry/abolish-standardized-testing-for-college-admissions_n_5b045869e4b003dc7e470ee3?guccounter=1&guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAAFTiEZ_Bt337jgSx8ed4aN3c5mXdZD3pnvYx_6K8SlY6Ch1fpy17WykFIcy2kRNPZIny0_2sj6B8qZJhxZBX2z0U2PRza2kOlvgZ7q0WDYDeZnFJF8Cb99r2qh1c0aYlGGynHIeEWeGDKeUk_P2q1utUO7REcEk6Q8QXg1A7_buf> 5-22 research assistant at the Pullias Center for Higher Education at the USC Rossier School of Education. TJHSSTAD

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 efficient and 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. As of January 2018, over 1,000 colleges and universities have stopped requiring SAT or ACT scores for undergraduate applicants. From academics to policymakers, people mistakenly believe that standardized tests are better at predicting college outcomes, like grades and graduation, than they really are. This uncritical belief in the current system of admissions allows those who have benefited to feel that they earned their position completely on their own. In reality, our success is a combination of our effort, our opportunities and the resources to make the most of both. This misplaced faith also makes us complicit in the exclusion of those who have not had our same privileges. 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.

#### De-emphasizing tests increases academic quality – Trinity proves.

Tough 9/10 What College Admissions Offices Really Want Elite schools say they’re looking for academic excellence and diversity. But their thirst for tuition revenue means that wealth trumps all. By PAUL TOUGH SEPT. 10, 2019Paul Tough is a contributing writer for the magazine. His article in this week’s issue is adapted from his new book, “The Years That Matter Most: How College Makes or Breaks Us,” which has its roots in his last article for the magazine about the disparity in graduation rates between rich and working-class students. Source photographs from Getty Images and Seth Poppel/Yearbook Library This article is adapted from ‘‘The Years That Matter Most: How College Makesor Breaks Us,’’ published by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. TJHSSTAD

* Link turns competitiveness, retention / dropouts, etc.
* Went test optional, nearly 40% of applicants didn’t submit scores though so Perez (director of admissions), said they placed 0 to no emphasis on tests

But by Trinity’s new measures of academic quality (which emphasized high school grades and a rigorous curriculum over test scores), it was the most highly qualified class in years. When the U.S. News & World Report list came out in September 2017, though, Trinity had fallen six spots on the ranking of the nation’s top liberal arts colleges, from No. 38 to No. 44. The U.S. News algorithm penalizes colleges if more than one-quarter of their admitted students don’t submit scores, and at the time it didn’t give them points for increasing their percentage of low-income or first-generation students. (It now does.) Trinity was paying more attention to diversity in its admissions, and its freshman class was becoming more academically accomplished, but by U.S. News’s standards, the college was heading in exactly the wrong direction. Soon after the U.S. News ranking came out, 17 members of Trinity’s English department sent a letter to the college’s board of trustees acknowledging that Trinity’s slide in the rankings might “spark some misgivings among Trustees about admissions policies enacted by Angel Pérez.” The professors urged the trustees to ignore the rankings and continue the new direction in admissions. The students that Pérez was admitting, they explained, were qualitatively different than those in earlier classes. They were more rewarding to teach. They were just plain better students. “We perceive in many of these students a refreshing array of qualities that were all too rare in prior years: intellectual curiosity, openness of mind and spirit and genuine will to engage with their peers,” the professors wrote. If Pérez’s admissions policies were “having inadvertent, temporary effects on U.S.N.W.R.’s dubious ‘selectivity’ measure,” they added, “we think this is a small price to pay for one of the most exciting transformations Trinity has witnessed in many years.”

#### Abolition key.

Colker 3/22 THE COLLEGE ADMISSIONS SCANDAL AND THE TROUBLE WITH STRICTLY TIMED STANDARDIZED TESTS RUTH COLKERMAR 22, 2019 Ruth Colker holds the Heck-Faust Memorial Chair in Constitutional Law at the Ohio State University's Moritz College of Law. TJHSSTAD

* Test-optional bad – students put at a competitive disadvantage because universities want to have higher rankings which come directly from their average SAT and ACT scores – students that don’t submit tests don’t do good on them

It is true that some universities make submission of scores on the ACT or SAT optional, allowing applicants to use other methods to demonstrate their knowledge and aptitudes. Nonetheless, when applicants take advantage of such optional methods, they place themselves at competitive disadvantage with respect to admissions or financial aid, including merit-based financial aid. The absence of standardized test scores signals that an applicant's scores are well below the median for that university's applicant pool. Despite their test-optional stances, such universities in fact reify the importance of speeded standardized exams. Further, because standardized test scores are part of the U.S. News and World Report ranking system, even test-optional universities are mindful of the big role that the test scores of their admitted students play in helping them maintain a high rank, and make admissions decisions accordingly. In some ways, it's a good thing that this bribery and cheating scandal has shone a spotlight on how some parents use fraudulent means to game standardized tests for their children.

## 1AC Add-ons

### Theory

#### 1] 1AR Theory Paradigm –

#### a. Aff gets it because its key to check infinite 1nc abuse, o/w on magnitude

#### b. DTD because the 1ar is too short to go for substance and theory

#### c. No RVIs because the 2NR could just dump on the RVI for 6 minutes and make the 2AR impossible

#### d. Comes first because it indicts the validity of your 1NC

#### e. No 2NR theory – skews the already time-crunched 2AR

#### 2] Aff RVIs k2 compensate for side bias

Shah 19 Sachin “A STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF SIDE-BIAS ON THE 2019 JANUARY-FEBRUARY LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE TOPIC” NSD, 15 February 2019. <http://nsdupdate.com/2019/a-statistical-analysis-of-side-bias-on-the-2019-january-february-lincoln-douglas-debate-topic/> SJCP//JG

To further quantify the side-bias, the proportion of negative wins when the affirmative was favored (p1) can be compared with the proportion of affirmative wins when the negative is favored (p2). Ideally the difference between the proportions would be 0; however, p1 = 34.84% while p2 = 28.77, a staggering 6.07% difference. Now the question is whether this difference is statistically significant. In order to determine the answer, a two-proportion z-test was used. The null hypothesis is p1 – p2 = 0 , because that means both sides are able to overcome the debating level skew equally. The alternative hypothesis is then p1 – p2 > 0, meaning the negative is able to overcome the skew more than the affirmative is able, demonstrating a side-bias. This two-proportion z-test rejected the null hypothesis in favor of the alternative (p-value < 0.0001). There is sufficient evidence that the negative is able to overcome the skew more often than the affirmative can. This implies there is a less than 0.01% chance that there is no side-bias because it demonstrates the higher proportion of negative wins when the affirmative is favored is significant. In short, the negative has a greater ability to win difficult rounds than the affirmative does, which indicates there exists a skew in the negative’s favor. This analysis is statistically rigorous and relevant in several aspects: (A) The p-value is less than the alpha. (B) The data is on the current January-February topic, meaning it’s relevant to rounds these months [2]. (C) The data represents a diversity of debating and judging styles across the country. (D) This analysis accounts for disparities in debating skill level. (E) Type I error was reduced by choosing a small alpha level. The combination of these points validates this analysis. As a final note, it is also interesting to look at the trend over multiple topics. In the rounds from 93 TOC bid distributing tournaments (2017 – 2019 YTD), the negative won 52.99% of ballots (p-value < 0.0001) and 54.63% of upset rounds (p-value < 0.0001). This suggests the bias might be structural, and not topic specific, as this data spans six different topics.

#### Empirics outweigh analytics because they conform to what actually happen in the round. Super low p-values and high sample size means our stats are reliable.

#### 3] PICs against a whole res aff are a voting issue:

#### a. ground – you can cherry pick parts of the resolution to PIC out of that are true or have very little aff ground – puts me at a major ground skew which is key to fairness and outweighs because ground is necessary to generate arguments.

#### b. topic lit – you kill clash and engagement about the topic by limiting discussion to one specific part of the topic that you are much better prepared on. Prevents us from exploring the breadth of the topic lit which links to topic ed which o/w because we only have two months to debate the topic.

#### c. reciprocity – I have to defend and research every part of the resolution whereas you can just prep one small part of it and limit the debate to that – reciprocity is key to fairness by definition.

### Reasonability

#### Evaluate theory as a question of reasonability with a brightline of structural skew. To clarify, this means they have to prove that I decreased the number of paths to their ballot and didn’t just have a better strategy or substantive advantage. Our brightline is justified because otherwise anything could be abusive, and anyone would read theory all the time.

#### Prefer on substantive education – reasonability allows a quick refocus on substance by resolving the theory debate and incentivizes clash by preventing theory debaters from always reading frivolous shells. Outweighs because it’s the constitutive impact of debate – nobody cares about theory in the real world, but sub ed is the only skill we take from debate

### Cap

#### **Meritocracy is a crucial ideological justification for capitalism – it’s the language of neo-conservative racists.**

Littler 18 MERITOCRACY AS NEOLIBERAL MANTRA By [discoversociety](https://discoversociety.org/author/discoversociety/) October 02, 2018 [4 Comments](https://discoversociety.org/2018/10/02/meritocracy-as-neoliberal-mantra/#comments) [2018](https://discoversociety.org/category/2018/), [Articles](https://discoversociety.org/category/articles/), [DS61](https://discoversociety.org/category/ds61/) Jo Littler Jo Littler is a reader in the department of sociology at City, University of London. Her book [Against Meritocracy: Culture, Power and Myths of Mobility](https://www.routledge.com/Against-Meritocracy-Culture-power-and-myths-of-mobility/Littler/p/book/9781138889552) is published by Routledge in August TJHSSTAD

Why is the idea of meritocracy – the idea that society should be organised so that anyone can rise to the top of the social pile, if they work hard and activate their talent – so normalized, so familiar, so ‘common-sense’? In part it is undoubtably because it holds within it some vivid elements of fairness. It is surely right that everyone should have a chance to progress and develop themselves, and to work in fields they are capable of working in, regardless of their background. It is right that establishments should not contract and ossify to keep the privileged inside their golden gates of power. It is right that people should not be discriminated against. All these points, which are generally part of the package of meaning that is meritocracy, are irrefutable. Meritocracy is also part of our common-sense because it has been used consistently in the service of a right-wing agenda, which not only hinders democratic goals but relentlessly works to secure their exact opposite. Over the past few decades, narratives of meritocracy have been vigorously and inventively used to perpetuate entrenched privilege and rapidly extend inequalities. The notion of meritocracy has been deployed, in shape-shifting fashion, as perhaps the core alibi for neoliberal capitalism. It has done so in a variety of guises, both socially liberal and conservative-authoritarian. A key part of the problem is that meritocracy has always involved those who ‘succeed’ and rise to the top of the social hierarchy being given copious financial rewards. This element makes meritocracy a structural impossibility, as it creates the exact opposite of a level playing field. The co-existence of meritocracy with dramatic economic inequality was always a problem for those on the Left, from the moment meritocracy became a word in the mid-1950s. (And indeed, even before it was coined as a term, the idea had plenty of traction as a discourse, from ‘pulling yourself up by your bootstraps’ in the US to Victorian self-help treatises [1]). In what is, to date, the first recorded use of the term, by the industrial sociologist Alan Fox in 1956 in Socialist Commentary (a journal described by Clement Atlee as a ‘useful corrective to the New Statesman’), the word is unproblematically a slur. ‘Why would you heap prodigious economic benefits on the already gifted?’ asked Fox, incredulously [2]. Unlike ‘equal opportunities’, ‘equality of outcome’, or ‘anti-discrimination’, the concept of meritocracy has always been inseparable from capitalism, as noted in the 1950s by social theorists and philosophers including Fox, Hannah Arendt and Raymond Williams. Meritocracy was also a problem, more notoriously, for the polymath Michael Young, for whom it became a way to lambast sectarian educational policies advocating grammar schools. In Young’s scathing 1958 fictional bestseller The Rise of the Meritocracy, which depicts past democratic progress and future social dystopia, meritocracy is also clearly a bad thing, leading through dangerous social division to a soulless, black market trade in brainy babies. Yet at the same time, in Young’s entertaining yet often fairly obtuse text, the clearer socialist critique of meritocracy (which, to be fair, was never elaborated extensively at this time) was also obfuscated. By the 1970s Young’s friend Daniel Bell had begun to promote meritocracy as a potential engine of the knowledge economy. Advocating greater social competitiveness probably did not seem to many as if it would hurt at a time when the welfare state was still flourishing. But by the 1980s, at the beginnings of the political implementation what we now call neoliberalism in the UK, the idea was being energetically deployed by right-wing think tanks as a possible conduit through which greater marketisation could be produced and collective provision could be dismantled. The ways in which meritocracy could be used as a destructive fiction and ideological tool, to gain consent for policies for increasing competition and destroying forms of collective or socialized resource, had been identified by Raymond Williams in 1958. Reviewing Young’s book, he noted that meritocracy went hand in glove with individualism, which ‘sweetened the poison of hierarchy’ and ran counter to solidarity and the task of common betterment. The ideological function of meritocracy – as legitimation for contemporary neoliberal capitalism – has proved to be remarkably supple, as I track in my book Against Meritocracy: Culture, Power and Myths of Mobility [3]. For Thatcher, the language of meritocracy was a way to stick two manicured fingers up to the old Establishment of ‘the Great and the Good’, and to galvanise white working and middle-class aspiration and support for selling off public assets including council houses and the railways. The social conservatism – the racism and sexism – of this period was roundly rejected by New Labour, who ushered in a new language of socially liberal meritocracy, in which anyone could ostensibly ‘make it,’ no matter their ethnicity or sexuality; and which sought to protect the very young through SureStart programmes and an emphasis on reducing child poverty. Wealth redistribution was not on the agenda, though, which meant that although attempts were made to protect children, a battery of moral education parenting techniques were also launched to try to offset the continual effects of inequality [4]. Meanwhile, adults were encouraged into competitive individualism as the privatization agenda became ratcheted up through Public Private Partnerships and [Private Finance Initiatives](https://uk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com/3-107-7049?originationContext=document&transitionType=DocumentItem&contextData=(sc.Default)). Post-New Labour, the Conservatives became ever more punitive, moralizing about ‘strivers and skivers’ and attacking what they depicted as a ‘bloated’ welfare system. Crucially, neoliberal meritocracy also gained its traction from cultural, social and media discourse across a variety of realms from schools to dating to work. Neoliberal meritocracy is characterised by the extension of competitive individualism into ever more areas of life: from enforcing rankings between, and within, universities through TEF and REF (the Teaching and Research Excellence Frameworks), and of schools and children through league tables and SATS exams (Standard Attainment Tests); to the reinvigoration of the talent show format under the auspices of reality TV, where people elbow each other out of the way to be the top apprentice or baker or singer, and to competing online to be the last one living and flossing in the computer game Fortnite. In the process, neoliberal meritocracy has also been characterised by drawing, highly selectively, on the language of social justice – particularly anti-racism, feminism and gay rights – which expanded from the 1960s and by flipping it on its head. Anyone can make it, we are told, and we are offered parables of progress in the form of luminous media examples of the few who actually manage to ‘make it’ and travel up what is a really long social ladder. And it is those who are least privileged and most affected by what we might call a ‘meritocratic deficit’ who are the most intensely incited to work hard and to believe in achievement, that nothing stands in their way but graft and self-belief ([Chapman](http://discoversociety.org/?p=5714)). Women are encouraged to ‘lean in’, mothers to solve the work/childcare problem themselves by becoming mumpreneurs who set up their own businesses from home, and underprivileged young people to hustle and be ‘entrepreneurial’. This is the ‘meritocratic’ way: to make the ever-lengthening ladder harder to access in the first place, and to instruct the least privileged to blame themselves rather than tackling the structures that continually fail them. In its current form, neoliberal meritocracy shows how the judgements about who has ‘merit’ and privilege can, in stratified and unequal systems, not only become increasingly contentious ([Payne](http://discoversociety.org/?p=5730)) but open to extreme abuse. Donald Trump uses and exploits the language of merit to validate who he will let enter the US and who he will lock up. His actions show how the struggle to maintain power co-exists with a language of merit and worth, to racist, sexist, abusive and inhumane effect. Meritocracy is an obfuscatory neoliberal mantra which has been used for decades to powerful effect, providing a key justification for increasing privatization and inequality in the interests of a few. It has provided crucial ideological ballast to the process of extending capitalism further and further into our social, material, psychological and environmental lives with devasting consequences. Neoliberal meritocracy should be challenged, dismantled and replaced with genuine egalitarianism: including economic redistribution, robust anti-discrimination policies and initiatives, and free education. Instead of neoliberal meritocracy we need policies and cultures which prioritise care, common ownership and collective development of our shared natural, physical, cultural and psychological resources [5] rather than fostering the lonely empowerment of individuals towards goals which, ultimately, both diminish and threaten us all.

### Eugenics

#### Standardized testing is a form of racial eugenics in which testing companies try to recreate results that harm minorities. The closer you are to the ideal the more likely you are to score higher.

Singer 19 [Steven Singer] April 06, 2019 Common Dreams DOA: 9/3/19 “Standardized Testing is a Tool of White Supremacy” <https://www.commondreams.org/views/2019/04/06/standardized-testing-tool-white-supremacy> SLHS-RR

But standardized testing? That hasn’t really changed all that much. It still reduces complex processes down to a predetermined set of only four possible answers—a recipe good for guessing what a test-maker wants more than expressing a complex answer about the real world. It still attempts to produce a bell curve of scores so that so many test takers fail, so many pass, so many get advanced scores, etc. It still judges correct and incorrect by reference to a predetermined standard of how a preconceived “typical” student would respond. Considering how and why such assessments were created in the first place, the presence of a racial achievement gap should not be surprising at all. That’s the result these tests were originally created to find. Modern testing comes out of Army IQ tests developed during World War I. In 1917, a group of psychologists led by Robert M. Yerkes, president of the American Psychological Association (APA), created the Army Alpha and Beta tests. These were specifically designed to measure the intelligence of recruits and help the military distinguish those of “superior mental ability” from those who were “mentally inferior.” These assessments were based on explicitly eugenicist foundations—the idea that certain races were distinctly superior to others. In 1923, one of the men who developed these intelligence tests, Carl Brigham, took these ideas further in his seminal work A Study of American Intelligence. In it, he used data gathered from these IQ tests to argue the following: The decline of American intelligence will be more rapid than the decline of the intelligence of European national groups, owing to the presence here of the negro. These are the plain, if somewhat ugly, facts that our study shows. The deterioration of American intelligence is not inevitable, however, if public action can be aroused to prevent it. Thus, Yerkes and Brigham’s pseudoscientific tests were used to justify Jim Crow laws, segregation, and even lynchings. Anything for “racial purity.” People took this research very seriously. States passed forced sterilization laws for people with “defective” traits, preventing between 60,000 and 70,000 people from “polluting” America’s ruling class. The practice was even upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in the 1927 Buck v. Bell decision. Justices decided that mandatory sterilization of “feeble-minded” individuals was, in fact, constitutional. Of the ruling, which has never been explicitly overturned, Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote: “It is better for all the world, if instead of waiting to execute degenerate offspring for crime, or to let them starve for their imbecility, society can prevent those who are manifestly unfit from continuing their kind. ...Three generations of imbeciles are enough.” Eventually Brigham took his experience with Army IQ tests to create a new assessment for the College Board—the Scholastic Aptitude Test—now known as the Scholastic Assessment Test or SAT. It was first given to high school students in 1926 as a gatekeeper. Just as the Army intelligence tests were designed to distinguish the superior from the inferior, the SAT was designed to predict which students would do well in college and which would not. It was meant to show which students should be given the chance at a higher education and which should be left behind. And unsurprisingly it has always—and continues to—privilege white students over children of color. The SAT remains a tool for ensuring white supremacy that is essentially partial and unfair—just as its designers always meant it to be. Moreover, it is the model by which all other high stakes standardized tests are designed. But Brigham was not alone in smuggling eugenicist ideals into the education field. These ideas dominated pedagogy and psychology for generations until after World War II when their similarity to the Nazi philosophy we had just defeated in Europe dimmed their exponents’ enthusiasm. Another major eugenicist who made a lasting impact on education was Lewis Terman, Professor of Education at Stanford University and originator of the Stanford-Binet intelligence test. In his highly influential 1916 textbook, The Measurement of Intelligence he wrote: Among laboring men and servant girls there are thousands like them [feebleminded individuals]. They are the world’s “hewers of wood and drawers of water.” And yet, as far as intelligence is concerned, the tests have told the truth. …No amount of school instruction will ever make them intelligent voters or capable voters in the true sense of the word. ...The fact that one meets this type with such frequency among Indians, Mexicans, and negroes suggests quite forcibly that the whole question of racial differences in mental traits will have to be taken up anew and by experimental methods. Children of this group should be segregated in special classes and be given instruction which is concrete and practical. They cannot master, but they can often be made efficient workers, able to look out for themselves. There is no possibility at present of convincing society that they should not be allowed to reproduce, although from a eugenic point of view they constitute a grave problem because of their unusually prolific breeding (91-92). This was the original justification for academic tracking. Terman and other educational psychologists convinced many schools to use high-stakes and culturally-biased tests to place “slow” students into special classes or separate schools while placing more advanced students of European ancestry into the college preparatory courses. The modern wave of high stakes testing has its roots in the Reagan administration—specifically the infamous propaganda hit piece A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform. In true disaster capitalism style, it concluded that our economy was at risk because of poor public schools. Therefore, it suggested circumventing the schools and subordinating them to a system of standardized tests, which would be used to determine everything from teacher quality to resource allocation. It’s a bizarre argument, but it goes something like this: the best way to create and sustain a fair educational system is by rewarding “high-achieving” students. So we shouldn’t provide kids with what they need to succeed. We should make school a competition where the strongest get the most and everyone else gets a lesser share. And the gatekeeper in this instance (as it was in access to higher education) is high stakes testing. The greater the test score, the more funding your school receives, the lower class sizes, the wider curriculum, more tutors, more experienced and well compensated teachers, etc. It’s a socially stratified education system completely supported by a pseudoscientific series of assessments. After all, what is a standardized test but an assessment that refers to a specific standard? And that standard is white, upper class students. In his book How the SAT Creates Built-in-Headwinds, national admissions-test expert, Jay Rosner, explains the process by-which SAT designers decide which questions to include on the test: Compare two 1998 SAT verbal [section] sentence-completion items with similar themes: The item correctly answered by more blacks than whites was discarded by [the Educational Testing Service] (ETS), whereas the item that has a higher disparate impact against blacks became part of the actual SAT. On one of the items, which was of medium difficulty, 62 percent of whites and 38 percent of African Americans answered correctly, resulting in a large impact of 24 percent... On this second item, 8 percent more African Americans than whites answered correctly. In other words, the criteria for whether a question is chosen for future tests is if it replicates the outcomes of previous exams—specifically tests where students of color score lower than white children. And this is still the criteria test makers use to determine which questions to use on future editions of nearly every assessment in wide use in the U.S.

# Extensions

## Overviews

### 1AR Round 5 O/V

#### The ROB is to challenge dominant forms of knowledge production:

#### Extend Ferri and Connor – even if their ontology claims are true, analyzing specific instances of oppression is necessary to understand nuanced manifestations of social death – society is complicated and analyzing the specific ways in which things like standardized tests are used to criminalize and stereotype black students is necessary to explain why and how anti-blackness operates.

#### the aff is a criticism of the way tests are used as a tool of segregation – the existence of other tools of oppression doesn’t disprove our criticism – we are NOT consequentialist. Winning that tests are bad is sufficient to affirm and anything else is ethical blackmail that footnotes minority struggles.

#### Standardized tests justify a myth of meritocracy that is used to mask the structural oppression they critique and mark students as inferior – this is the cause of all structural oppression in education systems. Proves we are consistent with the thesis of the K and that tests are a tool of oppression which meets our framing. Use a try or die framing – only the aff has a chance at rupturing ideological structures of meritocracy that preserve inequality – staying in the squo assures the continuation of oppression.

### 1AR Framing vs AP

#### The ROB is to challenge dominant forms of knowledge production:

#### Extend Ferri and Connor – even if their ontology claims are true, analyzing specific instances of oppression is necessary to understand nuanced manifestations of social death – society is complicated and analyzing the specific ways in which things like standardized tests are used to criminalize and stereotype black students is necessary to explain why and how anti-blackness operates.

### 1AR Framing vs Phil

#### The ROB is to challenge dominant forms of knowledge production:

#### Extend Knoester and Au – ethical theories in the context of education must have a racial, non-ideal starting point – anything else denies the existence of continued segregation within educational spaces and perpetuates the meritocratic framework we critique. Even if ideal theory is good generally, non-ideal theory is good in this specific instance – winning that hijacks your framework and means all our offense matters.

#### Extend Ferri and Connor – this is an educational reason to prefer the framework and comes first – it’s functionally a TJF – even if their normative theory is true, debate is an educational space tainted by oppressive frames of reference that disguise themselves as neutral – disrupting that by calling out instances of oppression is a prior question to discussing normative ideals.

### 1AR Framing vs Theory

#### The ROB is to challenge dominant forms of knowledge production:

#### Extend Ferri and Connor – their attempt to generate norms in education centers like debate by reading theory perpetuates a façade of fairness and inclusivity that always excludes certain bodies and maintain structural oppression – that’s violent and a reason to drop them.

#### Next, questions of in-round fairness bite the affs critique of meritocracy – their notion of fairness is used to construct a level playing field in which every debater supposedly has an equal shot at winning. This is used to neutralize problems of oppression within debate which is uniquely violent.

### 1AR Framing vs LARP

#### The ROB is to challenge dominant forms of knowledge production:

#### Extend Ferri and Connor – this is an educational reason to prefer the framework and comes first – even if consequences matter, debate is an educational space tainted by oppressive frames of reference that disguise themselves as neutral – disrupting that by calling out instances of oppression is a prior question to discussing consequences.

### 1AR – Framing vs Truth Testing

#### The ROB is to challenge dominant forms of knowledge production:

#### Extend Ferri and Connor – their appeal to constitutive norms in debate and an ideal notion of truth is undergirded by our epistemology claims – our understanding of truth is skewed by epistemic biases especially in the context of education which is used to mask widespread structural violence. Their claims that truth testing is the neutral/default model of debate allows hegemonic power structures to influence the debate space

#### The judge is an educator – view the framing debate as a question of whose model of debate is best for education, not which model of debate is constitutive. All our offense obviously also links under truth testing because we evaluate the truth of the resolution.

### 1AR – Framing vs K

#### The ROB is to challenge dominant forms of knowledge production:

#### Extend Ferri and Connor – it’s an epistemology claim about how structures of oppression hidden behind educational norms skew our understanding of the world. Epistemology o/w the K and comes first – words or concepts like \_[anti-blackness/queerness/etc.]\_ cannot be separated from their social construction and meaning but are always subject to change – it’s a prior question to assessing the truth of their theory.

### 1AR – Orientation Framing

#### the aff is a criticism of the way tests are used as a tool of segregation – the existence of other tools of oppression doesn’t disprove our criticism. Winning that tests are bad is sufficient to affirm and anything else is ethical blackmail that footnotes minority struggles.

### 1AR – Meritocracy – Generic

#### Standardized tests justify a myth of meritocracy that is used to disguise forms of structural inequality in the education system – the impact is perpetual structural violence where marginalized students are always deemed inferior.

### 1AR – Meritocracy – Structural Inequalities

#### Standardized tests justify a myth of meritocracy that is used to mark certain students in the education system as inferior – we control the root cause to all structural inequalities within the education system which outweighs all their offense on magnitude. Use a try or die framing – only the aff has a chance at rupturing the ideological structures of meritocracy that sustain inequality – staying in the squo assures the continuation of oppression.

## A2 Case Turns

### Overview

#### First, reject their \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ studies – they are a product of the test industry and exaggerated in order to maintain profit – err heavily aff on the case debate.

#### Second, winning tests are subjective takes out shift – shift assumes that tests are in some way more objective than other metrics which we say is a flawed narrative that produces meritocratic violence.

### A2 Shift

#### The shift debate –

#### First, there’s no way to quantify how much removing tests shifts different factors in the admission process – no quantification means the impact of a shift is marginal and the aff outweighs.

#### Second, the aff causes a culture shift that solves all of their alt causes.

Dandaneau 18 [Steven P. Dandaneau, sociology from Brandeis] "Dr. King and Standardized Testing," No Publication, https://firstgen.naspa.org/blog/dr-king-and-standardized-testing 4-2-2018 RE recut TJHSSTAD

A successful national movement to eliminate use of standardized tests for admissions and scholarship allocation would strike a blow against prevailing inequality and injustice in higher education. No single alternative reform would do more to make our institutions more first-generation student-ready, first, by eliminating the perhaps greatest barrier to access and affordability, and, second, by fostering a learning environment in which the diversity of intelligences and life experiences is recognized and respected. It would not solve all our problems nor render schooling in America fair and democratic. It would be a significant leap in the right direction, and it might inspire additional forms of social change.

#### Third, regional reps have context which solves – they know about things like which extracurriculars are available in certain areas, understand the financial context behind not being able to visit schools, etc.

#### Fifth, only the aff has a risk of changing the oppressive status quo which means it’s try or die – winning their arguments just means removing tests at worst does nothing

#### Sixth, Holistic review is a preferable model for college admissions that empirically increases class diversity.

UUH, 14 – (Urban Universities for Health, 09-30-14, “New National Study Finds Holistic Admission Has Positive Impact on Class Diversity”, http://urbanuniversitiesforhealth.org/news/press-release-new-national-study-finds-holistic-admission-has-positive-impa#.XVtnkq2ZPpA)

METHODOLOGY: Data were collected through an electronic survey that was sent to the presidents of 163 universities. A total of 104 universities from 45 different states participated in the study with 228 individual health professions schools (nursing, medicine, dentistry, public health, and pharmacy) providing their data on practices and outcomes. Survey respondents self-reported their use of holistic review, but they also reported their schools’ actual admissions practices. Actual practices were held up against a theoretical model for holistic admissions in order to objectively assess the extent to which schools have a holistic admission process.

WASHINGTON, DC (September 30, 2014)— A new national study finds that health professions schools report an overall positive impact from the use of holistic review – a university admissions process that assesses an applicant’s unique experiences alongside traditional measures of academic achievement such as grades and test scores. The report, [Holistic Admissions in the Health Professions](http://urbanuniversitiesforhealth.org/knowledge-base/publications), released today is the first large-scale study to examine the prevalence and effectiveness of holistic review across multiple health disciplines at universities nationwide. The national survey coordinated by Urban Universities for HEALTH – a collaboration between the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU), the Coalition of Urban Serving Universities (USU) and the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), with funding from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) – finds the majority of schools report an increase in the diversity of their incoming classes and no change to measures of academic quality, student academic performance, or student retention. Half of schools surveyed reported that the average GPA of the incoming class remained unchanged, while 40 percent reported that it increased. “Our study shows that holistic review is a very promising admissions practice that not only increased access for diverse students but also admitted students who excelled academically and have the right qualities to be successful in the workforce,” said Dr. Greer Glazer, Dean of the College of Nursing at the University of Cincinnati, who led the study. Many colleges and universities use a holistic admission process to select students. The practice has become more popular in health fields such as medicine, because it enables schools to evaluate a broader range of criteria important for student success, and to select individuals with the background and skills needed to meet the demands of a transforming health care environment. “Being a good health professional is about more than scientific knowledge. It also requires an understanding of people. Holistic review helps schools find students who have the attributes and abilities to become outstanding humanistic health professionals and leaders in their field,” said Darrell Kirch, M.D., president and CEO of the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC). “It is gratifying to see holistic review being used by so many institutions to recruit the kind of health providers you and I would want at our bedside. Furthermore, it’s heartening to see that these admission practices are showing signs of improving academic success, diversity, and other outcomes we want to encourage in the health professions.” “What we found is that universities can expand access to higher education for disadvantaged students while maintaining or improving academic standards,” said. Peter McPherson, President of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU). “This is exciting news for us, because our universities are looking for ways to help students from all backgrounds succeed, and we hope that our health profession schools in particular will use this evidence to recruit and train a health workforce that meets community and employer needs.”

#### legacy and sports are fringe cases – the aff is still good generally

### A2 Ake-Little

#### 1] Holistic review forces in depth analysis of individual applicants – means they choose a better class that leads to more endowments and donations in the future – long term financial stability outweighs the small increase in financial aid right now.

#### 2] Colleges will find a way to adapt – process isn’t perfect now and removing tests forces them to reduce inefficiencies.

### A2 Predictive Analytics

#### 1] TURN – predictive analytics good – networks and algorithms can be weighted to place greater emphasis on minorities – training sets don’t have to be biased and they can be checked to help minorities.

#### 2] No link – most people don’t have the technology to shift to predictive analytics and there’s no reason they would – even if they do, they’ll be overlooked by people who can detect their mistakes.

### A2 GPA Inflation

#### Off grade inflation –

#### 1. TURN – Minorities are more likely to be GPA discrepant – means GPA is preferable to tests

Sanchez and Mattern 18 Edgar Krista “Measuring Success: Testing, Grades, and the Future of College Admissions,” When High School Grade Point Averages and Test Scores Disagree: Implications for Test Optional Policies 2018 TJHSSTAD

Studies have found that students who have higher HSGPAs than test scores tend to be female, minority, and low-income students (Edmunds and Sanchez 2014; Kobrin, Camara, and Milewski 2002; Mattern, Shaw, and Kobrin 2011; Ramist, Lewis, and Jenkins 1997; Sanchez and Edmunds 2015; Sanchez and Lin 2017). For example, Sanchez and Lin (2017) found that the gender distribution of students who had a high HSGPA but a moderate or low ACT Composite score to be more heavily represented by females (66% and 62%, respectively). Additionally, for students with a moderate HSGPA and low ACT Composite score, only 60% of students were female. More than 50% of students with a high HSGPA and low ACT Composite score or moderate HSGPA and low ACT Composite score were minority and lowincome students. On the other hand, only a small percentage of minority and low-income students constituted the high HSGPA and high ACT Composite score group (8.77% of minorities; 9.63% of low-income students) as well as the high ACT Composite score and moderate HSGPA group (12.78% of minorities; 12.57% of lowincome students). There are also several noteworthy findings about the differences between these groups. HSGPA discrepant students are more likely to have lower socioeconomic status backgrounds (e.g., household income, parental education level) than either the SAT discrepant or consistent achievement groups (Mattern, Shaw, and Kobrin 2011; Ramist, Lewis, and Jenkins 1997). HSGPA discrepant students also tend to speak languages other than English at home (Kobrin, Camara, and Milewski 2002).

#### 2. No impact – 1) admissions officers assess grades in the context of schools and students in them – a 4.6 GPA is bad if the average at that school is a 4.9 2) reps know which schools inflate grades and which don’t.

### A2 Meltzer

#### Meltzer has her own test prep book and works in the prep industry – the only research she cites is from college board – their evidence is doubly biased, and you should reject it.

### A2 Kuncel

#### 1. our argument is not about increasing diversity, just about rupturing the myth of meritocracy

#### 2. this ev. talks about test optional, not completely removing tests

### A2 Accountability

#### 1. No link – your offense is in the context of state K-12 tests not admissions tests

#### 2. Standardized tests have been used for nearly 40 years now – they should’ve resolved any potential inequalities already but they haven’t

#### 3. Standardized tests are curved so that the distribution of test scores is constant – this is why they have not and cannot be used to create accountability measures

#### 4. TURN – accountability focus results in curricular narrowing that breeds complacency in structural violence.

Ragland 19 Sustaining Black Captivity: A Critical Analysis of Corporate Philanthropic Discourse on Education Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University By Allison Ragland Graduate Program in Teaching and Learning The Ohio State University 2019 Dissertation Committee Elaine Richardson, Advisor Franco Barchiesi Cynthia Tyson TJHSSTAD

In addition, Kohn (2000) argued that accountability policies under neoliberalism have virtually forced teachers, especially those in low-income schools, to teach exactly what is on the test because of the intense scrutiny, threat of public humiliation, and school sanctions based on low test scores. Gilliom (2009) also reported that teachers are increasingly pressured to teach what is on the test. He gave an example of a teacher who 46 used to use the War of 1812 to delve into an interdisciplinary examination of the topic over a period of several weeks. As a result of standards and accountability policies, the War of 1812 virtually disappeared from the teacher’s curriculum and was merely glazed over as opposed to offering an in-depth study of it because standardized testing did not require students to know about it. Gilliom (2009) argued that standardized testing functions as a form of educational surveillance by regulating what students are taught and making it difficult for teachers to do in-depth, contextualized, historical investigations of topics. It also hinders teachers’ ability for creativity in the classroom, as creative skills are not tested. Many teachers are pressured to spend nearly all of their time and energy focusing on test preparation, drills, memorization, and scripted instruction in order to comply with the demands of the tests. Gilliom (2009) warned that test taking has completely defined the curriculum and academic calendars of low-income schools and that this is part of a long-term conservative attempt to regulate the knowledge that is disseminated in schools: Anyone who lived through the educational politics of the 1990s knows that there was a huge and not entirely new war going on, with religious and cultural conservatives frequently advocating “the three R’s” or “back to basics” approach coupled with teaching methods known as phonics or direct instruction. The latter techniques focus on achieving knowledge acquisition through the repetition and memorization of small parts of words or other pieces of information. Both have been strongly embraced by the political and religious right in the United States and resisted by progressives and the education unions. What NCLB was able to 47 achieve was a largely tacit, but nonetheless massive, victory for the conservative movement. There is now strong evidence that as struggling districts attempt to pass the tests mandated by NCLB, the pursuit of success on the testing metrics pressures them to restrict the curriculum to the basic, tested materials at the expense of the arts, physical education, and other untested areas. Further, this pursuit pressures teachers to shift to educational techniques that better align with the particularist, discrete knowledge style of standardized tests. Exploring works of literature gives way to memorizing vocabulary and spelling lists; hands-on experimentation gives way to memorizing formulae for calculations. (p. 197). Lipman (2006, 2009) posited that standardized accountability results in the hindrance of critical thinking, especially for Black, Latinx, and poor students who could benefit the most from a critical understanding of the injustices that shape their lives. Lipman (2006) discussed how standardized testing has resulted in the elimination of classroom opportunities to discuss and analyze injustice, which is especially unfortunate for students from historically oppressed groups because “these are precisely the kinds of educational experiences students need to help them think critically and ethically about the inequalities that structure their life chances” (p. 46). Lipman (2009) also argued that accountability reflects a culture of surveillance: Learning inside accountability practices apprentices students to the compliant dispositions, uncritical habits of thought, and a culture of blame and suspicion that support tolerance for systematic government surveillance and political repression, 48 racial profiling, and jingoistic appeals to patriotism and war. In other words, schools become part of the fabric of coercion as a social process. (p. 171) Curricular Narrowing and Standardization Kohn (2000) and Lipman (2006, 2009) argued that standardized testing too often becomes the main focus of schools, especially low income schools. This is known as curricular narrowing, when the curriculum squeezes out everything except for what is immediately needed for the tests. For example, Abrams et al. (2003) found that many teachers in poor schools do not teach anything that is not on the test because there is so much pressure for them to pass the tests. They also found that teachers in low-income schools emphasize test-prep earlier in the year and use materials that look like the standardized tests throughout the entire school year. Instead of having a rich, holistic education, students in these schools are drilled and required to memorize a narrow body of decontextualized facts in order to pass the tests. Students are taught to answer test questions at the expense of fully understanding the content. Instead of covering topics in depth, “teachers often feel obliged to set aside other subjects for days, weeks, or (particularly in schools serving low income students) even months at a time in order to devote themselves to boosting students’ test scores. . . the test essentially becomes the curriculum” (Kohn, 2000, p. 29). Kohn (2000) continued, “the implications for the quality of teaching are not difficult to imagine, particularly if better scores on high-stakes exams are likely to result more from memorizing math facts and algorithms, for example, than from understanding concepts” (p. 29). 49 McNeil (2000) described the educational consequences of standardization and curricular narrowing in Texas, which mainly impacts low-income schools: The clear picture that emerges is that the standardized reforms drastically hurt the best teachers, forcing them to teach watered down content because it was computer gradable. The standardization brought about by the state policies forced them to teach artificially simplified curricula that had been designed by bureaucrats seeking expedient (easily implemented, noncontroversial) curricular formats. The quality of their teaching, their course content and their students’ learning all suffered. In addition, those relations within the school essential to fostering a culture of both equity and authentic academics were undermined. (p. 192) According to Hill (2006), standardization reproduces dominant, hegemonic ideologies and impedes critical thinking by not representing a range of ideas. Standardized content on tests and in curricula is also ahistorical and decontextualized, presenting information in small chunks instead of within a broader social context. In a stark contrast to actual learning, neoliberalism functions to “commodify public education by reducing learning to bits of information and skill to be taught and tested.” (Ross & Gibson, 2006, p.4)

#### 5. **High-stakes testing is tool of securitization, used to measure teacher and student performance, marking groups that “fail” as inferior.**

Cridland-Hughes 17 Critical Dialogue, Securitization Rhetoric, and Affirming Teaching: A Philosophical Exploration SUSAN CRIDLAND-HUGHES Clemson University TJHSSTAD

When applied to testing, securitization rhetoric emerges in the implementation of No Child Left Behind, an act that identified as part of its purpose (Sec 1001, Statement of Purpose, NCLB, 2002): 4) ensuring that high-quality academic assessments, accountability systems, teacher preparation and training, curriculum, and instructional materials are aligned with challenging State academic standards so that students, teachers, parents, and administrators can measure progress against common expectations for student academic achievement; (5) holding schools, local educational agencies, and States accountable for improving the academic achievement of all students, and identifying and turning around low-performing schools that have failed to provide a highquality education to their students, while providing alternatives to students in such schools to enable the students to receive a high-quality education; In this purpose statement, the Act articulates the desire of the legislature to provide quality assessment and instruction and a desire to evaluate schools based on how well they meet the purpose of educating youth equally. The second component embeds securitization within the ideals of the Act – in order to ensure that people meet the established goals, there must be accountability. The accountability becomes the securitized safety boundary that ensures that teachers will teach and students will learn, and this securitization rhetoric becomes the common narrative about success and failure in schools. When we embrace securitization as the appropriate common narrative, we desensitize ourselves to the number and level of atrocities committed against whatever we deem the other. This is the area where testing becomes most aligned with the securitized binaries of belonging and isolation. We are familiar with how successful students are considered an example of effective education, and teachers of successful students are seen as evidence that we can ensure that no child will be left behind. However, the exact opposite is also true – teachers and students perceived as failing are seen as somehow different and "other" from the successful; this labeling pathologizes performance and institutionalizes isolation for both the teachers labeled as struggling and those labeled as successful. One key example of this occurred in Los Angeles in 2010, where the Los Angeles Times published the value-added scores of all teachers in the district and identified specific teachers who were successful and unsuccessful based on seven years of value- added test scores (Felch, Song & Smith, 2010). Reporters then observed in those classrooms, describing what they perceived to be the reasons why students were struggling in individual teachers' classrooms and succeeding in others. Although the argument for public exposure of these measures of effectiveness is Cridland-Hughes w A Philosophical Exploration Journal of Curriculum Theorizing ♦ Volume 31, Number 3, 2017 49 accountability, there are unintended consequences for both students and teachers. In the article, one of the teachers interviewed described how "in the past, if I were recognized, I would become an outcast" (Felch et al., 2010, p.3). With regards to testing, those who succeed are pitted against those who fail- although the rhetoric at the time of NCLB was a rhetoric of supporting more youth to succeed, testing has subsequently demonstrated the development of a culture of fear. How does securitization relate to testing, education and critical literacy? Establishing that the goal of securitization is control, the same perspective applies in testing – if we test enough, we will gather enough data and evidence to put in place scaffolds/punishments that ensure that schools function, teachers teach, and students learn. Agamben's critique holds here, as well – in putting these high stakes tests in place, we are creating an adversarial relationship between politicians and high level administrators on one side and teachers on the other, and the divide we create actually makes our students less secure as learners. Securitization is an attempt to control variables that are in some ways uncontrollable, and testing tries to do the same thing. The end results of both are isolation, limits, and rising unrest. Why are we so susceptible in education to testing couched in securitization rhetoric? The answer is simple: both securitization and testing rhetoric feed on fear. Claudia Eppert (2008) explores in detail the way fear permeates both American society and American education: The energy of fear projects itself in experiences of frustration, blame, anger, worry, insecurity, distrust, and sorry; in thoughts of protection, superiority, judgment, hatred, and evil; and, finally, in actions of physical and/or symbolic defense, aggression, withdrawal and flight. (p.56) Eppert goes on to remind us that "the chase for security... in the belief that obtaining these will lead to permanent happiness and will bring relief from restless desire, inevitably breeds a paradoxical insecurity that inspires dynamics of fear" (p. 62). When we begin to explore how securitization and testing rhetoric align with this increased sense of fear in the schools, we see that testing becomes our chase for security, and subsequently results in all of the elements identified above. We have institutionalized fear for students, parents and teachers through the policies we enact. One of the strongest examples of policy-driven fear-mongering emerges when we look at the institutionalization of evaluation systems linking teacher evaluation with student performance. In 2011, Florida governor Rick Scott signed a bill linking teacher pay to student test scores (Postal, 2011). More recently, Maryland delayed implementation of a teacher evaluation that used student test scores as twenty percent of a teacher's score (Bowie, 2014). These policies create a direct link between the performance of a student on an external test and the economic safety of a teacher. Once the security of one member of the educational community of a classroom is threatened, the other members of the community are destabilized as well. In other words, it is more difficult for a teacher who does not feel supported to create a safe space or teach with confidence. With respect for the idea of measurement as a way to understand what is happening in schools, we have instead created a culture of fear.

### A2 Predictive Validity

#### 1. Reject prediction args – our Hernandez ev. says that even if tests predicted achievement perfectly, they would be doing so based on accumulated resources and a system that privileges white males – any predictive measure makes it impossible to unmask tools of oppression in the status quo and stop cycles of structural violence.

#### 2. TURN – GPA is a more reliable predictor of college performance.

Maitre 14 High school grades are a better predictor of college success than SAT, ACT, study saysMichelle Maitre covers career and college readiness. [Contact her](http://edsource.org/contact-michelle-maitre#.UwaolPRdXU4) and follow her on Twitter [@michelle\_maitre](https://twitter.com/michelle_maitre). Sign up [here](http://edsource.org/subscribe-page.html) for a no-cost online subscription to EdSource Today for reports from the largest education reporting team in California. FEBRUARY 21, 2014 TJHSSTAD

As California and other states work to define what “college and career readiness” means, a [new study](http://www.nacacnet.org/research/research-data/nacac-research/Documents/DefiningPromise.pdf) finds that a more reliable predictor of whether a student does well in college is his or her high school grades, rather than ACT or SAT scores. “One of the core messages of this study is that high school grades matter, and they matter a lot,” said principal investigator William C. Hiss, a professor and former dean of admissions at [Bates College](http://www.bates.edu/) in Lewiston, Maine. The study analyzed student and alumni records from 123,000 students in 33 colleges where SAT or ACT scores are optional for admission. The results found that a student’s performance in college closely mirrored their performance in high school: Students with strong grade point averages in high school maintained similar GPAs in college, regardless of how well or poorly they scored on college entrance exams. Likewise, students with lower GPAs – even those with high SAT or ACT scores – had lower GPAs in college and graduated at lower rates. “That surprised me,” Hiss said. “I did not expect to see the correlation was that close.” The study, published Feb. 18 on the website of the [National Association for College Admission Counseling](http://www.nacacnet.org/Pages/default.aspx), adds new fuel to [debates](http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2013/09/06/why-the-sats-shouldnt-be-a-factor-in-college-admissions) over the role of entrance exams in college admissions. Students in the study who did not submit SAT or ACT scores were more likely to be minorities, the first in their family to attend college, come from low-income families, and have learning disabilities, the study said. Standardized admissions tests can create a barrier to college for many students, Hiss said. “For economic growth and social stability, America will need to find successful paths to higher education for hundreds of thousands of additional first-generation-to-college, minority, immigrant, rural and (learning disabled) students,” Hiss wrote in a [fact sheet](http://www.nacacnet.org/media-center/PressRoom/2014/Pages/BillHiss.aspx) accompanying the study. “This study provides the research support for optional testing as at least one route by which that can happen.” The report comes as California grapples with the best way to measure how well schools are preparing students to succeed in college and careers

#### Our study o/w – the sample size of over 100k students is huge – sample size is necessary to prevent the effect of outliers

#### 3. Thirteen years of rigorous evaluation of testing as predictors for future success revealed only “moderate” associations. Predictive studies also have too many confounding variables.

Richardson 17 Chapter Title: THE PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION ARE NOT GENETIC Book Title: Genes, Brains, and Human Potential Book Subtitle: The Science and Ideology of Intelligence Book Author(s): KEN RICHARDSON Published by: Columbia University Press. (2017) Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7312/rich17842.14

Take, for example, the prediction of university performance from high school exam results. In the United States, the latter have consisted of SAT scores and more recently the Graduate Record Examination. Research has reported only small correlations, usually under 0.3, meaning that 90 percent of performance variation in higher education is not related to high school performance. A review, published in 2012, of thirteen years of previous research found only moderate average associations with university performance.14 And of course even that may be due to noncognitive attributes, such as self- confidence and self- efficacy beliefs, and other social background factors, as explained earlier.

#### **4. Grades, AP Exams, and lots of other measures can be used for predictive purposes.**

#### **Their predictive validity statistics are ahistorical, ignorant, and a misuse of statistics – this is a voting issue – they should be punished for the oppressive assumptions in their argument and for misrepresentation.**

Brown et al. 03 Chapter Title: Keeping Blacks in Their Place: Race, Education, and Testing Book Title: Whitewashing Race Book Subtitle: The Myth of a Color-Blind Society Book Author(s): Michael K. Brown, Martin Carnoy, Elliott Currie, Troy Duster, David B. Oppenheimer, Marjorie M. Shultz and David Wellman Published by: University of California Press. (2003) Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt1pn8hj.8> TJHSSTAD

But in order to make their case against public education, conservatives have to make huge leaps over stubborn facts. America is portrayed as a society in which the only remaining discrimination favors disadvantaged minorities. To do this, however, they ignore the past legacy of segregation and negative imagery of African Americans that is embedded in schools, colleges, and the labor market. Murray and Herrnstein, in The Bell Curve, and the Thernstroms, for example, claim that teenage achievement test scores, such as the SAT or achievement tests given as part of national surveys, are excellent predictors of future success. But to make this claim they have to assume that college education makes no difference to economic success. They also have to overlook the significant variability in both white and African American accomplishments across higher education institutions. These authors’ repeated misuse of empirical data is particularly troubling in this regard. It is not clear whether they really do not understand the quantitative data sufficiently or whether they misuse it intentionally because they assume their readers are statistically unsophisticated. In either case, they spin a story that appeals to stereotypes, raises the wrong questions, and provides many wrong answers.

[file:///C:/Users/avyuk/Downloads/\_%20Erevelles-2000-Educational\_Theory%20(1).pdf](file:///C:\Users\avyuk\Downloads\_%20Erevelles-2000-Educational_Theory%20(1).pdf)

Notwithstanding these staggering statistics, the deplorable plight of disabled people, even when recognized, has evinced little political interest among the general public or even critical theorists of education. For example, even though Bowles and Gintis have argued that the frequently touted relation between cognitive or technical ability and economic success masks the ideological interests of capitalism to justify social inequality along the axes of race, class, and gender, they shy away from applying similar analyses to the category of disability. On the other hand, Bowles and Gintis actually use disability to mark the limits of their theoretical claims when they state that “the standard educational practice of using IQ and test scores as a criterion for access to higher educational levels has little merit in terms of economic (not to mention educational) rationality and efficiency, except perhaps for the extremes of the IQ distribution curve.”‘h Clearly, the populations who are classified at the lower extreme of the IQ hstribution curve are disabled people, especially those with moderate to severe or multiple disabilities. But, in light of their materialist explanation of how and why ability is socially constructedin capitalist societies, Bowles and Gintis’s perfunctory dismissal of disability is contradictory, to say the least. Notwithstanding these persistent oversights, I would argue here that Bowles and Gintis’s critique of capitalist education could prove useful in extending as well as (relwriting the theoretical terrain of critical pedagogy if addressed from the standpoint of disability. In fact, I find the most persuasive aspect of their analyses to be their materialist interpretation of the concepts of intelligence or ability. If we accept intelligence or ability to be historically constituted within the structures of produc14. World Summit for SocialDevelopment, Copenhagen Declaration on SocialDeveIoprnent, 15-h. . 15. M.P. LaPlante, J. Kennedy, H.S. Kaye, and R.L.Wcnger, Disabdity and Employnient: Disability Statistics, Abstract 11 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education and National Institute of Disability and Rehabilitation Research). 16. Bowles and Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America, 9 (my emphasis). 30 EDUCATIONAL THEORY WINTER 2000 1 VOLUME SO / NUMBER 1 tion and property relations, then it would be possible to offer a similar materialist analysis for the category of (disJability and explore the implications of this analysis for the organization of social difference in U.S. public schools. For example, if we accept Bowles and Gintis’s argument that educational institutions have used the concept of intelligence/ability to legitimate racial, gendered, and class inequalities in both schools as well as society at large, then this couldimply that there is arelation between the category of disability and other categories of social difference such as race, class, gender, and sexuality. How then would a critical theory of education adapt its analyses to acknowledge this relation and what benefits could be derived from such analyses? Further, given Bowles and Gintis’s suggestion that we need to re-theorize the current alienating and exploitative relationship of the working classes and labor, what would this re-theorization look like from the standpoint of disability? More specifically, what arrangement of social and economic conditions would be supportive of an alternative theorization of labor such that the self-worth, needs, and desires of disabled people will not be dismissed, denigrated, or completely ignored?

For example, Seymour Sarason and John Doris pointed out that the first special education classes in the United States housed the urban poor, new immigrants, ~~ 52. Thomas Skrtic, Behind Special Education: A Critical Analysis of Professional Culture and School Organization (Colorado: Love Publishing House, 19911, 24. EREVELLES Pedagogy, Disability, and Schooling 43 Native Americans, and Afri~an-Americans.~~ The justification of this separation of public education into regular and special education classes was based on results of psychometric tests like Alfred Binet’s intelligence scales that supported a hereditary theory of IQ and that drew relationships between mental illness, moral degeneracy, pauperism, and race, class, and gender.54 While these eugenic policies were no longer in vogue by the late 1960s, their influence continued in American public schools such that as late as 1968, an article by L.M. Dunn indicated that nearly 60 to 80% of pupils taught in special education classes were African-American, Native American, Hispanics, non-English speakers, and children from non-middle-class backgrounds. This occurred despite the fact that the 1954 pivotal court case, Brown v. Board of Education, rendered the segregational policies of public education on the basis of race unconstitutional.5i In fact, this segregation was justified by drawing on the logic of disability to claim that these students were unable to meet the normative standards of the regular classroom. Thus, despite the legal mandate for desegregation, American public education has used the category of disability to support separate regular education and special education programs that assign students oppressively marked by race, class, and gender to lower tracks within the educational matrix that correspond to similar tracks within the larger social and economic order. In light of the situation just alluded to, it is indeed ironic that the 1975 Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) was modeled after Brown v. Board of Education, where students with disabilities were now, by legal mandate, to be integratedinto classrooms that represented the least restrictive environment. In fact, within some education circles, the passing of PL 94-142 was interpreted as a progressive move that would address the last bastion of inequality in U.S. public education and would respond effectively to the moral imperative of equal opportunity for all citizens. However, by the late 1970s, much of this optimism was tempered by new educational policy decisions that came in the wake of the perception that the U.S. economy was appearing to lose its hegemonic control of the global economy. It was in this context that another landmark education policy document, A Nation at Risk, was circulated.

Mary Futrell describes this document as the effort to serve and protect the national interest by supporting educational reform that would help the U.S. maintain “technological prowess in the service of military security, economic rejuvenation in service of reclaimed dominance within the international marketplace, the smooth social and political integration of new waves of immigrants in the service of national harmony.”56 In response to this rousing call, the new education policies implemented more tests for teachers, more credits for graduation, more hours in a school day, more pressure to enforce higher educational standards - in 53. Seymour Sarason and John Doris, Educational Handicap, Public Policy, and Sociul History: A Broadened Perspective on Mental Retardation (Ncw York: The Free Press, 1979). 54. Stephen J. Gould, The Mismeasure of Man [New York: Norton, 1981). 55. Albert P. Blaustein and Robert L. Zangrado, eds., Civil Rights and African-Americans: A Documentary History (Evanston, 111.: Northwestern University Press, 1968). 56. Mary Futrell, “Redefining National Security: New Directions for Educational Reform,” in Educational Reform: Making Sense of It All, ed. Samuel Bacharach (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1990), 260. 44 EDUCATIONAL THEORY WINTER 2000 1 VOLUME 50 1 NUMBER 1 short, more emphasis on issues of excellence as opposed to equity - with detrimental effects for students who benefited from the compensatory or inclusive programs of previous years. At the same time, these reform efforts were insturmental in resurrecting the eugenic policies of the 1920s via the controversial book The Bell Curve by Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray, which used the logic of disability to justify the persistent economic inequality faced by America’s racialized underclass. 57 Therefore, in recent years, despite the move to integrate more students with disabilities into regular classrooms, new labels, like ”at risk,” “learning disabled,” “emotionally handicapped,” and “gifted and talented” have emerged in order to continue to re-segregate children in the name of increasing standards so as to maintain a competitive edge in global markets and to ensure that the capitalist class in the United States maintains global economic dominance. Interestingly enough, the bulk of these special classes continue to be populated by students who have been marked in oppressive ways by race, class, or gender. For example, both Christine Sleeter and Barry Franklin have drawn linkages between the construction of the categories of learning disability and emotional disturbance and the continued maintenance of race, class, and gender divisions in society.58 In this way, we can see how special education through the articulation of an ideology of disability appeals to abstract notions of efficiency, rationality, and equity rooted in a seemingly open, objective, and meritocratic science in order to reproduce in abstract form the dominant class relations, divisions of labor, and cultural hegemony present in twentieth-century America.

#### **Standardized testing is rooted in a long-standing history of racism – the notion of merit-based scholarships and testing being a neutral yardstick for admissions officers is flawed because the effects of the racist structures that erected standardized testing never went away.**

Rosales The Racist Beginnings of Standardized Testing From grade school to college, students of color have suffered the effects of Biased testing. By John Rosales 2018 archives TJHSSTAD

As the U.S. absorbed millions of immigrants from Europe beginning in the 19th century, the day’s leading social scientists, many of them White Anglo-Saxon Protestants, were concerned by the infiltration of non-whites into the nation’s public schools. At the time, psychologist Carl Brigham wrote that African-Americans were on the low end of the racial, ethnic, and/or cultural spectrum. Brigham had helped to develop aptitude tests for the U.S. Army during World War I and was influential in the development of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT). At the time, he and other social scientists considered the SAT a new psychological test and a supplement to existing college board exams. In the 21st century, the SAT and the ACT (American College Testing) are part of a wide range of tests students may face before reaching college. The College Board also offers SAT II tests, designed for individual subjects ranging from biology to geography. The marathon four-hour Advanced Placement (AP) examinations—which some universities accept for students who want to opt out of introductory college-level classes—remain common: Nearly 350,000 took the U.S. history AP test in 2017, the most popular subject test offered. There’s also the PSAT (Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test) taken primarily by eleventh graders as preparation for the SAT and as an assessment for the National Merit Scholarships. Biased Testing from the Start Brigham’s Ph.D. dissertation, written in 1916, “Variable Factors in the Binet Tests,” analyzed the work of the French psychologist Alfred Binet, who developed intelligence tests as diagnostic tools to detect learning disabilities. The Stanford psychologist Lewis Terman relied on Binet’s work to produce today’s standard IQ test, the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Tests. During World War I, standardized tests helped place 1.5 million soldiers in units segregated by race and by test scores. The tests were scientific yet they remained deeply biased, according to researchers and media reports. In 1917, Terman and a group of colleagues were recruited by the American Psychological Association to help the Army develop group intelligence tests and a group intelligence scale. Army testing during World War I ignited the most rapid expansion of the school testing movement. By 1918, there were more than 100 standardized tests, developed by different researchers to measure achievement in the principal elementary and secondary school subjects. The U.S. Bureau of Education reported in 1925 that intelligence and achievement tests were increasingly used to classify students at all levels. The first SAT was administered in 1926 to more than 8,000 students, 40 percent of them female. The original test lasted 90 minutes and consisted of 315 questions focused on vocabulary and basic math. “Unlike the college boards, the SAT is designed primarily to assess aptitude for learning rather than mastery of subjects already learned,” according to Erik Jacobsen, a New Jersey writer and math-physics teacher based at Newark Academy in Livingston, N.J. “For some college officials, an aptitude test, which is presumed to measure intelligence, is appealing since at this time (1926) intelligence and ethnic origin are thought to be connected, and therefore the results of such a test could be used to limit the admissions of particularly undesirable ethnicities.” By 1930, multiple-choice tests were firmly entrenched in U.S. schools. The rapid spread of the SAT sparked debate along two lines. Some critics viewed the multiple-choice format as encouraging memorization and guessing. Others examined the content of the questions and reached the conclusion that the tests were racist. Eventually, Brigham adapted the Army test for use in college admissions, and his work began to interest interested administrators at Harvard University. Starting in 1934, Harvard adopted the SAT to select scholarship recipients at the school. Many institutions of higher learning soon followed suit. Since the beginning of standardized testing, students of color, particularly those from low-income families, have suffered the most from high-stakes testing in U.S. public schools. Decades of research demonstrate that African-American, Latino, and Native American students, as well as students from some Asian groups, experience bias from standardized tests administered from early childhood through college. Assessment By the 1950s and 1960s, top U.S. universities were talent-searching for the “brainy kids,” regardless of ethnicity, states Jerome Karabel in “The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton.” This dictum among universities to identify the brightest students as reflected by test scores did not bode well for students from communities of color, who were—as a result of widespread bias in testing—disproportionately failing state or local high school graduation exams, according to the National Center for Fair and Open Testing, also known as FairTest. The center addresses issues related to accuracy in student test taking and scoring, while working to eliminate racial, class, gender, and cultural barriers posed by standardized tests. According to Fair Test research, on average, students of color score lower on college admissions tests, thus many capable youth are denied entrance or access to so-called “merit” scholarships, contributing to the huge racial gap in college enrollments and completion. High stakes testing also causes additional damage to some students who are categorized as English language learners (ELLs). The tests are often inaccurate for ELLs, according to FairTest, leading to misplacement or retention. ELLs are, alongside students with disabilities, those least likely to pass graduation tests. African-Americans, especially males, are disproportionately placed or misplaced in special education, frequently based on test results. In effect, the use of high-stakes testing perpetuates racial inequality through the emotional and psychological power of the tests over the test takers, according to FairTest. A Flawed Science In his essay “The Racist Origins of the SAT,” Gil Troy calls Brigham a “Pilgrim-pedigreed, eugenics-blinded bigot.” Eugenics is often defined as the science of improving a human population by controlled breeding to increase the occurrence of desirable heritable characteristics. It was developed by Francis Galton as a method of improving the human race. Only after the perversion of its doctrines by the Nazis in World War II was the theory dismissed. “All-American decency and idealism coexisted uncomfortably with these scientists’ equally American racism and closemindedness,” Troy writes. Binet, Terman, and Brigham stood at the intersection of powerful intellectual, ideological, and political trends a century ago when the Age of Science and standardization began, according to Troy. “In (those) consensus-seeking times, scientists became obsessed with deviations and handicaps, both physical and intellectual,” Troy states. “And many social scientists, misapplying Charles Darwin’s evolving evolutionary science, and eugenics’ pseudo-science, worried about maintaining white purity.” Today, a reform movement is growing across the country to resist testing abuse and overuse, and to promote authentic assessment. In some communities, according to FairTest, parents, students, education support professionals, and teachers are boycotting and opting out of tests. Also, demonstrations, rallies, forums and town halls focusing on testing reform have been organized.

#### Forecasting assumes some notion of what success means, that measure of success is probably racist

<http://dailytrojan.com/2019/03/26/opinion-the-racist-roots-of-the-sat-render-it-ineffective/> - solvency advocate

A. The Economic Bias of the SAT When it comes to answering some of these SAT questions, it is fair to ask whether two students in the testing room, with completely different racial and socioeconomic backgrounds, will come up with the same right answers. The answer is obviously no when we accept the research demonstrating disparate outcomes and acknowledge the fact that the SAT was designed for the progression of white students to the detriment of black students and other students of color.71 One major factor is the fact that while SAT prep courses are available, not every family can afford them.72As Professor Richard Delgado, one of the leading critics of standardized testing, explains, “[a] further reason why SAT scores and family wealth may be correlated is that crash/prep courses, some of which cost $1200 or more, are said to boost one’s score by 150 points or more on the SAT and a comparable amount on the LSAT.”73 If the economic playing field is divided between the haves and the havenots, I believe that it is much more likely that a kid who lives in the affluent Mill Basin section of Brooklyn would take an SAT prep course. Conversely, I am not sure that a kid who lives in the economically depressed Brownsville section of Brooklyn has the same means or opportunity to take an SAT prep course.74 It is not hard to do the math here.75                                                                                                                               71 See generally Delgado, supra note 9; Fish, supra note 61. 72 Delgado, supra note 9, at 602–03. 73 Id. at 602. 74 See Todd Balf, The Story Behind the SAT Overhaul, N.Y. TIMES (March 6, 2014) http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/09/magazine/the-story-behind-the-sat-overhaul. html?\_r=0 (“An even more serious charge leveled at the test was that it put students whose families had money at a distinct advantage, because their parents could afford expensive test-prep classes and tutors”). 75 Delgado, supra note 9, at 602–03 (“Because our society has the highest level of childhood poverty in the western world, with over forty percent of black and Latino kids growing up poor it is easy to guess who gets to take Kaplan courses and attend elite prep schools that emphasize college attendance”); Claudia Buchmann, SAT Test Prep Tools Give Advantage to Students From Wealthier Families, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, (Aug. 7, 2006) http://researchnews.osu.edu/archive/satprep.htm. Standardized Testing and Race 19 VOLUME 13 • ISSUE 1 • 2014 B. A Few Sample SAT Questions The following sample questions come directly from the Official SAT Practice Test for the 2013-2014 academic year.76 In my opinion, not only are these questions skewed toward excluding minority students from higher education, I am also hard-pressed to see how the majority of these questions are even relevant to everyday life. There are those who would argue that we learn many things in school that we never use in real life. My response is that learning things that I would never use otherwise is just a waste of time. For example, sitting in trigonometry, physics, history and literature classes was just utterly pointless for me. Admittedly these subjects may be useful to a student interested in pursuing a career in any of these fields, I had little to no passion for such careers or opportunities, so was not able to engage with the material in the same way other students who liked those subjects would have. The following are sample verbal questions: 8. Favoring economy of expression in writing, the professor urged students toward a ———- rather than an ———- prose style. (A) spare . . ornate (B) terse . . opinionated (C) personal . . academic (D) baroque . . embellished (E) repetitive . . intricate77                                                                                                                               76 OFFICIAL SAT PRACTICE TEST 2013–14, available at https://satonlinecourse.college board.org/SR/digital\_assets/assessment/pdf/F4D31AB0-66B4-CE32-00F7-F5405701 F413-F.pdf. 77 Id. at 15. 20 SEATTLE JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE SEATTLE JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE 3. Since other seabirds customarily nest in colonies on ocean cliffs and islands, the marbled murrelet’s ———- nesting in forests many miles from the sea must be considered ———-. (A) ambivalence about . . hypothetical (B) indifference to . . bold (C) insistence upon . . evident (D) aversion to . . dangerous (E) predilection for . . atypical78 Unfortunately, minority students would not do well on questions like these for two very important reasons. First, minority students in poorer neighborhoods do not have the same cultural exposure as many white students where they could expand their vocabulary to include the words in these questions.79 “African-American leaders contended that the SAT verbal exam is culturally biased against the poor because the questions relate more to upper middle-class white life.”80Second, minority students in poorer neighborhoods also suffer from being enrolled in inferior schools. This too results in minority students falling further behind because they do not have the resources that white students have access to:81 This is an unfortunate fact of life because “lower-class African-American students do not receive the same quality of education as middle-class Caucasian students, and are therefore unable to be as successful on such tests as those with a higher quality of primary education.”82 When students are preparing for the verbal part of the SAT, a quick and dirty suggestion might be for them to go the Google website and look up the                                                                                                                               78 Id. at 37. 79 See, e.g., Douglas Bryant, A Level Playing Field? The NCAA’s Freshman Eligibility Standards Violate Title VI, But the Problems Can Be Solved, 32 TEX. TECH L. REV. 305, 310 (2001). 80 Id. at 310. 81 See, e.g., Laura Pentimone, The National Collegiate Athletic Association’s Quest to Educate the Student-Athlete: Are the Academic Eligibility Requirements an Attempt to Foster Academic Integrity or Merely to Promote Racism?, 14 N.Y. L. SCH. J. HUM. RTS. 471, 474 (1998). 82 Id. at 473–74. Standardized Testing and Race 21 VOLUME 13 • ISSUE 1 • 2014 meanings of the words. That is easier said than done when one considers the possibility that minority students and their parents may not have a computer at home.83 I am sure that in a few dire cases, some minority families may not be able to purchase a dictionary, let alone a computer. So, if a minority student cannot afford a prep course, private tutoring, or a computer, then his or her options are severely limited.84 C. The Cultural Bias of the SAT Whatever the reason—whether it is race, economics, or even life experience—all SAT takers are not created equal,85 and the SAT questions seemingly go out of their way to perpetuate that inequality.86 “Many test questions presuppose knowledge that is only common in middle or upper class white communities.”87 Once again, if there is a state-sanctioned examination that is based, at least in part, on the racial and socioeconomic experiences of some to the exclusion of others,88 do we really have to ask if such a test is one hundred percent neutral? The answer is an obvious no.

As Professor Delgado explains, “[o]ne study of the SAT found items requiring knowledge of golf, tennis, pirouettes, property taxes, minuets, kettle drums, tympani, polo, and horseback riding, items that are scarcely common in minority communities.”91 I think it rather unlikely that a poor minority student from the Washington Heights section of upper Manhattan danced a pirouette, played tympani in an orchestra, or rode a horse prior to taking the SAT. Asking a student from that socioeconomic background to answer questions regarding those topics and then potentially base his or her academic and professional future on his or her ability to answer those kinds of questions is beyond unfair. Again, the logical progression is this: 1) a student in that position would not have the life experience necessary to answer that question; 2) if he or she gets enough of those questions wrong, it will adversely affect his or her test score; and 3) his or her test score would probably result in rejection of his or her college application. This shows that the SAT’s proclamation that it “tests what you already know”92 is a flagrant misrepresentation; the SAT tests primarily what middle- and upper-class white students already know, not what all students already know

If that is not bad enough, what happens if a question shows up on the SAT that is actually favorable to a minority or economically disadvantaged test taker? When this has happened in the past, the SAT administrators have left those specific questions ungraded or eliminated them from future tests.93 This again raises questions about the idea that standardized testing in general, and the SAT in particular, is really race neutral.94 As explained in a piece by Dr. Ibram X. Kendi, the SAT administrators have thrown out questions in which black students performed better than white students.95 It appears to me that minority students cannot really close the gap on the SAT if the SAT administrators throw out questions that relate to their experience and culture.96 As Dr. Kendi argues, “the eliminating of the Black questions, the retaining of White questions is the heartbeat of racism in the SAT.”97 In addition to Dr. Kendi’s commentary, Dr. Roy Freedle, formerly of the Education Testing Service (ETS)( the organization that administers the SAT), gives a similar commentary regarding the SAT. He mentions that the                                                                                                                               93 Ibram X. Kendi, New Mind-Boggling Evidence Proves SAT Bias, DIVERSE ISSUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION, http://diverseeducation.com/article/49830/; Jay Rosner, The SAT: Quantifying the Unfairness Behind the Bubbles, in SAT WARS: THE CASE FOR TEST OPTIONAL COLLEGE ADMISSIONS 104–17 (Joseph A. Soares, ed. 2012) (explaining how SAT administrators select new test questions to produce the same spread of scores as existing questions create, so select questions that continue to favor higher-income white males). 94See Kendi, supra note 93 (“So, if high-scoring test-takers—who are more likely to be White (and male, and wealthy)—tend to answer the question correctly in pretesting, it’s a worthy SAT question; if not, it’s thrown out”). 95 See id. (Referring to the research conducted by Mr. Rosner, see supra note 93, Dr. Kendi explains, “[h]e found what he calls ‘Black questions,’ in which more Blacks than Whites answered correctly in the pre-testing phase. ‘But it appears that none ever make it onto a scored section of the SAT’”). 96 See id. 97 Id. 24 SEATTLE JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE SEATTLE JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE people who devise the SAT prefer to use questions that favor white students over black students.98 [W]hen a new test form is constructed by selecting items from a large number of potential test items, test assemblers routinely select only items that favor Whites over African-Americans. This is done even though one can find in the batch of potential items many examples wherein the African-Americans outperform the White students.99 If administrators continue to select questions that create the same demographic score distribution as the previously existing questions created, the SAT will continue to favor middle- and upper-class white males. Let us assume, for example, that an SAT question asks about baseball statistics and the question happens to be about Ty Cobb, a Baseball Hall-of Fame player and a virulent racist in his lifetime.100 As per the above commentaries of Dr. Kendi and Dr. Freedle, a black student might be compelled to answer that question precisely because it is on the test already. I would doubt that same student would have the same opportunity to answer a similar question about Jackie Robinson, a Baseball Hall-of-Fame player who broke the color line in 1947 with the Brooklyn Dodgers.101 Very likely, a higher percentage of                                                                                                                               98 Roy Freedle, How and Why Standardized Tests Systematically Underestimate AfricanAmericans’ True Verbal Ability and What to Do About It: Towards the Promotion of Two New Theories with Practical Applications, 80 ST. JOHN’S L. REV. 183, 193 (2006). 99 Id., citing Jay Rosner, On White Preferences, NATION, Apr. 14, 2003, at 24, 24, also available at http://www.jayrosner.com/publication-onwhitepreferences.html (last visited Aug. 31, 2014). 100 Top 10 Tarnished Baseball Reputations, REAL CLEAR SPORTS (May 17, 2013), http://www.realclearsports.com/lists/top\_10\_tarnished\_baseball\_reputations/ty\_cobb\_tarn ished.html?state=stop (“Cobb was also openly racist, once having stabbed a black night watchman, who intervened after Cobb had slapped a black elevator operator for ‘being uppity’”); see also Bill Pennington, Hall of Fame Has Always Made Room for Infamy, N.Y. TIMES (Jan. 8, 2013), http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/09/sports/baseball/baseballhall-of-fame-has-always-made-room-for-infamy.html?\_r=2& (“Known as the Georgia Peach, he was often painted a racist and had numerous documented altercations with African-Americans off the field, including one that led to a charge of attempted murder”). 101 Jackie Robinson Biography, Biography.com, http://www.biography.com/ people/ Standardized Testing and Race 25 VOLUME 13 • ISSUE 1 • 2014 black students would be familiar with Jackie Robinson than with Ty Cobb so their scores on a new test question about Jackie Robinson would likely exceed their scores on a preexisting question about Ty Cobb. In the book SAT Wars, Jay Rosner, Executive Director of the Princeton Review Foundation and noted testing expert, gives an example of such a question being eliminated from the SAT:102 The actor’s bearing on stage seemed\_\_\_\_\_\_; her movements were natural and her technique \_\_\_\_\_\_.103 a) unremitting…blase b) fluid…tentative c) unstudied…uncontrived d) eclectic…uniform e) grandiose…controlled The correct answer is C.104 Interestingly, Rosner identifies this question as a “black question”, meaning that 8 percent more black respondents than whites answered this question correctly 105 Yet, this question never made it onto a scored section of the SAT.106 Once again, there are test questions where black students actually outperform white students, but these questions are absent from the SAT.107 Therefore, taking the assertions of Mr. Rosner, Dr. Freedle, and Dr. Kendi at face value, a similar question about Jackie Robinson’s                                                                                                                               jackie-robinson-9460813 (last visited Sept. 6, 2014). 102 Rosner, supra note 93, at 113. 103 Id. at 114. 104 Id. 105 Id.. 106 Id. 107 Id. (“So, Black questions do exist, but it appears none ever make it onto a scored section of the SAT. Black students may encounter black questions, but only on an unscored section of the SAT.”). 26 SEATTLE JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE SEATTLE JOURNAL FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE accomplishments would probably never see the light of day on the SAT.108 This sleight of hand confirms the reality that the SAT is anything but race neutral if it continues to systematically eliminate questions that seemingly favor minority test takers.109 Finally, it appears that the ETS in recent years has made very little information available. As Rosner noted: “ETS should be required to make item data available to anyone who requests it, at fees that were applicable at the time ($500 per test) when the data was last available to the public (up until about 2002).”110 Consequently, there is very little information available that would confirm whether in recent years this practice is still in force. Rosner also observed: “The publicly available data on rejected SAT questions are limited to partial data on about a dozen questions given by ETS to a few reporters, so no study of rejected questions is possible.”111 In my view, the dearth of recent information along with ETS’s seeming reluctance to provide additional information can lead one to question, even in 2014, whether their exam questions are in fact race neutral.

<https://gadflyonthewallblog.com/2016/10/26/standardizing-whiteness-the-essential-racism-of-standardized-testing/>

With them you can give rich and middle class whites every advantage while withholding the same from students of color. And we don’t call it racism or classism because we pretend the whites earned their privileges by their test scores.

“We are using the testocracy as a proxy for privilege,” said civil rights theorist [Lanni Guinier](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lani_Guinier). Test scores are the excuse for [prejudicial and unjust practices that would be impossible without them.](http://www.commondreams.org/views/2012/03/13/occupy-education-debates-gates-foundation-and-wins)

For instance, if you really wanted to help someone who’s struggling, you might offer extra help. But low test scores are used as the reason for withholding that help. [We actually use these invalid scores as a means of demeaning and firing poor black kids’ teachers](https://dianeravitch.net/2014/05/20/just-how-meaningful-are-those-value-added-ratings/) – as if anything they could do [could completely overcome biased assessments and poverty](http://r.search.yahoo.com/_ylt=A0LEVidkChFYmiEAJhcnnIlQ;_ylu=X3oDMTE0MTJtMWwwBGNvbG8DYmYxBHBvcwMxBHZ0aWQDRkZVSTNDMV8xBHNlYwNzcg--/RV=2/RE=1477540581/RO=10/RU=http%3a%2f%2fnepc.colorado.edu%2ffiles%2fPB-Berliner-NON-SCHOOL.pdf/RK=0/RS=VhM9yGyES4YHYDj2aidgRDRI9VU-). In this way, we not only remove those already in place to help these kids, we ensure few people will volunteer to take their place.

And [when you have a teacher shortage](http://curmudgucation.blogspot.com/2016/09/new-report-on-teacher-shortage.html) in these poor urban neighborhoods, you can use that to justify further deprivations. Instead of teachers with 4-year education degrees, you can hire lightly trained [Teach for America temps](https://gadflyonthewallblog.wordpress.com/2015/03/14/teach-for-america-what-a-stupid-idea-or-is-it/) – college grads who’ve taken no coursework in education beyond a six weeks cram session.

And if the parents of these children complain, you can [open charter schools to pull a quick bait and switch](https://gadflyonthewallblog.wordpress.com/2016/07/30/no-new-charter-schools-naacp-draws-line-in-the-sand/). Make them [feel like they have a choice](https://gadflyonthewallblog.wordpress.com/2016/06/01/the-charter-school-swindle-selling-segregation-to-blacks-and-latinos/) when really you’re pulling the rug out from under them. You provide them with a school with none of the safeguards of a traditional public institution – no elected school board, no transparency on how tax dollars are spent, little oversight, a right to refuse any student they wish, etc. And when the school goes belly up, these kids will be pushed back to their former traditional public school that has had to make due with less funding and now can provide even fewer  services than it could before students jumped ship.

Using standardized test scores to judge not just students but whole schools, you can destabilize the entire system of public education. Charter schools and traditional public schools fight over ever-dwindling funding, one required to prove everything it does, the other able to do whatever it wants until it closes with little to no consequences for charter operators who take the money and run.

The US Supreme Court ruled in Brown vs Board that we can’t have “separate but equal” schools because when they’re separate, they’re rarely equal. But somehow that doesn’t apply to charter schools.

Somehow [we’ve stopped caring about integration](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2013/08/29/report-public-schools-more-segregated-now-than-40-years-ago/) – one of the central victories of the Civil Rights movement! This [plays right into the hands of the corporate education reformers](https://gadflyonthewallblog.wordpress.com/2016/09/01/whats-more-important-fighting-school-segregation-or-protecting-charter-school-profits/). They have done everything they can to increase segregation because it makes it so much easier to privilege rich white kids and crush poor black ones.

They don’t want an equal mix of black and white, rich and poor in our schools. That would make it much harder to select against one class of student while boosting another.

They need to keep the races and classes as separate as possible. Charter schools help in this regard, but they would be insufficient without the help from [many white families who flee from these “other” darker complected kids](http://www.slate.com/articles/life/education/2016/07/when_white_parents_have_a_choice_they_choose_segregated_schools.html). It’s just another way to send more funding to white kids and less to poor black kids. [They say it’s based on local property taxes. That way they can pretend it’s all fair and above board](https://gadflyonthewallblog.wordpress.com/2015/07/09/do-americans-throw-money-at-their-schools-a-fair-funding-primer/). Rich folks have a right to be able to give their kids the best, and if poor folks can’t afford to do the same, who do you expect to pick up the tab?

### A2 rich ppl game the system

#### 1. Tutoring helps privileged students.

Buchmann et al. 10 Claudia Buchmann, Dennis J. Condron, Vincent J. Roscingo, 2010, “Shadow Education, American Style: Test Preparation, the SAT and College Enrollment,” Social Forces, 89(2), pp. 435-461, doi:10.1353/sof.2010.0105 SJBE

Next we turn to the question of whether exam preparation activities influence SAT scores. The analyses presented in Table 3 use generalized least squares regression to generate estimates and standard errors that account for the clustered NELS sample design. The first model includes family income and parental education, race/ethnicity, and all controls that had a significant effect on the odds of test prep in earlier analyses. Model 1 reveals large and significant disparities in SAT scores by family income and parental education. Asians score about 35 points higher than whites, while blacks score about 40 points lower than whites. Scores of other minority groups do not differ significantly from those of whites. Females score about 37 points lower than their male counterparts. These findings pertaining to social class, race and gender are generally consistent with those of past research (Grodsky et al. 2008; Kobrin, Sathy and Shaw 2007; Jencks and Phillips 1998). Not surprisingly, prior achievement has a strong positive impact on SAT scores. Few of the other controls for selection into test prep matter, although the regional disparities are large, with test-takers from all other regions scoring significantly lower than those from the Northeast. Models 2 and 3 introduce highest-level test preparation, in order to assess its direct impact on SAT scores as well as the extent to which it may mediate family income and parental education effects already established in Model 1. As the coefficient in Model 2 indicates, test-takers gain about 10 points on the SAT by utilizing the next-highest level of test preparation. To delineate more precisely how different types of test prep are related to SAT scores, Model 3 replaces the ordinal measure with the more interpretable categorical coding. Using books, videos or computer software with no other type of prep does not significantly boost SAT scores (although the effect is positive). The other three forms of test preparation bolster SAT scores. Compared to using no prep, taking a high-school course produces a gain of about 26 points. Taking a private/commercial course boosts scores by about 30 points and a private tutor increases scores by about 37 points.

#### 2. no impact – rich ppl will game the system either way – legacy, lobbying for admissions, etc. – all their args just prove its non-unique

## A2 Util

### Framing vs Util

#### 1] Epistemology comes first – our biases shape how we calculate future value which means predictions are implicated by our positionality.

#### 2] Util is eugenicist – the logic of maximizing well-being entails sacrificing those deemed less fit and productive in contributing to the greater good – means you should reject it.

### Util Dump

#### Consequentialism fails –

#### 1] consequences are external to the subject, so they can’t be morally culpable for them – ethics needs to assign blame because the whole point of ethics is to tell people what to do

#### 2] every consequence leads to infinitely more consequences which causes infinite regress – means even if util is true it’s impossible to use

#### 3] the universe is infinitely expanding which means there’s infinite pain and pleasure in the world – means adding any unit of happiness doesn’t make a dent

#### 4] consequentialism has a majority over minority mindset which justifies things like slavery or genocide and is morally repugnant – independent reason to drop them because they make debate unsafe and inaccessible

#### 5] pain and pleasure are completely subjective and impossible to measure, which means util can’t guide action

### A2 Parameters

#### 1] Prefer substantive justifications on the FW debate – they need to proactively prove my framing is bad, not just that their framing is good.

#### 2] TURN – Util harms small school debaters who don’t have access to lots of prep or coaches like big schools such as Harvard Westlake.

#### 3] TURN – theoretical justifications for util decimate phil ed which o/w everything because it’s the reason ld debate exists.

#### 4] TURN – policy lit will always be objectively skewed towards one side, which means one side will always have an advantage under util. Debating means based frameworks is better because no side is objectively true.

#### 5] TURN – our framing is better for topic lit – most authors talk about tests in the context of their eugenicist foundations and purpose as a tool of segregation, not how removing them might lead to extinction.

### A2 Extinction Framing

#### 1. Their extinction rhetoric is a tool of eugenics, justifying weeding out certain individuals in order to save future popular

#### **Extinction rhetoric is used to justify the racial eugenics movement, weeding out those deemed unfit in order to create a more competitive United States fortified from existential threat. The transition to a standardized school system is merely a byproduct of fearful rhetoric.**

Gatto 2k taught for 30 years, was named New York teacher of the year, and did graduate studies at Berkley and Cornell, 2000 John “The Under Ground History of American Education” pgs 181-183 TJHSSTAD

* Extinction rhetoric based in fear of failure that is used to justify eugenics – government says we need to start identifying the fittest students to select and give opportunities too, don’t care about those deemed unfit because they won’t help prevent extinction
* Papers over structural inequalities to marginalized folk – those deemed unfit are minorities, low-income, etc. – seen as useless in preventing existential threats, justifies racism against them

Francis Amasa Walker, president of M.I.T., first declared in 1891 what was soon to become an upperclass mantra: Anglo-Saxons were quietly committing "racial suicide." The insult of competing with Latin/Slav/Celtic folkways seemingly discouraged reproduction among families of the old stock. After that bombshell, an orchestrated campaign of scientific racism swept the United States and didn’t flag in public energy for forty long years. Racial suicide was the Red Scare, Fifth Column, and AIDS epidemic of its day all rolled into one. In the long history of manufactured crises, it ranks up there with the Reichstag fire, Pearl Harbor, the Gulf of Tonkin, the gasoline shortage of 1973, the Asian economic miracle, and corporate downsizing as a prime example of modern psychological management of public opinion. The racial suicide theme sounded at exactly the moment public schooling was transforming itself into forced government schooling. The American campaign against racial suicide enlisted great scientists of the day to produce a full library of books, scientific journal articles, popular magazine pieces, legislation, lectures, and indirect school curricula. It caught the attention of the entire civilized world, including Imperial Germany and Imperial Japan. Both sent official study delegations to America to observe the resourcefulness of this new industrial utopia in purging itself of its original democratic character. It is as if there exists some tacit understanding on the part of mainstream scholarship and journalism to steer clear of the shoals of this period, but even an amateur like myself finds enough to indicate that racial suicide provided a leading motive to justify the radical shift of American society toward well-schooled orthodoxy. What is intriguing in light of the relative amnesia concerning these connections is the sheer quantity of the damning data. Genetic experimentation, once teased from its hiding holes, is revealed as a master political project of the twentieth century with the United States, Germany, and England its enthusiastic sponsors. Data gathered in school surveys and social experimentation with children have been important sources of grist for this initiative. M.I.T.’s Walker got an intellectual boost from activities of the influential American sociologist Edward A. Ross, who explained to the American Academy of Political and Social Science exactly how unchecked Asiatic immigration would lead to the extinction of the American people. Higher races, he said, will not endure competition from lower ones. After that, even Teddy Roosevelt was issuing marching orders to Anglo-Saxon mothers, asking well-bred ladies to mobilize their loins in an effort to arrest the suicidal decline. Breed as if the race depended on it, said Roosevelt. Eugenics had openly become national politics for the first time in America, but hardly the last. Harper’s Weekly chastised Roosevelt, saying mere exhortation would have no effect as long as immigration continued to reduce the native birthrate by insulting our best breeders. From 1905 to 1909 at least one major popular magazine article on the subject appeared every single month. Books warned that race suicide would "toll the passing of this great Anglo-Teuton people," giving the nation over to Latins, Slavs, or worse, Jews and other Asiatics. Meanwhile, the long-ignored genetic work of monk Gregor Mendel was conveniently rediscovered, adding more fuel to the fires of racial thinking. Here, presumably, a humble man of God showed mathematically that something caused transmission of characteristics from generation to generation, independent of any effect of nurture or education. Horse, dog, and rose breeders had empirically derived these insights a thousand years before Mendel, but credit passed to science for the "discovery." Into the center of this racial excitement strode the formidable figure of Sir Francis Galton, first cousin of Charles Darwin, in line of descent from Malthus,1 possessor of incredible intellectual ability and indefatigable energy, a man of great personal wealth, a knight of the realm. Galton preached improvement of the human breed with evangelical fervor, demanding a policy of biological positivism which would produce the same genetic dividends that were being reaped by positivism in the hard sciences of chemistry and physics. The "eugenics movement," as it was now called, would save us socially by manipulating the best to breed (positive eugenics) and encouraging the worst to die out (negative eugenics). School would have a major role to play in this. Race-improvement was in the air, its method compounded out of state action and forced schooling. Galton’s inspiration and plenty of American money—much of it Andrew Carnegie’s and Mrs. Averill Harriman’s—opened the first racial science laboratory in the world in Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island, in 1904. And kept it open for thirty-five years, until Hitler’s invasion of Poland made discretion seem the wiser part of zealotry for the moment at the Carnegie Corporation. In 1939, it was quietly shut down. The last president at the Cold Spring Harbor facility was M.I.T. president Vannevar Bush, often called "The Father of the Atomic Bomb." Eugenic thinking injected energy into the exploding "mental hygiene" movement, too. Word went out to the recently erected national network of hospitals that it was okay to begin sterilizing mental defectives. This green light came complete with legislative licenses to decide who those defectives were—and freedom from any legal jeopardy. A scholarly book from M.I.T. created intellectual havoc in the year 1899 and long afterwards, lending maximum credibility to the eugenicist agenda. The Races of Europe was written by brilliant economist William Z. Ripley; it armed the racial-suicide crowd and its companion group of enthusiasts, the racialscience crowd, with information that Europe was divided into three races, easily distinguishable from one another by physical measurements. First, a race of blonde long heads (the Teutons); second, a central race of stocky round heads (the Alpines); and third, a southern race of slender, dark long heads (the Mediterraneans). Here, finally, was a way to distinguish reliably among the qualities of old immigration and new! Ripley took the 28-year-old Darwinian concept of "reversion" and charged it with new energy. Was it possible, Ripley asked, that promiscuous breeding of Nordic peoples with Southern Europeans could doom the New England Anglo-Nordic stock? Incipient race suicide could be dealt with only by legislation. Education should be employed to raise the current immigrant’s "standard of morality," making him more tolerable to society. That would help. But nothing could be done about reversion. Subspecies of men could not be allowed to couple with 100 percent American female breeding stock. All the pieces were now in position for full-scale national hysteria to commence, an era of sanctions buttressed by the authority of peerless scientific experts. American society would require harsh discipline after the Prussian fashion in order to meet this challenge. Thanks to men like Ripley, the experts could apply such discipline with an exalted sense of mathematical righteousness. The first requirement would be to force the dangerous classes into schools. Laws were on the books, time to enforce them. A covert American sterilization program managed by trusted administrators in the brand new hospital network took place during the same years that forced schooling was being brought along. This sterilization initiative occasionally broke silence in highly specialized journals whose reader discretion was taken for granted. Thus Charles V. Carrington, writing in the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science (July 1910), reported on two interesting cases of successful involuntary sterilization. One involved an "epileptic masturbator" who, after vasectomy, "ceased masturbating altogether." The other was a black man also given to masturbation and general deviltry. After sterilization, he became "a strong, well-developed young Negro, nicely behaved, and not a masturbatory sodomist," Carrington reported. Surgical intervention as social policy was given its precedents in America long before the Nazi era. Advocates of Yaleman Gesell’s "eugenic violence" offensive against the underclasses swung from every point on the scientific compass. William McDougall, the eminent social psychologist, announced himself a champion of Nordic superiority; Ellsworth Huntington, prominent Yale geographer, wrote The Character of Races, showing that only one race had any real moral character. Henry Fairfield Osborn, president and founder of the American Museum of Natural History, gave the "Address of Welcome" to the Second International Congress of Eugenics; Osborn’s close friend Lothrop Stoddard wrote The Revolt Against Civilization: Menace of the Underman; and psychologist James McKeen Cattell, a force in the rise of standardized testing, wrote to Galton, "We are following in America your advice and example." The famous humanitarian anthropologist Alfred L. Kroeber remarked acidly to a newsman that antieugenic protests came only from the "orthodoxly religious," rarely from the enlightened camp of science. So there it was. Keep them all in mind: Kroeber, Gesell, Ripley, McDougall, Huntington, Osborn, great scientific humanist names whose work underscored how important a role forced schooling was designed to play. Scientific studies had shown conclusively that extending the duration and intensity of schooling caused sharp declines in fertility—and sterility in many. Part of school’s stealth curriculum would be a steady expansion of its reach throughout the century. Two more examples will drive home the relentlessness of this long scientific campaign against American tradition. J.B.S. Haldane, a distinguished Fabian geneticist from England, issued a lurid warning about what might happen if blonde women bred with human demi-apes like Italians, Jews, and other kinds of retrograde biology: "A new type of submen, abhorred by nature, ugly as no natural product is ugly" would emerge. The new hypothesis held that female offspring of such unions would be too repulsive to look upon. In Daedalus, or Science and the Future, Haldane said there were really only four fundamental biological innovations of prehistory: 1) Domestication of animals; 2) Domestication of plants; 3) The use of fungi for the production of alcohol; 4) The invention of frontal copulation "which altered the path of sexual selection, focused the attention of man as a lover upon woman’s face and breasts, and changed our ideal of beauty from the steatopygous Hottentot to the modern European, from the Venus of Brassenpouy to the Venus of Milo." All evolution might be in jeopardy if there were no more pretty faces to look at, this was the thesis. Today, there is an aura of the absurd to these assertions, but it would be well to reflect on the institutional world that emerged from the other end of this same forge, for it is the new moral world you and I live in, a fully scientized and organized society, managed by the best people—people who prefer to remain out of sight of the hoi polloi, segregated in their own in walled villages and other redoubts.

### Anderson

#### Their appeal to util makes debate unsafe, since the logic of “the end justifies the means” can justify *any* reprehensible action – this is a reason to drop them

Anderson: Anderson, Kerby. [National Director of Probe Ministries International] “Utilitarianism: The Greatest Good for the Greatest Number.” Probe, 2004. RP

One problem with utilitarianism is that its leads to an ‘end justifies the means’ mentality. If any worthwhile end can justify the means to attain it, a true ethical foundation is lost. But we all know that the end does not justify the means. If that were so, then Hitler could justify the Holocaust because the end was to purify the human race. Stalin could justify his slaughter of millions because he was trying to achieve a communist utopia. The end never justifies the means. The means must justify themselves. A particular act cannot be judged as good simply because it may lead to a good consequence. The means must be judged by some objective and consistent standard of morality. Second, utilitarianism cannot protect the rights of minorities if the goal is the greatest good for the greatest number. Americans in the eighteenth century could justify slavery on the basis that it provided a good consequence for a majority of Americans. Certainly the majority benefited from cheap slave labor even though the lives of black slaves were much worse. A third problem with utilitarianism is predicting the consequences. If morality is based on results, then we would have to have omniscience in order to accurately predict the consequence of any action. But at best we can only guess at the future, and often these educated guesses are wrong. A fourth problem with utilitarianism is that consequences themselves must be judged. When results occur, we must still ask whether they are good or bad … provides no objective and consistent foundation to judge results because results are the mechanism used to judge the action itself. Inviolability is intrinsically valuable

## A2 LARP

### 1AR – Exceptions Trick

#### **Colleges make exceptions for homeschool, specialty program, and international applicants – its normal means.**

Hiss et al. 18 DEFINING ACCESS: How Test-Optional Works Co-Authors: Steven T. Syverson, Valerie W. Franks, William C. Hiss To be hosted electronically by the National Association for College Admission Counseling 2018 TJHSSTAD

What did TOP deans say about their experience with the policy? At the start of the study, we interviewed each participating Dean of Admission about their experience with TOP. Then, we reviewed their comments in light of the data submission, which was subject to a thorough analysis. Pulling apart some of these unique findings from each institution enabled us to see patterns in similar experiences. • The motivations cited for adopting a test-optional policy were fairly consistent across the institutions in the study, relating primarily to improving the access of underserved students: o “TOP arose from the decision to pursue access to higher education among underrepresented groups.” o “It was important to our commitment to access, in particular to First-Generation students and students from under-resourced schools. Also felt it might help us reach students who might previously not have considered.” • The adoption of the policy was also described as way to simply formalize what they had been doing in practice all along. “We never weighted testing heavily – always weighted classroom performance more heavily” or another institution “We always pitched that the scores were not given much weight.” • While the policies varied in terms of specifics, most employed an Optional for All policy with a few exceptions, for example, requiring test scores from international students, homeschooled students, or students applying to specialty programs. Some had started with an Academic Threshold or Optional Plus policy, and then migrated to the more open variation of the policy, Optional for All, indicating an increased comfort level with making sound admission decisions without testing..

#### Colleges make exceptions for homeschooled students – its normal means:

Jaschik 8/5 3 More Colleges Go Test Optional Dominican of California, Xavier of Ohio and University of New Haven are latest to make the move. By [Scott Jaschik](https://www.insidehighered.com/users/scott-jaschik) August 5, 2019

Three more colleges -- Dominican University of California, Xavier University of Ohio and the University of New Haven -- have gone test optional. [Dominican](https://home.dominican.edu/test-optional/) said its policy would not apply to nursing, homeschooled or international students. For the others, “We believe that a student’s overall high school academic record is the best indicator of a student’s future college success,” said Vickie Alleman, vice president for enrollment and marketing. [Xavier](https://www.xavier.edu/undergraduate-admission/admission-process/test-optional) made similar arguments. "Every application submitted to Xavier receives a holistic review. This means every piece of your application is reviewed and considered in order to make a decision. One single item does not determine your admissibility, and a test-optional policy allows students to demonstrate their abilities in other ways. Further, our research has shown that high school performance, especially in rigorous course work, is the best indicator of potential to succeed at Xavier," said a statement. Athletes, homeschooled, nursing and some honors students may not use the test-optional policy at Xavier. The [University of New Haven](http://www.newhaven.edu/admissions/undergraduate/the-application-process/first-year-student-application-process/test-optional.php), which has similar rules about who can't apply without an SAT or ACT score, explained its new policy in this statement: "The University of New Haven does not require students interested in most of our academic programs to submit SAT/ACT scores. As a student-first institution that deeply cares for education to be both personal and pragmatic, the University of New Haven strives to empower students to achieve excellence and success. By having a test-optional policy, we want students to determine if their SAT/ACT scores are an accurate representation of their academic ability. If they feel that their SAT/ACT scores are not, they will not be penalized during admission review if they do not submit test scores."

### 1AR – Consider vs Use Trick

#### Consider is distinct from use.

Lawless 18

(Joseph, Columbia, MA Education@UNLV, Prosecutorial Misconduct: Law, Procedure, Forms, ed. 4, LexisNexis)

The term "consider" is defined as "to think carefully about, esp[ecially] in order to make a decision; contemplate; reflect on." Random House Webster's Unabridged Dictionary 434 (2d ed.1998). Conversely, the verb "use" is defined as "to employ for some purpose; put into service; make use of." Id. at 2097; see also Black's Law Dictionary 1541 (6th ed. 1990) ("To make use of; to convert to one's service; to employ; to avail oneself of; to carry out a purpose or action by means of; put into action or service; especially to attain an end.") (emphasis added). As employed in the regulation at issue, these two words have wholly divergent meaning: The Tax Commissioner is required to "consider" the various approaches to valuation by contemplating the feasibility of utilizing each of the ascribed methods. On the other hand, these methods are to be "used" or actually employed only where "applicable."

#### Means that “Ought not consider” implies colleges place less weight on tests, not that they completely remove tests. Implies …

### 1AR – State Mandated Trick

#### Standardized tests are state mandated

Reddy 18 (Chitra, English@Hyderabad, 3-14, <https://content.wisestep.com/advantages-disadvantages-standardized-tests/)>

But, What Do We Mean By The Term ‘Standardized Tests’? These tests are a special type of tests that are widely practiced in the United States along with many countries in the world. It is a state mandated examination which all of the students must take on a global platform. They are mainly designed to assess the performance of the students in an assortment of subjects like English, Maths, and Biology and so on. The intensity of the questions and the pattern of the question paper will be uniform throughout the world and only the language in which the exam is conducted varies. Thus, the pressure of examination will be obviously higher amidst the parents, teachers and the students as the exam is answered on a global level. So, the efficiency of this type of program has become a highly controversial topic in today’s education field. Let us now take a look at the demerits and benefits of standardized testing that are involved.

#### SAT, ACT, AP Exams, etc. are not state mandated – students choose to take them – means …

### 1AR – GPA Good

#### TURN – GPA is a more reliable predictor of college performance.

Maitre 14 High school grades are a better predictor of college success than SAT, ACT, study saysMichelle Maitre covers career and college readiness. [Contact her](http://edsource.org/contact-michelle-maitre#.UwaolPRdXU4) and follow her on Twitter [@michelle\_maitre](https://twitter.com/michelle_maitre). Sign up [here](http://edsource.org/subscribe-page.html) for a no-cost online subscription to EdSource Today for reports from the largest education reporting team in California. FEBRUARY 21, 2014 TJHSSTAD

As California and other states work to define what “college and career readiness” means, a [new study](http://www.nacacnet.org/research/research-data/nacac-research/Documents/DefiningPromise.pdf) finds that a more reliable predictor of whether a student does well in college is his or her high school grades, rather than ACT or SAT scores. “One of the core messages of this study is that high school grades matter, and they matter a lot,” said principal investigator William C. Hiss, a professor and former dean of admissions at [Bates College](http://www.bates.edu/) in Lewiston, Maine. The study analyzed student and alumni records from 123,000 students in 33 colleges where SAT or ACT scores are optional for admission. The results found that a student’s performance in college closely mirrored their performance in high school: Students with strong grade point averages in high school maintained similar GPAs in college, regardless of how well or poorly they scored on college entrance exams. Likewise, students with lower GPAs – even those with high SAT or ACT scores – had lower GPAs in college and graduated at lower rates. “That surprised me,” Hiss said. “I did not expect to see the correlation was that close.” The study, published Feb. 18 on the website of the [National Association for College Admission Counseling](http://www.nacacnet.org/Pages/default.aspx), adds new fuel to [debates](http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2013/09/06/why-the-sats-shouldnt-be-a-factor-in-college-admissions) over the role of entrance exams in college admissions. Students in the study who did not submit SAT or ACT scores were more likely to be minorities, the first in their family to attend college, come from low-income families, and have learning disabilities, the study said. Standardized admissions tests can create a barrier to college for many students, Hiss said. “For economic growth and social stability, America will need to find successful paths to higher education for hundreds of thousands of additional first-generation-to-college, minority, immigrant, rural and (learning disabled) students,” Hiss wrote in a [fact sheet](http://www.nacacnet.org/media-center/PressRoom/2014/Pages/BillHiss.aspx) accompanying the study. “This study provides the research support for optional testing as at least one route by which that can happen.” The report comes as California grapples with the best way to measure how well schools are preparing students to succeed in college and careers

#### Our study o/w on sample size – it’s across a huge number of students and colleges and over multiple decades – that’s necessary to mitigate the effect of outliers.

Allensworth and Clark 18 Are GPAs an Inconsistent Measure of College Readiness across High Schools? Examining Assumptions about Grades versus Standardized Test Scores Elaine M. Allensworth and Kallie Clark University of Chicago Consortium on School Research 1313 East 60th Street Chicago, IL 60637 Revised January 27, 2019 Initially Posted April 2018

Model 2 in Table 2 shows the results from a model where HSGPA is entered as a continuous variable along with a squared term, instead of discrete bins. The linear component shows that for every standard deviation increase in HSGPA, the odds of graduating from college double (odds coefficient = 2.02) at the point where the quadratic term is zero (which is at the sample average). The quadratic term is positive, so the relationship is larger among students with the highest levels of achievement, and lower among students with low HSGPAs. The school variance component for the intercept from this model (0.603) is slightly higher than those in the binned model (where variance components ranged from 0.501 to 0.575), and represents the variance in school effects averaged across students of all achievement levels. Not only is the school-level variance component large (0.603), it is larger when HSGPAs are included in the Are GPAs an Inconsistent Measure across High Schools? 16 model than in a model that only includes control variables (0.447, not shown in table). This pattern is consistent with the “frogpond” effects discussed earlier, wherein HSGPAs are suppressed at high schools with more positive school effects. About one-fourth of the schoollevel variation in Model 2 ((0.603-0.447)/0.603 = 26%) is “extra” variation that is induced by comparing students with similar HSGPAs. The model displayed in Table 2 also allows the slope of the relationship between HSGPA and college graduation to vary by high school. The strong linear trend (coefficient of 0.703), does not vary significantly by high school. The quadratic term (coefficient of 0.062) does vary slightly across schools (0.103). The noise that is introduced by variation in the linear and quadratic components is small relative to the signal from the linear slope (0.703), so the overall slope of the relationship is fairly similar across schools. The gray lines in the left panel of Figure 2 show the relationship of HSGPA with college graduation for each high school, estimated from the coefficients and variance components from Model 2. The considerable variation in college graduation rates by high school for students with the same HSGPA is clearly visible. At the same time, the relationship between HSGPA and college graduation has a similar slope, and is large and positive, across high schools. Table 3 shows the results of models that mirror those in Table 2, substituting ACT scores for HSGPAs. Differences in college graduation rates by ACT score are more modest than by HSGPA, particularly after controlling for student background and college characteristics, but show a sizable range—from odds of 0.39 to 1.98 in the conditional model (graduation rates of 28 to 66 percent). School-level variance is smaller among students with the same ACT score than among students with the same HSGPA. Still, there is considerable variation in college graduation rates by high school among students with the same ACT score (0.265 to 0.343). For students Are GPAs an Inconsistent Measure across High Schools? 17 with an ACT score of 16-17, for example, a two-standard deviation range in the log-odds of graduating is -0.387 ± 0.343. Students with an ACT score of 16-17 in a school with large positive effects (one standard deviation above the mean) would graduate at a rate that similar to students with scores of 20-21 in a more typical school. Thus, students with the same qualifications, defined by either their HSGPA or their ACT score, graduate at different rates based upon which high school they attend. Model 2 in Table 3 shows the relationship of ACT scores with college graduation modeled with continuous linear and quadratic terms. The standardized linear term is much smaller than that of standardized HSGPA scores (0.129 vs. 0.703), with the odds of graduating increasing by 14 percent (odds coefficient of 1.14) for every standard deviation increase in ACT scores when the quadratic term equals zero. There is a negative quadratic term, so the relationship is larger among students with low achievement, small among students with high achievement, and becomes negative among students with the highest achievement. The variance components show that the linear component of the slope varies significantly, and the variance in the slopes (0.192) is larger than the average slope (0.129). Thus, the noise introduced by school effects is larger than the signal from ACT scores. Where students attend high school says more about whether they are likely to graduate from college than their individual ACT score, at least among students with average or high ACT scores. ACT scores also provide less accurate predictions of college success based on students’ race, ethnicity, and gender than HSGPAs. The subgroup differences in college graduation rates are significantly different from zero for Asian and male students in the models that control for ACT scores, but the demographic coefficients are not significantly different from zero in the models that control for HSGPAs. ACT scores explain only a little of the school-level variance in Are GPAs an Inconsistent Measure across High Schools? 18 college graduation rates; the variance component on average school effects (0.411) is similar to a model with the same control variables but no ACT scores (0.446). However, they do not induce more school-level variance, as was seen with HSGPAs. The right panel of Figure 1 shows the relationships from Models 2 and 3, modeled as percentages. The dark line shows the averages from the bins in Model 2, while the gray lines show the relationship for each school, calculated from the coefficients and variance components in Model 2. The dark line is not at the center of the gray lines because most of the students with high ACT scores are concentrated in schools with high average college graduation rates, while students with very low ACT scores are concentrated at schools with low average college graduation rates. Many schools do not have students with very high ACT scores, and a number of other schools do not have students with very low ACT scores, so few of the lines go the full range of the horizontal axis. The figure shows how the relationship of students’ individual ACT scores with college graduation is small relative to the variation in. In Table 4, ACT scores and HSGPAs are included together in the models. The main HSGPA coefficient does not change substantially relative to the model without ACT scores in Table 2 (0.708 vs 0.703), but the main ACT coefficient shrinks considerably from the model without HSGPA (from 0.129 to a nonsignificant -0.016). Because the ACT score contributes little to the prediction, there is a similar amount of school-level variance in the combined model (0.622) as the model that includes HSGPA alone (0.603, from Table 1). ACT scores used at the individual student level do not reduce the variability by high school in predicting who will graduate college. The slope of the relationship of ACT scores with college graduation still varies significantly based on high school (0.213); in schools a standard deviation below the mean the linear slope is negative (-0.016 - .213, or -0.219) and in others it is positive (-0.016 + 0.213 or Are GPAs an Inconsistent Measure across High Schools? 19 0.197). In the next model, the variables are group-mean centered so that the coefficients show the relationship of each variable with college graduation relative to other students in the same school. The school-level variance of the intercept in this model is much larger because the student variables do not control for differences across schools in student body composition. The within-school coefficient for HSGPAs is slightly larger than the coefficient from the earlier model, while the ACT score coefficient is small and not significant. The ACT slope varies significantly by high school (0.206, p

### A2 Competitiveness DA

#### **1] TURN – Diversity is key to competitiveness.**

McBride 17 [(Lisa, Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion at Salem State University) Internally cites Handelsman (Jo, Associate Director for science in the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy) and Lu (Hong, Department of Economics Syracuse University) and Butts (Cherie, Associate Director of Program Leadership at Biogen Inc) “Inclusion of Diverse Groups in STEM :ads to Increased Creativity, Innovation,” INSIGHT Into Diversity, 08/21/2017] DD

Research has shown that diversity among top leaders and problem-solvers is critical to fostering creativity and innovation in STEM. These efforts must involve welcoming and including women and those from underrepresented populations into the STEM workforce. Jo Handelsman, PhD, the associate director for science in the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, made clear the imperative to diversify the STEM workforce under the Obama administration. “STEM innovation is key to America’s future,” she said. “We must draw on talent from every part of our society and capitalize on the extraordinary diversity of thought that comes with diversity of people.” Diversity at all stages of the STEM pipeline is critical for increasing the number of people participating in innovative problem-solving in both academic and applied research in biotechnology, as diversity and inclusion lead to improved creativity and innovation — a concept that is supported by research from Lu Hong and Scott E. Page. Through their research on problem-solving agents, published by the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, they demonstrated that a diverse team was able to outperform a homogeneous team of “high-ability” problem-solvers. The “relatively greater ability [of top problem-solvers] is more than offset by their lack of problem-solving diversity,” they explained. In other words, people from diverse backgrounds with diverse experiences will approach problems differently, and as a result, may devise more creative and groundbreaking solutions. A lack of diversity in the scientific workforce is concerning, as it implies that considerable talent is being left out of the innovation enterprise. Recently, there has been a national call to action to reclaim America’s role as a global leader in science and technology. According to Handelsman, “Systemic barriers, such as implicit and explicit bias, present challenges to efforts to draw upon a diverse community in building a STEM workforce for the 21st century.” More collaboration is needed to eliminate such barriers and to drive positive system transformation with evidence-based policies and practices. We must convene leaders, experts, and chief diversity officers from industry, academia, professional societies, and the government to not only discuss ways to reframe the national conversation on STEM-workforce diversity, but to also close the gap and grow the talent pool. Encouraging Best Practices Earlier this year, Salem State University in Massachusetts hosted a forum called A Stakeholders Roundtable that focused on excellence and innovation through diversity in the STEM workforce, which included discussions on models for communicating about diversity to the public in ways that reinforce diversity as an asset rather than a challenge. Participants included STEM employers and prospective members of the STEM workforce who shared lessons learned and best practices for ensuring an inclusive working environment, reducing implicit bias in the workplace, and retaining and advancing a diverse STEM workforce. The event also featured presentations by students from the Youth Development Organization (YDO) in Lawrence, Mass., a nonprofit entrepreneurial organization that recruits underserved students while seeking partnerships, developing training concepts, and implementing comprehensive STEM programs. YDO allows high-achieving local middle and high school students to work in basic sciences laboratories year-round. This type of programming helps give students who have expressed a desire to pursue STEM careers the opportunity to do so. Notably, Antonia Novello, MD — who served as the 14th U.S. Surgeon General and was the first woman and the first Hispanic ever to hold this position — spoke at the event. In her closing remarks, she stated, “By implementing a unique training paradigm based on an early-start model, a longitudinal training continuum, and a multi-institutional mentorship approach, we can refocus the landscape for entrepreneurship and innovation.” Encouraging participation in STEM is certainly the first step to increasing diversity in these fields. At the K-12 level, best practices include providing near-peer mentors, role models who are similar in background to the students they are encouraging, and early and sustained opportunities to explore science through authentic research experiences. An example of a program that incorporates these best practices is the soon-to-launch Salem State STEM Opportunities Academy, which will focus on middle school girls from underrepresented minorities in the surrounding community. Female undergraduate STEM majors at Salem State will serve as tutors and mentors, while faculty and staff will serve as role models. Participants will work in teams and use the scientific method to answer questions from a variety of different STEM fields. Additionally, the academy will provide opportunities for young people to explore different careers in STEM. Many of the participants will be first-generation college students, so including parents and guardians in the conversation is also critical. The goal of programs like the STEM Opportunities Academy is to encourage young women and those from underrepresented minorities to pursue STEM at the undergraduate

#### 2] TURN – standardized tests lead to curricular narrowing that leaves out important skills for tomorrow’s workforce.

Cerda 10 By Marisela Cerda, Triple Pundit part of the Guardian Sustainable Business Network Tue 23 Nov 2010 09.27 EST Standardized testing leads US children to fall behind on systems thinking TJHSSTAD

Yet another highly publicized study, this time in the Atlantic, showed recently that based on their test scores … and only their test scores … our students aren't getting a competitive education for the global marketplace. But focusing on test scores, like most of these studies do, misses the larger point: our K-12 education system actively discourages the approaches most necessary to encourage sustainable practice in the 21st century. Indeed, it is things like an overemphasis on test scores and the "marketplace" that are themselves part of the problem, not the solution. United States educators are mandated to teach educational standards within a very specific time frame before students are tested by their state or district. The inevitable result is that teachers "teach to the test," rather than teaching to the subject matter, or focusing on the needs of the child. The system encourages educators to become uninventive with their lesson plans and cover the material without regard for their students' learning styles, potentials, or needs. In essence, the current system prioritizes its own needs (test scores) over the needs of its students (to engage with and master the material in a way they'll find meaningful on an ongoing basis). Teachers feel pressure to engage their students in only instrumental learning so that students correctly answer questions on state mandated exams. Educators are also pressured by school administrators who tend to compel them to only teach the subjects that are state tested. These administrators are also facing pressure from their state governments because, with the nation's focus on metrics, states fund schools that perform to certain standards exams. Schools that fail lose total control: the state takes over and current teachers and administrators are fired. Because of the demands of this testing regimen, educators to lack the time to expose their students to worthwhile experiences that would instead develop their understanding of social, cultural, economic, or environmental concerns. Nor is there any incentive for them to do so, since the latest approach to teacher evaluations – so-called "value added" evaluations – rates teachers solely on the basis of their students' test scores. When teachers, and not just students, are judged by how students perform on standardized tests, the system has truly gone overboard – but that's the direction we're heading. One teacher committed suicide in September 2010 as a result of a "value-added" evaluation that the L.A. times assigned to him. Performance pay may also be in our mists – with "performance" again defined solely by how students do on tests. At that point, what are we incentivizing but a mindless answer factory that is increasingly disconnected from the world we actually want students to live in? Sustainable solutions to our most pressing problems do not involve "getting the right answer" from the choices they're handed so much as creative thinking, cooperative approaches, and a willingness to experiment thoughtfully. The competitive nature of the classroom – even outside of the standardized testing regimen – does nothing to address the need for a more systemic, cooperative attitude toward dealing with global issues. Is it enough that America's students will be prepared for a career? A sustainable consciousness does not embrace competition. Instead it embraces cooperation – the very quality the "value-added" and standardized approach to education drives out of the classroom. American education's mission almost seems to be to push people further away from sustainable behavior. There is some good news – including a new attempt in California to move away from standardized assessment. Beginning in 2012, Californian K-12 students will be assessed four times a year on performance-based knowledge instead of once a year through standardized multiple-choice exams. The Common Core Standards Initiative (CCSI) will evaluate them on standards: [CCSI is] designed to be robust and relevant to the real world, reflecting the knowledge and skills that our young people need for success in college and careers. With American students fully prepared for the future, our communities will be best positioned to compete successfully in the global economy. (CCSI, 2010.) This is a step in the right direction, but it's still encouraging a competitive mindset and avoiding a look at the root causes of poor student performance. Districts should make it a point to develop the skills in those teachers whose students do not perform well, and also to step back to look at the larger picture and consider if children getting enough to eat at home, if they have to walk through gang-infested streets everyday, and if their parents well cared for by social systems. It is systemically counter-productive if we do not consider the bigger picture. In order to make United States K-12 schools more sustainable, they have to be re-designed … and in order to encourage sustainable thinking, they need to help children develop the skills and knowledge they'll need to be good global citizens … as well as working professionals.

#### **3] TURN – Standardized testing increases high-school dropouts.**

Klima 07 THE CHILDREN WE LEAVE BEHIND: EFFECTS OF HIGH-STAKES TESTING ON DROPOUT RATES SHIRI KLIMA REVIEW OF LAW AND SOCIAL JUSTICE [Vol. 17:1] 2007 <https://gould.usc.edu/students/journals/rlsj/issues/assets/docs/issue_17/07_Klima_Macro.pdf>

THE DISASTER CREATED BY USING EXIT EXAMS TO DETERMINE GRADUATION A. HIGH-STAKES TESTING LEADS TO HIGHER DROPOUT RATES The No Child Left Behind Act does not require or even recommend that test scores be used as a mandatory bar to decide high school graduation.68 However, the USDE has encouraged such use,69 and many states have opted to use the scores in this way. When a high-stakes test is used to determine graduation, it is often referred to as an “exit exam.” The introduction of these exit exams and other high-stakes tests has been accompanied by increased dropout rates.70 Students may actually fail the high stakes tests and drop out, or they may just fear failure and drop out in anticipation of not passing.71 In Massachusetts, in the first year that students were required to pass the state test in order to graduate (2003), the senior dropout rate in the Boston public schools rose from 7.0% to 7.7% (or 1405 students), in Holyoke from 7.6% to 10.2% and in Framingham from 1.2% to 3.7%.72 68 THOMAS, supra note 2, at 18. NCLB does, however, require that test scores be used for other specific purposes. First, the tests are to be used to judge individual schools’ effectiveness and to track the progress of school-improvement efforts. Second, the test results are to be reported to federal and state officials. Third, the outcomes must inform communities of their schools’ test results and resulting NCLB status. Finally, the test results must be communicated to parents to notify them of their children’s academic success. Id. 69 Id. As of 2000, more than half of the states had already implemented or were developing some form of high school exam that was mandatory for graduation. Laura S. Hamilton & Daniel M. Koretz, Tests and Their Use in Test-Based Accountability Systems, in MAKING SENSE OF TEST-BASED ACCOUNTABILITY IN EDUCATION 13, 45 (Laura S. Hamilton, Brian M. Stecher & Stephen P. Klein eds., 2002). 70 THOMAS, supra note 2, at 200. 71 Id. at 249. This anxiety is highlighted in the case of the student who came to me for advice. See Introduction supra. 72 Anand Vaishnav, High School Dropout Rates Are Up Sharply, BOSTON GLOBE, Apr. 6, 2004, at B3. 2007] THE CHILDREN WE LEAVE BEHIND 13 Linda Darling-Hammond explains that studies have correlated the effects of grade retention, student discouragement and school exclusion policies stimulated by high-stakes tests with dropout rates in Georgia, Florida, Massachusetts, New York and North Carolina.73 For example, according to the NCES, when new high-stakes testing policies were introduced in New York, graduation rates decreased from 63% to 58% between 1997 and 2001.74 In Florida, a similar trend emerged when high-stakes testing began; there, the graduation rates fell from 57% to 52% during the same period.75 The National Research Council’s Board on Testing and Assessment (“NRC”) likewise observed this correlation.76 According to the Board, although the exact causation is unclear, much of the existing research shows that the use of high-stakes tests is linked to higher dropout rates.77 The NRC cited a study by Sean F. Reardon as an example of such research.78 Reardon used data from the National Educational Longitudinal Study (“NELS”) and found that high-stakes eighth-grade tests were “associated with sharply higher dropout rates” between the eighth and tenth grades.79 Reardon also found that schools with high concentrations of students of low socioeconomic class were most likely to have high-stakes testing policies.80 His analysis suggests that “it is the concentrated poverty of these schools and their communities, and their concomitant lack of resources, that link [high-stakes testing] policies to higher dropout rates, rather than other risk factors, such as student grades, age, attendance, and minority group membership.”81 Indeed, in Reardon’s study, dropout rates between eighth and tenth grades were up to six percentage points higher than in comparable schools not requiring high-stakes testing.82 But it appears that there is more than just a correlation between highstakes testing and increased dropout rates. In finding this correlation, Reardon manipulated variables in 720 schools and explained that his find73 Darling-Hammond, supra note 18, at 20. 74 See id. 75 See id. 76 See NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, supra note 28, at 174. 77 See id. 78 See id. 79 See id. (citing Sean F. Reardon, Eighth Grade Minimum Competency Testing and Early High School Dropout Patterns 5 (April 8–12, 1996) (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association)). 80 Id. 81 Id. (quoting Sean F. Reardon). 82 See id. 14 REVIEW OF LAW AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

#### Our evidence o/w – your study can’t account for the people who dropout and never apply to college because they didn’t do well on the SAT or don’t want to take it.

#### Impact turn

#### The US is losing the economic competition with China---plan flips it and sustains US leadership

Meuse 17 (Joseph, Founder and President of Belmont Partners, an international financial consulting firm, “China’s Economic Battle for Global Leadership”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/joseph-meuse/chinas-economic-battle-fo_b_279881.html>, 07/06/2017, NRG)

History shows that countries demonstrate their greatest strength when they are at war. People unify for a common cause, reduce their individual needs and wants and sacrifice for the greater good. We think of wars as being fought with weapons and soldiers, but the war of the new millennium is being fought on a monetary and labor scale across the globe. While we don’t yet realize it in this country, America is in an economic war with China. We have been in this economic battle for years, and are much closer to losing than we realize. As the president and founder of an international financial consulting company that works closely with Chinese companies, I see the enormity of China’s global financial influence and power on a daily basis. China gets up every morning focused on beating the West and is supremely committed to becoming the leading economic superpower in the world. From small merchants to corporate CEOs, from young children to senior citizens, the entire Chinese population is united in their goal of usurping Western economic leadership. Chinese families get up every morning focused on how to advance economically and ensuring that their children are studying hard so that they can be extremely competitive in the future. When I visit my Shanghai office, I marvel at the scores of families I see working together on the street selling products at all times of the day and night. At the provincial government level, the Chinese are focused solely on job creation and enhancing investments which ensure economic expansion. Government leaders who are not committed to this are pushed out of office quickly. At the national government level, policies are in place at the provincial level and below that foster economic progress. Anyone who stands in the way is removed as China believes the needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few. In America, we believe we are still too far ahead of China to be duly concerned and remain committed to focusing on our individual needs. Our federal and state governments continue to pass pork barrel programs. Our campaign system is so broken that once a politician is in office, they have a good chance of being a politician for life. Politicians rarely talk about our issues with China, let alone that China may surpass us as an economic superpower sooner than we think. On top of this, China has five times greater population than we have in the United States, greater natural resources and a heck of a lot more reserve money than us. When you look back at America’ history and review the Cold War and World War II as examples, our greatest times came when we were challenged. These global events pushed us to put our country first and us second. We were willing to make sacrifices then, just as the Chinese are sacrificing today, each and every day. We need to think this way again. We must start at the community level to create centers focused on economic competitiveness where job skills and corporate advancement are fostered along with education for our youth. We need to have a sense of urgency. Over the last eight years, a few U.S. factions have stood up and said we need to solve the problem of job loss and diminished competitiveness, but not much was done. Will this time be any different? If you do not believe the seriousness of the situation and what I have shared with you, I implore that you visit China. I will be there later this month where I will again see the battles and the ground they gain each and every day. I am taking my two grade school sons to China this fall, not only because I think it will open their minds, but because I am concerned that for their generation, the world will be a China-centered one. We need to wake up and realize that China is winning the battles, and at this rate, the war is almost over. Will the USA lose its superpower status in the global financial system?

#### Losing the competitiveness battle is good---transition to a Chinese-led order is peaceful and prevents great power nuclear war—US reassertion of a lead role fails and breaks down institutions

Mazarr, 17—Senior Political Scientist at the RAND Corporation and Associate Director of the Strategy, Doctrine, and Resources Program at the RAND Corporation's Arroyo Center (Michael, “The Once and Future Order: What Comes After Hegemony?,” Foreign Affairs (Jan/Feb 2017): 25-32, NRG)

Few foreign policy issues have attracted more attention in recent years than the problem of sustaining the U.S.-led liberal international order. After World War II, the United States sponsored a set of institutions, rules, and norms designed to avoid repeating the mistakes of the 1930s and promote peace, prosperity, and democracy. The resulting system has served as the bedrock of U.S. national security strategy ever since. In everything from arms control to peacekeeping to trade to human rights, marrying U.S. power and international norms and institutions has achieved significant results. Washington continues to put maintaining the international order at the center of the United States' global role. Yet the survival of that order-indeed, of any ordering principles at all-now seems in question. Dissatisfied countries such as China and Russia view its operation as unjust, and people around the world are angry about the economic and social price they've had to pay for globalization. It's not clear exactly what Presidentelect Donald Trump's views are on the role of the United States in the world, much less the liberal order, but his administration will confront the most profound foreign policy task that any new administration has faced in 70 years: rethinking the role that the international order should play in U.S. grand strategy. Whatever Trump's own views, the instincts of many in Washington will be to attempt to restore a unified, U.S.-dominated system by confronting the rule breakers and aggressively promoting liberal values. This would be the wrong approach; in trying to hold the old order together, Washington could end up accelerating its dissolution. What the United States must learn to do instead is navigate and lead the more diversified, pluralistic system that is now materializing-one with a bigger role for emerging-market powers and more ways for countries other than the United States to lead than the current order provides. THE HOUSE THAT WE BUILT The creation of the current order, like that of its two modern predecessors-the Concert of Europe and the League of Nations-was an effort to design the basic architecture of international relations in the wake of a war among major powers. All three orders used a range of tools- organizations, treaties, informal meetings, and norms-to attain the goals of their creators. The current order's main institutions include the United Nations, nato, the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund (imf), the World Bank, and the G-20. Together, these bodies have influenced almost every aspect of the modern world. The un has provided a forum for the international community to rally around shared interests and ratify joint action. The international financial institutions have boosted trade and stabilized the global economy during crises. Multilateral treaties and agreements brokered through various bodies have helped avoid chaotic arms races and uncontrolled nuclear proliferation. And dense global networks of experts, activists, businesses, and nonprofits, operating within the framework of the liberal order, have built consensus and taken action on hundreds of other issues. The rules of any such order are not self-enforcing. When combined with direct state power, however, they encourage governments to accept norms of conduct such as nonaggression, the avoidance of nuclear weapons, and respect for human rights. The United States would be wise to do what it can to sustain these norms in the future. The trick is figuring out how to do so-and what, given all the changes the world is now experiencing, the emerging order should look like. THE NOT-SO-LIBERAL ORDER The postwar liberal order has proved remarkably stable. But it has always incorporated two distinct and not necessarily reconcilable visions. One is a narrow, cautious view of the un and the core international financial institutions as guardians of sovereign equality, territorial inviolability, and a limited degree of free trade. The other is a more ambitious agenda: protecting human rights, fostering democratic political systems, promoting free-market economic reforms, and encouraging good governance. Until recently, the tension between these two visions did not pose a serious problem. For many decades, the Cold War allowed the United States and its allies to gloss over the gap in the name of upholding a unified front against the Soviets. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Washington fully embraced the more ambitious approach by expanding nato up to Russia's doorstep; intervening to protect human rights in places such as the Balkans and Libya; supporting uprisings, at least rhetorically, in the name of democracy in countries including Egypt, Georgia, and Myanmar; and applying increasingly sophisticated economic sanctions to illiberal governments. In the newly unipolar international system, Washington often behaved as if the narrower concept of order had been superseded by the more ambitious one. At the same time, the United States often took advantage of its preeminence to sidestep the order's rules and institutions when it found them inconvenient. The problem with this approach, of course, is that international orders gain much of their potency by defining the sources of prestige and status within the system, such as participation in and leadership of international institutions. Their stability depends on leading members abiding-and being seen to abide-by key norms of behavior. When the leader of an order consistently appears to others to interpret the rules as it sees fit, the legitimacy of the system is undermined and other countries come to believe that the order offends, rather than sustains, their dignity. An extreme version of this occurred in the 1930s, when a series of perceived insults convinced Japan-once a strong supporter of the League of Nations-that the system was a racist, Anglo-American cabal designed to emasculate it. Partly as a result, Japan withdrew from the league and signed the Tripartite Pact with Germany and Italy before entering World War II. Today, a similar story is playing out as some countries see the United States as applying norms selectively and in its own favor, norms that are already tailored to U.S. interests. This is persuading them that the system's main function is to validate the United States' status and prestige at the expense of their own. For years now, a number of countries, including Brazil, India, South Africa, and Turkey, have found various ways to express their frustration with the current rules. But China and Russia have become the two most important dissenters. These two countries view the order very differently and have divergent ambitions and strategies. Yet their broad complaints have much in common. Both countries feel disenfranchised by a U.S.-dominated system that imposes strict conditions on their participation and, they believe, menaces their regimes by promoting democracy. And both countries have called for fundamental reforms to make the order less imperial and more pluralistic. Russian officials are particularly disillusioned. They believe that they made an honest effort to join Western- led institutions after the fall of the Soviet Union but were spurned by the West, which subjected them to a long series of insults: nato's attacks on Serbia in the Balkan wars of the 1990s; nato enlargement into eastern Europe; and Western support for "color revolutions" in the early years of the new century, which threatened or in some cases actually overthrew Russian-backed leaders in several eastern European countries. In a June 2016 speech to Russian diplomats, Russian President Vladimir Putin complained that certain Western states "continue stubborn attempts to retain their monopoly on geopolitical domination," arguing that this was leading to a "confrontation between different visions of how to build the global governance mechanisms in the 21st century." And Putin hasn't just limited himself to complaining. In recent years, Russia has taken a number of dramatic, sometimes violent steps-especially in Europe-to weaken the U.S.-led order. China also feels disrespected. The financial crisis at the end of the last decade convinced many Chinese that the West had entered a period of rapid decline and that China deserved a more powerful voice in the international system. Since then, Beijing has increased its influence in several institutions, including the imf and the World Bank. But the changes have not gone far enough for many Chinese leaders. They still chafe at Western domination of these bodies, perceive U.S. democracy promotion as a threat, and resent the regional network of U.S. alliances that surrounds China. Beijing has thus undertaken a range of economic initiatives to gain more influence within the current order, including increasing its development aid and founding the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, which it clearly intends to compete with the imf and the World Bank. China has also pursued its interests in defiance of global norms by building islands in contested international waters and harassing U.S. aircraftin the South China Sea. Worrisome as these developments are, it is important not to exaggerate the threats they represent. Neither China nor Russia has declared itself an enemy of the postwar order (although Russia is certainly moving in that direction). Both continue to praise the core un system and participate actively in a host of institutions, treaties, and diplomatic processes. Indeed, China has worked hard to embed itself ever more firmly in the current order. In a 2015 speech in Seattle, Chinese President Xi Jinping said that "China has been a participant, builder, and contributor" in, of, and to the system and that it stood "firmly for the international order" based on the purposes and principles outlined in the un Charter. China and Russia both rely on cross-border trade, international energy markets, and global information networks-all of which depend heavily on international rules and institutions. And at least for the time being, neither country seems anxious to challenge the order militarily. Many major countries, including China and Russia, are groping toward roles appropriate to their growing power in a rapidly evolving international system. If that system is going to persevere, their grievances and ambitions must be accommodated. This will require a more flexible, pluralistic approach to institutions, rules, and norms. ALL THE RAGE Another threat to the liberal order comes from the populist uprisings now under way in many countries around the world, which have been spurred on by outrage at increasing economic inequality, uneasiness with cultural and demographic changes, and anger at a perceived loss of national sovereignty. For the liberal order to survive, the populations of its member countries must embrace its basic social and political values. That embrace is now weakening. The postwar order has driven global integration and liberalization by encouraging free-trade agreements, developing international law, and fostering global communications networks. Such developments strengthened the order in turn by cementing public support for liberal values. But the populist rebellion against globalization now imperils that virtuous circle. The populist surge has featured outbursts in Europe and the United States against the perceived intrusions necessary of a globalizing order. Public support for new trade agreements has tumbled. Resentment toward supranational authorities, such as the European Union, has risen steadily, as has suspicion of and hostility toward immigrants and immigration. The uprising has already claimed one major casualty-the United Kingdom's eu membership-and is mutating into angry, xenophobic nationalism in countries as diverse as Austria, Denmark, France, Greece, Hungary, the Netherlands, Russia, Sweden, and the United States. So far, none of these countries has totally rejected the international order. Populism remains a minority trend in most electorates, and support for liberal principles remains robust in many countries. In a 2016 Gallup survey, for example, 58 percent of Americans polled indicated that they saw trade as an opportunity rather than a threat- the highest number since 1992. Similarly, a 2016 poll by the Pew Research Center found that support for the UN among Americans had grown by nine points since 2004, to a new peak of 64 percent. Reassuring as such findings are, however, if even a quarter or a third of citizens turn decisively against liberal values in a critical mass of nations, it can destabilize the entire system. In some cases, this happens because radical parties or individuals can come to power without ever achieving more than a plurality of support. More commonly, a rejectionist bloc can ~~cripple~~ [wreck] legislatures by obstructing steps, such as trade deals and arms treaties, that would strengthen the prevailing order. And sometimes, as happened with the British vote to leave the eu, committed opponents of the order are joined by a larger number of worried citizens in a successful effort to roll back elements of the system. MIX IT UP International orders tend to rest on two pillars: the balance of power and prestige among the leading members and some degree of shared values. Both of these pillars look shaky today. For many years, U.S. grand strategy has been based on the idea that the unitary U.S.-led order reflected universal values, was easy to join, and exercised a gravitational pull on other countries. Those assumptions do not hold as strongly as they once did. If Washington hopes to sustain an international system that can help avoid conflict, raise prosperity, and promote liberal values, it will have to embrace a more diverse order-one that operates in different ways for different countries and regions and on different issues. The United States will be tempted to resist such a change and to double down on the existing liberal order by following the Cold War playbook: rallying democracies and punishing norm breakers. But such a narrow order would create more embittered outcasts and thus imperil the most fundamental objective of any global order: keeping the peace among great powers. Dividing the world into defenders and opponents of a shared order is also likely to be less feasible than in the past. China's role in the global economy and its standing as a regional power mean that it cannot be isolated in the way the Soviet Union was. Many of today's rising powers, moreover, have preferences that are too diverse to gather into either a U.S.-led system or a bloc opposed to it.

### A2 International Students DA

#### **1. International students quickly and irreversibly declining in the status quo – no uniqueness.**

Cooper 18 [Preston Cooper](https://www.forbes.com/sites/prestoncooper2/) I am a higher education analyst based in Washington, D.C. I formerly worked in higher education research at the American Enterprise Institute and the Manhattan Institut ... Nov 16, 2018, 02:30am The Real Reason International Students Are Fleeing U.S. Colleges (It's Not Trump) TJHSSTAD

The Wall Street Journal reported on Tuesday that new enrollments of international students at American colleges are shrinking for the first time in over a decade. According to the Institute of International Education, 109,000 international students enrolled as first-time undergraduates in 2017, a decline of 7,000 (6%) from the previous year. That marks the second straight year of declining new international enrollment at U.S. institutions. Commentators have attributed the decline to a “Trump effect,” wherein the president’s aggressive rhetoric on immigration dissuades foreign students from coming to America. Indeed, that has probably influenced a few students’ decisions, particularly those from the seven countries targeted by the administration’s travel ban. But students from several unaffected countries have also shunned American colleges, suggesting that the primary reason for the trend lies at the bank rather than the visa office. In 2016, the typical foreign student attending a selective American college paid $23,500 in tuition and fees, more than three times the price a U.S. citizen paid. Tuition for international students increased by nearly $5,000 since 2012, while tuition for Americans went up only $450. While tuition for foreign students has risen for the last two decades, the spike over the last four years has been particularly dramatic. Source: National Postsecondary Student Aid Study. Figures are adjusted for inflation. Source: National Postsecondary Student Aid Study. Figures are adjusted for inflation. PRESTON COOPER/FORBES Today In: Industry Colleges are keen to enroll international students since they generally receive much less financial aid than American citizens, if they get it at all. This makes international students a key source of additional revenue for universities when domestic students are tapped out. Until now, foreign students have been happy to pay high prices for a spot at a prestigious American university. But the recent decline in new international enrollments suggests that the party can’t go on forever. Colleges in America spend more per student than virtually every other country in the developed world. Raising tuition for international students has, until now, been a straightforward way to pay for big university budgets. But it seems that foreigners have finally had enough.

#### 2. TURN – Removing tests makes applying to college much more affordable for international students – makes the process more accessible.

#### 3. No internal link between making it harder for international student applications to be evaluated and decreasing international enrollment.

### A2 Endowments DA

### A2 Dropouts / Retention DA

#### **1. TURN – Standardized testing increases high-school dropouts.**

Klima 07 THE CHILDREN WE LEAVE BEHIND: EFFECTS OF HIGH-STAKES TESTING ON DROPOUT RATES SHIRI KLIMA REVIEW OF LAW AND SOCIAL JUSTICE [Vol. 17:1] 2007 <https://gould.usc.edu/students/journals/rlsj/issues/assets/docs/issue_17/07_Klima_Macro.pdf>

THE DISASTER CREATED BY USING EXIT EXAMS TO DETERMINE GRADUATION A. HIGH-STAKES TESTING LEADS TO HIGHER DROPOUT RATES The No Child Left Behind Act does not require or even recommend that test scores be used as a mandatory bar to decide high school graduation.68 However, the USDE has encouraged such use,69 and many states have opted to use the scores in this way. When a high-stakes test is used to determine graduation, it is often referred to as an “exit exam.” The introduction of these exit exams and other high-stakes tests has been accompanied by increased dropout rates.70 Students may actually fail the high stakes tests and drop out, or they may just fear failure and drop out in anticipation of not passing.71 In Massachusetts, in the first year that students were required to pass the state test in order to graduate (2003), the senior dropout rate in the Boston public schools rose from 7.0% to 7.7% (or 1405 students), in Holyoke from 7.6% to 10.2% and in Framingham from 1.2% to 3.7%.72 68 THOMAS, supra note 2, at 18. NCLB does, however, require that test scores be used for other specific purposes. First, the tests are to be used to judge individual schools’ effectiveness and to track the progress of school-improvement efforts. Second, the test results are to be reported to federal and state officials. Third, the outcomes must inform communities of their schools’ test results and resulting NCLB status. Finally, the test results must be communicated to parents to notify them of their children’s academic success. Id. 69 Id. As of 2000, more than half of the states had already implemented or were developing some form of high school exam that was mandatory for graduation. Laura S. Hamilton & Daniel M. Koretz, Tests and Their Use in Test-Based Accountability Systems, in MAKING SENSE OF TEST-BASED ACCOUNTABILITY IN EDUCATION 13, 45 (Laura S. Hamilton, Brian M. Stecher & Stephen P. Klein eds., 2002). 70 THOMAS, supra note 2, at 200. 71 Id. at 249. This anxiety is highlighted in the case of the student who came to me for advice. See Introduction supra. 72 Anand Vaishnav, High School Dropout Rates Are Up Sharply, BOSTON GLOBE, Apr. 6, 2004, at B3. 2007] THE CHILDREN WE LEAVE BEHIND 13 Linda Darling-Hammond explains that studies have correlated the effects of grade retention, student discouragement and school exclusion policies stimulated by high-stakes tests with dropout rates in Georgia, Florida, Massachusetts, New York and North Carolina.73 For example, according to the NCES, when new high-stakes testing policies were introduced in New York, graduation rates decreased from 63% to 58% between 1997 and 2001.74 In Florida, a similar trend emerged when high-stakes testing began; there, the graduation rates fell from 57% to 52% during the same period.75 The National Research Council’s Board on Testing and Assessment (“NRC”) likewise observed this correlation.76 According to the Board, although the exact causation is unclear, much of the existing research shows that the use of high-stakes tests is linked to higher dropout rates.77 The NRC cited a study by Sean F. Reardon as an example of such research.78 Reardon used data from the National Educational Longitudinal Study (“NELS”) and found that high-stakes eighth-grade tests were “associated with sharply higher dropout rates” between the eighth and tenth grades.79 Reardon also found that schools with high concentrations of students of low socioeconomic class were most likely to have high-stakes testing policies.80 His analysis suggests that “it is the concentrated poverty of these schools and their communities, and their concomitant lack of resources, that link [high-stakes testing] policies to higher dropout rates, rather than other risk factors, such as student grades, age, attendance, and minority group membership.”81 Indeed, in Reardon’s study, dropout rates between eighth and tenth grades were up to six percentage points higher than in comparable schools not requiring high-stakes testing.82 But it appears that there is more than just a correlation between highstakes testing and increased dropout rates. In finding this correlation, Reardon manipulated variables in 720 schools and explained that his find73 Darling-Hammond, supra note 18, at 20. 74 See id. 75 See id. 76 See NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, supra note 28, at 174. 77 See id. 78 See id. 79 See id. (citing Sean F. Reardon, Eighth Grade Minimum Competency Testing and Early High School Dropout Patterns 5 (April 8–12, 1996) (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association)). 80 Id. 81 Id. (quoting Sean F. Reardon). 82 See id. 14 REVIEW OF LAW AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

#### Our evidence o/w – your study can’t account for the people who dropout and never apply to college because they didn’t do well on the SAT or don’t want to take it.

#### 2. TURN – GPA is a more reliable predictor of college performance.

Maitre 14 High school grades are a better predictor of college success than SAT, ACT, study saysMichelle Maitre covers career and college readiness. [Contact her](http://edsource.org/contact-michelle-maitre#.UwaolPRdXU4) and follow her on Twitter [@michelle\_maitre](https://twitter.com/michelle_maitre). Sign up [here](http://edsource.org/subscribe-page.html) for a no-cost online subscription to EdSource Today for reports from the largest education reporting team in California. FEBRUARY 21, 2014 TJHSSTAD

As California and other states work to define what “college and career readiness” means, a [new study](http://www.nacacnet.org/research/research-data/nacac-research/Documents/DefiningPromise.pdf) finds that a more reliable predictor of whether a student does well in college is his or her high school grades, rather than ACT or SAT scores. “One of the core messages of this study is that high school grades matter, and they matter a lot,” said principal investigator William C. Hiss, a professor and former dean of admissions at [Bates College](http://www.bates.edu/) in Lewiston, Maine. The study analyzed student and alumni records from 123,000 students in 33 colleges where SAT or ACT scores are optional for admission. The results found that a student’s performance in college closely mirrored their performance in high school: Students with strong grade point averages in high school maintained similar GPAs in college, regardless of how well or poorly they scored on college entrance exams. Likewise, students with lower GPAs – even those with high SAT or ACT scores – had lower GPAs in college and graduated at lower rates. “That surprised me,” Hiss said. “I did not expect to see the correlation was that close.” The study, published Feb. 18 on the website of the [National Association for College Admission Counseling](http://www.nacacnet.org/Pages/default.aspx), adds new fuel to [debates](http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2013/09/06/why-the-sats-shouldnt-be-a-factor-in-college-admissions) over the role of entrance exams in college admissions. Students in the study who did not submit SAT or ACT scores were more likely to be minorities, the first in their family to attend college, come from low-income families, and have learning disabilities, the study said. Standardized admissions tests can create a barrier to college for many students, Hiss said. “For economic growth and social stability, America will need to find successful paths to higher education for hundreds of thousands of additional first-generation-to-college, minority, immigrant, rural and (learning disabled) students,” Hiss wrote in a [fact sheet](http://www.nacacnet.org/media-center/PressRoom/2014/Pages/BillHiss.aspx) accompanying the study. “This study provides the research support for optional testing as at least one route by which that can happen.” The report comes as California grapples with the best way to measure how well schools are preparing students to succeed in college and careers

#### Our study o/w on sample size – it’s across a huge number of students and colleges and over multiple decades – that’s necessary to mitigate the effect of outliers.

#### 3. Too many confounding variables and alternative reasons for people dropping out of college – social factors, academic pressure, sickness, etc. – standardized tests don’t and can’t predict any of these things.

#### 4. TURN – tests cause stress and anxiety which incentivizes students to drop out.

#### A2 Shaw et al. – come on – this study is from the college board – they GAVE PEOPLE MONEY to make them do better on tests to prove their point and also administered the tests after college when students were smarter – the methodology of their study is designed to achieve pre-determined ends which means you should err heavily aff.

Shaw et al. The Redesigned SAT® Pilot Predictive Validity Study: A First Look By Emily J. Shaw, Jessica P. Marini, Jonathan Beard, Doron Shmueli, Linda Young, and Helen Ng 2016 TJHSSTAD

Students received a $100 gift card for participating in the study immediately following their test participation. To increase test-taking motivation, students were also made aware that they would receive a $50 gift card, mailed at a later date, if their scores on the redesigned SAT met or exceeded their most recent SAT scores on record at the College Board.

#### \*Interp – if the negative claims that the affirmative results in greater numbers of high school dropouts, they must provide a definition of dropout.

#### Violation – they don’t

#### No standard [definition of dropout] / [method for calculating retention rates] – almost every district does calculations differently.

Klima 07 THE CHILDREN WE LEAVE BEHIND: EFFECTS OF HIGH-STAKES TESTING ON DROPOUT RATES SHIRI KLIMA REVIEW OF LAW AND SOCIAL JUSTICE [Vol. 17:1] 2007 <https://gould.usc.edu/students/journals/rlsj/issues/assets/docs/issue_17/07_Klima_Macro.pdf>

THE INCONSISTENCIES IN STATE DEFINITIONS AND CALCULATIONS OF DROPOUTS To understand the magnitude of the problem, we need to determine the total number of dropouts, but this endeavor alone is incredibly complex. Obtaining an estimate depends on how one counts and who is included within the definition of the word.30 Indeed, a standard definition of “dropout” does not currently exist. The federal government provides a recommended definition,31 but only thirty-six states and the District of Columbia report data using this definition.32 States not working with the U.S. Department of Education (“USDE”) on this effort include California, Florida, Michigan, New York and North Carolina.33 These states are believed to have higher-than-average dropout rates.34 Another measure of the dropout rate is the Common Core of Data Survey of the USDE’s National Center for Educational Statistics (“NCES”).35 Forty-six states and the District of Columbia “usually report” dropout data to the NCES, but only twenty-two states and the District of Columbia use the definition of dropout adopted by the NCES.36 Ultimately, states differ in their definition of dropout; they use different time periods during the school year to collect data, various data collection methods, multiple ways of tracking youth no longer in school and varied methods of calculating dropout rates.37 For instance, some states subtract students who return to school from their dropout total.38 Some count students enrolled in high school equivalency programs as dropouts.39 Some include students who register for college prior to obtaining a high school diploma, 29 Id. 30 SMINK & SCHARGEL, supra note 25, at 10. 31 The federal government’s definition of a high school dropout is an individual who: (a) was enrolled in a district in grades 9 through 12 at some time during the preceding school year; (b) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; (c) has not graduated or completed a program of studies by the maximum age established by a State; (d) has not transferred to another public school district, a nonpublic school, or a State-approved educational program; and (e) has not left school because of death, illness, or a school-approved absence. DOE School Dropout Prevention Program, 70 Fed. Reg. 39,499, 39,449–39,501 (July 8, 2005). 32 SMINK & SCHARGEL, supra note 25, at 10. 33 Id. 34 Id. 35 Id. at 10–11. 36 Id. 37 Id. at 11. 38 Id. 39 Id. 2007] THE CHILDREN WE LEAVE BEHIND 9 enter the military or enter correctional or mental institutions.40 States differ based on whether they include students who complete high school with some credential other than a regular diploma, or those who receive their diploma by passing the Graduate Equivalency Degree (“GED”) test.41 States also have different laws regarding the age at which a student may legally leave school.42 B. THE INCONSISTENCIES IN DISTRICT DEFINITIONS AND CALCULATIONS OF DROPOUTS The inconsistency between the states is further confounded by the lack of uniformity in definitions and methods of calculation within each state at the school district level. When students formally withdraw, districts use different and inconsistent codes to explain why each student leaves.43 Students who do not formally withdraw but who stop attending school at some point pose an obstacle, and districts classify such students differently based on idiosyncratic policies.44 For example, how long a student may be truant before he or she is classified a dropout varies widely among districts.45 Districts are also inconsistent about classification of students who are in special schools, alternative programs and special education classes.46 Districts even vary as to which grades are included in their reported dropout rates.47 At the most basic level, different districts use different terminology that may or may not overlap with the term “dropout.”48 The Los Angeles Unified School District, for example, prefers the term “early school leavers.”49 All this has led Phi Delta Kappa’s Center for Evaluation, Development, and Research to conclude: We simply cannot agree what a dropout is. In some districts, death, marriage, taking a job, entering the armed forces, entering college early, being expelled or jailed, going to a deaf school, business school, or vocational school causes one to be considered a dropout. In another district, none of these acts would be considered. . . . 40 Id. 41 Id. 42 Id. 43 Floyd Morgan Hammack, Large School Systems’ Dropout Reports: An Analysis of Definitions, Procedures, and Findings, in SCHOOL DROPOUTS: PATTERNS AND POLICIES 20, 23 (Gary Natriello ed., 1986). 44 Id. 45 Id. 46 Id. 47 Id. at 23–24. 48 Id. at 26. 49 Id. 10 REVIEW OF LAW AND SOCIAL JUSTICE [Vol. 17:1 There are at least as many different definitions of a dropout as there are school districts recording dropouts. Some districts solved their problem of who to count as a dropout by not using any definition at all, whereas other districts had three or four definitions, and neither we nor they seemed to know which one was used.

#### The standard is shiftiness – I can’t generate offense against the disad because you can just shift out of any arguments I make by saying that your specific metric of assessing retention is different – that decimates fairness because I don’t have a reciprocal ability to respond to the disad. This also kills clash – we get less education if we can’t get into the nuances of what your metric is and how standardized tests apply to the certain communities your definition classifies as dropouts.

### A2 Scholarships DA

#### **1. TURN – Merit-based scholarships overwhelmingly hurt minority students – these trade off with need-based scholarships that the aff causes a shift too – solves the disad.**

Fairtest 07 University Testing: Scholarships Submitted by fairtest on August 22, 2007 - 2:20pm [scholarships](https://www.fairtest.org/scholarships) [university](https://www.fairtest.org/category/university) TJHSSTAD

Many state-funded, college-based, and private scholarship programs are increasingly basing receipt of financial aid on measures of academic "merit" rather than monetary need. The amount given out by states under "merit" programs now more than doubles the money earmarked for "need-based" scholarships: in early 2001, 13 states offered "merit-based" funding to students that totaled $709 million, while in 1998-99 only $325 million was given out based on financial need. "Merit-based" scholarship programs frequently rely on high school GPA, class rank, and/or standardized test scores to determine eligibility. When test score requirements are employed, scholarship recipients usually have to meet "cut-off" (minimum) scores on the SAT I, ACT, AP, SAT II, or state graduation exams. However, rigid "cut-off" test score requirements for scholarships or admission are against test-maker guidelines for both the SAT and ACT, in part because of the variability inherent in all standardized test scores. The SAT I, for example, has a standard error of difference (the amount two scores must differ before they indicate ability differences) of 40-44 point on the Verbal portion and 42-44 points on the Math section. Setting "cut-off" scores to determine who is meritorious is arbitrary at best, and psychometrically unsound at worst. Despite these violations of their own guidelines, test-makers have done little to curb such misuses. The use of test score minumums results in "merit" aid disproportionately going to upper-income, White students who are already more likely to attend college than their lower-income peers and students of color. For example, in Michigan more than half of the "merit" scholarships go to students in high schools where fewer than 10 percent of the students qualify for free lunch. "Merit-based" aid given out by state governments for state college and university tuition would seem to contradict the central mission of these institutions - to make higher education affordable and accessible to a wide range of students.

#### **2. TURN – reliance on testing for scholarships puts women of color at a disadvantage.**

Moss 89 Berkeley Journal of Gender, Law & Justice Volume 4 | Issue 2 Article 3 December 1989 Standardized Tests as a Tool of Exclusion: Improper Use of the SAT in New York Kary L. Moss TJHSSTAD

Whether a student wins a scholarship can determine which college she will attend or whether she will be able to attend at all. The criteria used to award scholarships is determinative: New York's practice of relying exclusively on the SAT has cost females, who in recent years have averaged approximately ten verbal points and forty to fifty math points less than males on the SAT,2 an estimated three million dollars per year.3 We do not know the racial breakdown of that distribution, but since we know that most women of color do less well than white women on the SAT,4 scholarships distributed solely on the basis of SAT scores presumably hurt the former most seriously. The unfairness of New York state's practice is clear from figures which indicate that females had a higher mean grade point average than males in 1988.' Grade point average is widely regarded by most educators, including The College Board and the Educational Testing Service (ETS), the creators of the SAT and other standardized tests, as the best measure of high school achievement.6 When used alone, test scores are not viewed as an adequate measure of aptitude and achievement. ETS has warned: In order to make useful comparisons of students' performance on tests, a common test given to all students would be required.

#### 3. TURN – merit scholarships are the epitome of meritocracy – the notion that marginalized students have equal ability to go to college and can easily get aid if they are smart enough normalizes more insidious structural violence and bites the aff framing.

#### 4. Very few scholarships rely exclusively on standardized tests – the link to the disad is super small which means you should err on the aff o/wing.

### A2 Homeschool DA

#### 1] no link – homeschool students can take high school equivalency tests like the GED or HSET and apply to college using those. The aff doesn’t remove equivalency tests because they are distinct from admissions tests

#### 2] the aff outweighs – massive structural violence within the public-school system due to the myth of meritocracy is worse than a small number of homeschool students having a slightly harder time in applying to college

#### 3] no impact – homeschooled students can just switch to public school in senior year right before apps are due and then apply to college

#### 4] TURN – homeschooled students are especially pressured by standardized tests because they aren’t sure if what they have been taught matches with the test – perpetuates stress and test anxiety

#### 5] TURN – Their stats are misleading – only students that knew they would do well take tests – means removing them makes the process more accessible.

Jahan 19 <https://wehavekids.com/education/Do-Homeschoolers-Really-Do-Better-on-Tests> February 13, 2019 J. 200+ articles TJHSSTAD

Critical Arguments Critics point out that these higher scores do not indicate that homeschooling is superior to other forms of schooling. Some arguments are: Students who take these tests are self-selecting, so we don't know if homeschoolers overall are doing better than other students. But all SAT and ACT takers are self-selecting regardless of how they were schooled. However, there is no way to know if homeschoolers are taking these tests at a lower or higher rate than public or private school students. If broken down by demographics, homeschoolers may not fare so well. Homeschoolers tend to come from higher earning and better educated families, which may account for the higher scores. Sampling is sometimes done to compare homeschoolers to public school students. Critics point out that successful homeschooling parents may be more likely to allow their children to be tested than less successful homeschoolers. The Demographic Argument Johnna Burns of Northeastern State University made the demographic case in a 1999 study called "The Correlational Relationship between Homeschooling Demographics and High Test Scores." 1 According to Burns, homeschoolers are more likely to come from homes with educated parents and higher incomes. Homeschooling parents are less likely to divorce (which is true of higher income couples in general). Homeschooled kids watch less television. All of this results in higher academic achievement. As a result, Burns says that there is "inconclusive evidence of the actual quality of homeschool instruction." A U.S. Department of Education study found that homeschooling parents are about twice as likely to have advanced degrees. But the percentages with Bachelors degrees or some college is similar to the population overall. Blacks and Hispanics are underrepresented among homeschoolers. 2 HSLDA Study The Home School Legal Defense Association (HSLDA) commissioned a study called the "Homeschool Progress Report 2009." 3 This report did look at demographics. This study found that: "Homeschoolers are still achieving well beyond their public school counterparts—no matter what their family background, socioeconomic level, or style of homeschooling." Homeschoolers in this study were actually not better off or better educated, when compared to other households headed by two parents. "Homeschoolers’ median family income ($75,000–79,999) closely spanned the nationwide median (about $79,000) for families headed by a married couple and with one or more related children under 18." Homeschool households where neither parent had a college degree did less well than households with one or more college graduate parents. But the differences in academic performance were not significant. "Students whose parents both had a college degree performed better than those who had no parent with a college degree. However, this correlation is generally weaker for homeschool students than for public school students. The homeschooled students whose parents did not have college degrees still performed at the 83rd percentile." According to this study, homeschoolers have significantly higher test scores than the national average. "Homeschooled boys (87th percentile) and girls (88th percentile) scored equally well; the income level of parents did not appreciably affect the results (household income under $35,000: 85th percentile—household income over $70,000: 89th percentile); and while parent education level did have some impact, even children whose parents did not have college degrees scored in the 83rd percentile, which is well above the national average for public school students. Homeschooled children whose parents both had college degrees scored in the 90th percentile." 4 Since the HSLDA is a group that represents homeschoolers, it is possible that there is bias in the study, which consisted of 11,739 participants. Critics can easily make the self-selecting claim that only parents who knew their children would do well would participate.

### A2 Brain Drain DA

#### 1] TURN – standardized tests is the key access point for international students

Wong 13 There or Back Again? The Motivations and Future Plans of Chinese Students in the United States by Christopher Patrick Wong B.A. in Anthropology and International Affairs, May 2007, The George Washington University A Thesis submitted to The Faculty of The Elliott School of International Affairs of The George Washington University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of International Affairs January 31, 2013 Thesis directed by Bruce Dickson Professor of Political Science and International Affairs TJHSSTAD

On the most fundamental level, large-scale international student mobility has arisen because of expanded standardized testing and global university rankings. They have created an international marketplace from which students can select schools. Internationally recognized standardized tests, including English proficiency tests such as the TOEFL and IELTS, have become increasingly accessible to Chinese students and offer an alternative to the national exams that determine domestic educational advancement. The number of IELTS test-takers in China alone exceeds 300,000 each year.1 On the other hand, global university rankings have become reference points for students interested in studying abroad. Shanghai Jiaotong University has famously published its Academic Ranking of World Universities every year since 1 Chinese IELTS Official Website, accessed October 25, 2012, http://www.chinaielts.org/en/. 6 2003, on which Western universities routinely dominate.

#### Implies removing tests means less international students come to the US.

#### 2] No internal link – brain drain doesn’t happen – people go back to their homes because that’s where their culture and family is

#### A2 Wake Forest ev.

#### Your ev. is terrible – its from a single test optional school that just happened to see an increase in international students – means 1) I don’t link because the aff isn’t test optional 2) there’s no causation between removing tests and increasing international students, it’s just a correlation and 3) your ev. just says there were more international applicants in the pool, not more international students accepted, which means no link

#### TURN – not evaluating standardized testing makes objectively and effectively admitting international students impossible which means less come to the US.

Bhatia 19, Avvalzameer , 3-5-19, “Standardized test scores are a necessary assessment to equalize UC admissions”, <https://dailybruin.com/2019/03/05/standardized-test-scores-are-a-necessary-assessment-to-equalize-uc-admissions/>

Each year, tens of thousands of students from thousands of schools across the globe vie for the chance to call themselves Bruins. One of the few things unifying that massively varied applicant pool: sitting at a desk and taking the SAT – or the ACT, if that’s your cup of tea. Standardized test scores are one of 14 factors the University of California uses to comprehensively review admissions applications and assess a student’s readiness for college. But many students have complained about the effectiveness of standardized test scores in determining college success. Recently, Beyond the Score, a student organization that seeks to challenge the use of standardized tests in University admissions, [hosted a town hall to raise awareness](https://dailybruin.com/2019/02/21/student-group-seeks-end-of-standardized-testing-in-college-admissions/) about the drawbacks of requiring that applicants take the SAT or ACT. Members of the organization called the tests inherently racist, claiming the structure of standardized tests disadvantages minorities, people of color and students from lower-income families who can’t afford preparatory courses. However, standardized tests also have a number of advantages. Test scores allow universities to put applicants from various backgrounds with different academic and grading systems on a level playing field. This gives students with inflated or deflated high school GPAs a fair opportunity to demonstrate their skill sets and knowledge of core concepts expected of university admits. The UC Academic Senate is in the process of reviewing the role of standardized testing in the admissions process, at the request of UC President Janet Napolitano. Specifically, the academic task force is working toward determining the validity and usefulness of standardized test scores and high school GPAs in the admissions process. But it’s crucial standardized tests stay in place. Tests such as the SAT and ACT act as equalizers for applicants, making things fairer, especially for international students who come from various backgrounds and academic systems. Ricardo Vazquez, a UCLA spokesperson, said standardized tests provide a uniform reference point independent of individual high schools’ grading systems or rigor, contributing to the fairness of the UC admissions process. He’s right: Standardized testing puts applicants on an even playing field. Students around the world are exposed to questions that test their knowledge of the same English and math concepts and are expected to finish the test in a set time limit. Additionally, all tests are graded on the same scale and generally have a consistent level of difficulty, making them a fair avenue for students to demonstrate their skills and readiness for college. Test scores also act as a counterweight to the variability of applicants’ high school GPAs. “My high school precalculus class was extremely easy when compared to those offered by other local public schools,” said Olivia Schulist, a third-year society and genetics student. “It would not have been fair to base a decision regarding my admission solely on my high school GPA.” Standardized tests are even more important when comparing the academic competence of international students. The UC admissions pool is comprised of students from all over the world, and countries across the globe follow different academic programs and grading scales. Many of these programs tend to be more challenging, time-consuming or simply different from those followed by American high schools. It’s important to have at least one common standard to cut across the diverse applicant pool. Standardized tests offer just that. Priscilla To, a third-year business economics student, said in her hometown of Hong Kong alone, schools follow myriad academic systems, such as the local Hong Kong Diploma of Secondary Education, the International Baccalaureate, the American Advanced Placement and the British General Certificate of Education. “These different academic systems vary in difficulty and emphasize different skills,” To said. “Standardized testing enables universities to understand a student’s performance.” Additionally, standardized tests allow universities to set a bar for their admits. A university’s admitted-student SAT score range allows applicants to better understand the university’s requirements and make informed decisions regarding their applications. “I think the SATs are important to gauge the academic standing of applicants and establish a benchmark for admission to a particular university,” said Aditi Ganesh, a third-year economics student. They also add a sense of predictability to the admissions process. Applicants can expect higher chances of admission if their scores on standardized tests fall in the top 25 percent of previously admitted students’ scores. This allows them to be more pragmatic about the universities they apply to. Of course, standardized tests can appear to disadvantage lower-income students who cannot always afford to pay for lessons, study materials and practice tests. These students can struggle to cover the cost of taking the test and sending scores to universities. Despite these barriers, the solution clearly isn’t removing standardized testing altogether. The UC already takes applicants’ socioeconomic background into account and compares their scores on standardized tests with others from similar communities and backgrounds. By using a holistic admissions process, the UC is able to compare applicants from all backgrounds on a level ground. With over 100,000 students’ admission decisions on the line, UCLA must be more objective than ever. And until a better alternative is found, the SAT and ACT are the best we have.

### A2 Mismatch DA

#### 1] TURN – GPA is a more reliable predictor of college performance.

Maitre 14 High school grades are a better predictor of college success than SAT, ACT, study saysMichelle Maitre covers career and college readiness. [Contact her](http://edsource.org/contact-michelle-maitre#.UwaolPRdXU4) and follow her on Twitter [@michelle\_maitre](https://twitter.com/michelle_maitre). Sign up [here](http://edsource.org/subscribe-page.html) for a no-cost online subscription to EdSource Today for reports from the largest education reporting team in California. FEBRUARY 21, 2014 TJHSSTAD

As California and other states work to define what “college and career readiness” means, a [new study](http://www.nacacnet.org/research/research-data/nacac-research/Documents/DefiningPromise.pdf) finds that a more reliable predictor of whether a student does well in college is his or her high school grades, rather than ACT or SAT scores. “One of the core messages of this study is that high school grades matter, and they matter a lot,” said principal investigator William C. Hiss, a professor and former dean of admissions at [Bates College](http://www.bates.edu/) in Lewiston, Maine. The study analyzed student and alumni records from 123,000 students in 33 colleges where SAT or ACT scores are optional for admission. The results found that a student’s performance in college closely mirrored their performance in high school: Students with strong grade point averages in high school maintained similar GPAs in college, regardless of how well or poorly they scored on college entrance exams. Likewise, students with lower GPAs – even those with high SAT or ACT scores – had lower GPAs in college and graduated at lower rates. “That surprised me,” Hiss said. “I did not expect to see the correlation was that close.” The study, published Feb. 18 on the website of the [National Association for College Admission Counseling](http://www.nacacnet.org/Pages/default.aspx), adds new fuel to [debates](http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2013/09/06/why-the-sats-shouldnt-be-a-factor-in-college-admissions) over the role of entrance exams in college admissions. Students in the study who did not submit SAT or ACT scores were more likely to be minorities, the first in their family to attend college, come from low-income families, and have learning disabilities, the study said. Standardized admissions tests can create a barrier to college for many students, Hiss said. “For economic growth and social stability, America will need to find successful paths to higher education for hundreds of thousands of additional first-generation-to-college, minority, immigrant, rural and (learning disabled) students,” Hiss wrote in a [fact sheet](http://www.nacacnet.org/media-center/PressRoom/2014/Pages/BillHiss.aspx) accompanying the study. “This study provides the research support for optional testing as at least one route by which that can happen.” The report comes as California grapples with the best way to measure how well schools are preparing students to succeed in college and careers

#### Our study o/w – its across a huge number of students and colleges and over multiple decades.

### A2 Funding / Financial Strain / Student Debt DA

#### **1] TURN – Removing standardized tests can put a short-term strain on colleges, but increases alumni donations and funding in the future – Trinity proves.**

Tough 9/10 What College Admissions Offices Really Want Elite schools say they’re looking for academic excellence and diversity. But their thirst for tuition revenue means that wealth trumps all. By PAUL TOUGH SEPT. 10, 2019Paul Tough is a contributing writer for the magazine. His article in this week’s issue is adapted from his new book, “The Years That Matter Most: How College Makes or Breaks Us,” which has its roots in his last article for the magazine about the disparity in graduation rates between rich and working-class students. Source photographs from Getty Images and Seth Poppel/Yearbook Library This article is adapted from ‘‘The Years That Matter Most: How College Makesor Breaks Us,’’ published by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. TJHSSTAD

But perhaps the most startling fact about the pre-Pérez admissions strategy at Trinity was that it was not doing much to help the college stay afloat financially. As Pérez saw it, this was mostly a question of demographics. The pool of affluent 18-year-old Americans was shrinking, especially in the Northeast, and the ones who remained had come to understand that they had significant bargaining power when it came to negotiating tuition discounts with the colleges that wanted to admit them. As a result, paradoxically, Trinity was going broke educating an unusually wealthy student body. Pérez thought Trinity could do better. To him, the school’s existing enrollment-management strategy was simply unsustainable — financially, academically and morally. In the fall of 2015, he recommended to the president and the board of trustees that Trinity abandon its previous approach to admissions and move in more or less the opposite direction. If the school put more emphasis on recruiting and enrolling excellent low-income and first-generation students, Pérez argued, it might require an additional short-term investment in financial aid — not an easy step, he acknowledged, for an institution losing millions of dollars a year. But it would improve Trinity’s flagging reputation by making the school not only more socioeconomically diverse but also more academically elite. That transformation, Pérez believed, would attract more applicants and bring in more alumni donations as well. Part of what makes life in enrollment management so challenging is that each admissions decision you make has implications for your college that go well beyond the composition of next fall’s freshman class. Which students you accept and which ones you reject this year will help determine who will apply to your college next year. That phenomenon was due, in large part, to the power of the “America’s Best Colleges” list published each year by U.S. News & World Report. The list rewards colleges for admitting students with high SAT scores; the more high-scoring students you admit, the better U.S. News likes you. The U.S. News list is openly loathed by people who work in admissions; in a 2011 poll, the most recent available, only 3 percent of admissions officials nationwide said they thought the “America’s Best Colleges” list accurately reflected the actual best colleges in America, and 87 percent said the list caused universities to take steps that were “counterproductive” to their educational mission in order to improve their ranking. But people in admissions can’t ignore the U.S. News rankings. They know that American high school students and their families take them very seriously. Research on national universities has demonstrated, using data analysis, what enrollment managers know in their bones: If you rise even one place on the U.S. News list, you will receive more and better applications from next year’s crop of high school seniors. And if you fall even one place on the list ... well, God help you. Jon Boeckenstedt, who spent 17 years helping run the enrollment department at DePaul University in Chicago before moving west this summer to take a similar position at Oregon State, has traced this effect from inside the profession. Boeckenstedt, who is in his early 60s, was a first-generation college student himself, the son of a manual laborer from Dubuque, Iowa. He maintains two lively blogs about the practice of college admissions, and in recent years he has used them as a platform to advocate for more clarity, honesty and fairness in the field of enrollment management — or as he sometimes calls it, the admissions-industrial complex. “Few enrollment-management people will admit this publicly, but we’re all sort of in the same boat,” Boeckenstedt told me when I visited him in his office at DePaul in 2017. “Admissions for us is not a matter of turning down students we’d like to admit. It’s a matter of admitting students we’d like to turn down.” In his writing, Boeckenstedt explains the connections between the everyday pressures enrollment managers like him experience in their jobs and the stark socioeconomic stratification that now pervades higher education. For one recent post on his blog Higher Ed Data Stories, he created a detailed multicolored chart that compared admissions data from more than 1,000 colleges and sorted those colleges according to three cross-referenced variables: their mean freshman SAT score, the percentage of their freshmen who receive federal Pell grants and the percentage of their students who are black or Latino. The resulting graphic demonstrates, in a vivid way, what might be called the iron law of college admissions: The colleges with high average SAT scores — which are also the highest-ranked colleges and the ones with the lowest acceptance rates and the largest endowments — admit very few low-income students and very few black and Latino students. In fact, Boeckenstedt’s chart shows an almost perfect correlation between institutional selectivity and students’ average family income, a steady, unwavering diagonal line slicing through the graph. With only a few exceptions, every American college follows the same pattern. There is a popular and persistent image of college admissions in which diversity-obsessed universities are using affirmative action to deny spaces to academically talented affluent students while admitting low-income students with lower ability in their place. Boeckenstedt says the opposite is closer to the truth. If you’re an enrollment manager, he explains, the easiest category of students for you to admit are below-average students from high-income families. Because their parents can afford tutoring, they are very likely to have decent test scores, which means they won’t hurt your U.S. News ranking. They probably won’t distinguish themselves academically at your college, but they can pay full tuition. And they don’t have a lot of other options, so they’re likely to say yes to your admission offer. “These are the kids who will gladly pay more to move up the food chain,” Boeckenstedt says. “I call them the C.F.O. Specials, because they appeal to the college’s chief financial officer. They are challenging for the faculty, but they bring in a lot of revenue.” Boeckenstedt says that there are two structural factors that make life difficult for enrollment managers who want to admit more low-income students. The first factor is the simple need for tuition revenue. Unless colleges can reduce their costs, it is going to be difficult for them to resist the lure of wealthy students who can pay full price. And there are several perverse incentives in the marketplace that make it hard for colleges to cut costs. The most basic one is that the U.S. News algorithm rewards them for spending a lot of money: Higher faculty salaries and more spending on student services lead directly to better rankings. If you reduce your expenses, your ranking will fall, which means that next year your applicant pool will probably shrink. So instead you keep your spending high, which means you need a lot of tuition revenue, which means you need to keep admitting lots of rich kids. Things are different among the wealthiest colleges. They often advertise themselves as “need blind,” and yet their freshman classes tend to include relatively few students from families with the greatest financial need. Boeckenstedt points out a fact that is somehow simultaneously totally obvious and yet still kind of dumbfounding: Some of the most selective colleges have so much money that they could easily admit freshman classes made up entirely of academically excellent Pell-eligible students and charge them nothing at all. The cost in lost tuition would amount to a rounding error in their annual budgets. But not only do those and other selective colleges not take that step; they generally do the opposite, year after year. As a group, they admit fewer Pell-eligible students than almost any other institutions. Colleges like DePaul, with much smaller endowments, somehow manage to find the money to admit and give aid to twice as many low-income students, proportionally, as elite colleges do. Why don’t the most selective colleges do more? The answer, in Boeckenstedt’s opinion, is that staying “elite” depends not just on admitting a lot of high-scoring students. It also depends on admitting a lot of rich ones. And he has a point: The researchers Nicholas A. Bowman and Michael N. Bastedo showed in a 2008 paper that when colleges take steps to become more racially or socioeconomically diverse, applications tend to go down in future years. “Maybe — just maybe — the term ‘elite’ means ‘uncluttered by poor people,’ ” Boeckenstedt wrote. “And maybe that’s the problem?” There is a second big structural problem standing in the way of colleges that want to admit a more socioeconomically balanced freshman class: the extraordinary power of standardized admission tests and the apparently unbreakable relationship between family income and SAT or ACT scores. “In general, the higher your freshman-class SAT, the lower the percentage of freshmen on Pell and the less diverse you are,” Boeckenstedt wrote in one blog post. “Thus, when we ask universities to be ‘excellent,’ and we define ‘excellence’ by input variables like SAT or ACT scores and selectivity, this is what we’re left with: Colleges who want to do the right thing have to act counter to their own interests.”

#### 2] TURN – shift away from tests forces colleges to revise merit aid policies that overwhelmingly benefit privileged students that can already pay for college.

Tough 9/10 What College Admissions Offices Really Want Elite schools say they’re looking for academic excellence and diversity. But their thirst for tuition revenue means that wealth trumps all. By PAUL TOUGH SEPT. 10, 2019Paul Tough is a contributing writer for the magazine. His article in this week’s issue is adapted from his new book, “The Years That Matter Most: How College Makes or Breaks Us,” which has its roots in his last article for the magazine about the disparity in graduation rates between rich and working-class students. Source photographs from Getty Images and Seth Poppel/Yearbook Library This article is adapted from ‘‘The Years That Matter Most: How College Makesor Breaks Us,’’ published by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. TJHSSTAD

The first number was the size of the class, which had to be as close as possible to 600 students. The second number, even more pressing, was the combined tuition revenue those 600 students needed to bring in. And back in February, Trinity’s board of trustees decided on the tuition target for the class of 2021: $19 million. Pérez knew that if he was going to hit those two numbers, there was one tool that was going to be more important than any other: financial aid. The modern practice of enrollment management was invented in the mid-1970s by a man named Jack Maguire, who was then the dean of admissions at Boston College, and one of his most important innovations was to deploy financial aid strategically, as a way to attract the students he most wanted to admit, whether they genuinely needed financial assistance or not. It was something of a radical idea — giving aid to students who didn’t need it — and it didn’t seem, at first, to make sense. But in the 1980s, other colleges began experimenting with this new strategy, giving these grants the euphemistic name “merit aid,” and they found it worked remarkably well. It turned out that offering grants — even relatively small ones — to students with high family incomes made it significantly more likely that those students would enroll in your college. (If you called the grant a “scholarship,” it worked even better.) And if a well-off student was willing to pay, say, $30,000 of your $40,000 tuition, that was still a pretty good deal for your college. Over the last 30 years, as list-price tuitions have climbed rapidly, this strategy has spread to almost every private college in the nation, and many public ones, as well. And as merit aid has expanded, it has created two big problems. The first, and most obvious, is that if you give more aid to rich kids, you have less to offer to poor kids. American colleges collectively now give more institutional aid to each student with a family income over $100,000, on average, than they do to each student with a family income under $20,000. Equity aside, many enrollment managers have come to see the spread of merit aid as a dire threat to their institutions’ financial health. Maguire’s approach may have worked well when only a few colleges were doing it, but it works much less well now that everyone is. Beginning in the early 2000s, the practice of giving out merit aid evolved first into an arms race and then, more recently, into what is beginning to look like a death spiral. At private, nonprofit four-year colleges — a category that includes most of the nation’s highly selective institutions — 89 percent of students receive some form of financial aid, meaning that almost no one is paying full price. Colleges still publish official tuition rates, just as they used to, and those published rates are often astoundingly high. But the official numbers have become almost entirely divorced from reality. Each year, colleges offer larger and larger “tuition discounts” — a broad term for institutional aid — in order to attract the students they want. In 2018 the average tuition-discount rate for freshmen at private, nonprofit universities hit 50 percent for the first time, meaning that colleges were charging students, on average, less than half of their posted tuition rates.

#### 3] TURN – The plan results in more rigorous applications that boost the efficiency of admissions offices.

McCubbin 18 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 RE recut TJHSSTAD

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 seen 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. A school that is not seeking to increase socioeconomic and racial diversity and finds that test scores really are a predictor of success in their environment may opt to continue utilizing them in their admission process (Jencks & Phillips, 1998). They may even consider utilizing a test optional or test flexible strategy to provide greater access (Simon, 2015). But chances are, that same school will uncover additional factors that carry equal weight to success on their campus and can incorporate opportunities in their application for students to demonstrate those things as well. In doing this, a school may see a decrease in the number of applications they receive but their likelihood of yielding the students that do apply should increase.

#### 4] TURN – more applications means colleges gain a perception of selectivity – perception of selectivity is key to acquiring funding.

#### 5] Alt causes to student debt and financial crisis – lack of financial literacy among undergrads and close to zero transparency from private corporations encourage malpractice – no uniqueness.

### A2 Politics DA

#### 1] TURN – double bind – either Trump takes credit for education reform, which isolates his base and the white elites that support him, or he doesn’t in which case the democrats do and win.

#### 2] Trump wins 2020 – keeps riding the wave.

Black 9/27 [Conrad Black](https://nationalpost.com/author/cblacknp) September 27, 2019 2:56 PM EDT Filed under Full Comment Conrad Black: Why Donald Trump will win big in 2020 FDR in 1936, Lyndon Johnson in 1964, Richard Nixon in 1972, Ronald Reagan in 1984, all won by over 20 points. Trump will gain a victory on that scale next year, and he will have earned it

Trump’s offence, and his strength, is that he doesn’t make much effort to disguise the fact that he is a fierce, tough and often ruthless alumnus of the very tough schools of American capitalism, entertainment and politics. The Globe and Mail headline implies that he has ridden his luck to where he is now. In fact, in making billions of dollars in (principally) Manhattan real estate, inventing a television concept and pulling in 25 million viewers every week for 14 seasons, devising a concept of levering celebrity, through being a boxing and wrestling impresario, a tabloid star and a reality TV icon, and then changing party affiliations seven times in 13 years and using social media to end-run the national press, seizing control of one of the great political parties and gaming the electoral system into the White House, he achieved more prior to his inauguration than any of the 43 preceding U.S. presidents except Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Grant, Eisenhower, and possibly Hoover. He is the only person elected president of the U.S. who never sought or held a public office or high military command and only the sixth to win the office with fewer votes than his chief opponent. This wasn’t luck; it was ambitious calculation and flawless execution. [Conrad Black: Trudeau's not a racist, just a hypocrite and a weak leader](https://nationalpost.com/news/politics/election-2019/conrad-black-trudeaus-not-a-racist-just-a-hypocrite-and-a-weak-leader?video_autoplay=true) [Conrad Black: Trump is right to take on China, but Canada shouldn't extradite Meng](https://nationalpost.com/opinion/conrad-black-trump-is-right-to-take-on-china-but-canada-shouldnt-extradite-meng) [Conrad Black: The Quebec separatism crisis is quietly and slowly fading](https://nationalpost.com/opinion/conrad-black-the-quebec-separatism-crisis-is-quietly-and-slowly-fading) Canadians liked Obama because he was non-white, fluent and suave, leftish and undemanding of “allies.” But GDP growth per capita in the U.S. declined from 4.5 per cent under Reagan to 3.9 per cent under Clinton, to two per cent under George W. Bush, to one per cent under Obama, and the Americans were not going to stand for what they feared (instinctively) would happen next under the Democrats. They were right. With Trump, working and lower-middle class earnings have risen 3.4 per cent annually, average income for female-led, single-parent homes rose 7.6 per cent, defined poverty in such households among African-American and Hispanics fell by 3.5 per cent, and the number of defined poor people declined by over five million. Illegal immigration has been reduced by 60 per cent; oil imports, which were five million barrels a day four years ago, are zero (on a net basis), and in absolute terms, China has ceased to gain in GDP on the United States, and the concept of nuclear non-proliferation has been revived in respect of Iran and North Korea (who swindled Trump’s predecessors). The United States worships success, and practices it, rather than being envious of it. The United States, by the standards of most other advanced countries, is garish and corrupt; it’s not what many Americans and most Canadians want, but it is a democracy and Americans can run their country as they please. There has never in human history been anything like the rise of America from three million colonists to overwhelming pre-eminence in the whole world in two long lifetimes (1783-1945). Successful American presidents are never Mr. Nice Guy, though it’s a bonus when, like Franklin D. Roosevelt and Ronald Reagan, they act the part. This Ukraine nonsense is a fraudulent desperation shot by the Democrats and will blow up in their faces. Donald Trump is probably the most successful and powerful person in the world and he will steamroller this rag-tag of kooks and retreads desultorily arrayed against him. The U.S. system periodically crushes one of its parties like a waffle. FDR in 1936, Lyndon Johnson in 1964, Richard Nixon in 1972, Ronald Reagan in 1984, all won by over 20 points. The Globe and Mail can dream on like Johnny Cash’s Teenage Queen, but Trump will gain a victory on that scale next year, and like the presidents just mentioned, he will have earned it. Those who resurrect the fortunes of great nations are not groomed and sent out by casting studios, or subject to confirmation by foreign newspapers.

#### **3] Experts agree – Trump will get re-elected.**

Volastro 9/13 (YES LIKE, TODAY)Two-thirds of top executives say Trump will be reelected in 2020, business survey reveals PUBLISHED 4 HOURS AGOUPDATED 2 HOURS AGO 9/13/2019 Anthony Volastro @VOLASTROCNBC KEY POINTS

More than two-thirds of chief financial officers surveyed by CNBC think Donald Trump will be reelected President of the United States in 2020; a quarter say former Vice President Joe Biden will win. A weak economy can be a major setback for an incumbent; however, the majority of CFOs say a recession is not on the horizon. This is in spite of the fact that corporations say the trade war between the U.S. and China will continue to hurt them. WATCH NOW VIDEO02:02 Q3 CFO Survey Results Recent polls reveal a downgrade in President Donald Trump’s job approval rating on the economy and show he’s trailing in head-to-head match-ups against the leading 2020 presidential election Democratic candidates, but a majority of U.S. business leaders believe, at least for now, that he will win reelection. More than two-thirds of North American chief financial officers surveyed by CNBC say Trump will win the 2020 election, while a quarter say former Vice President Joe Biden, according to the results of the latest CNBC Global CFO Council survey for the third quarter 2019. The CNBC Global CFO Council represents some of the largest public and private companies in the world, collectively managing more than $5 trillion in market value across a wide variety of sectors. The Q3 2019 survey was conducted between Aug. 21 and Sept. 3 among 62 global members of the council. This is the first time the quarterly CNBC CFO survey has asked C-suite executives about the upcoming presidential election, and it is early in the election cycle. CFOs also tend to follow the prevailing sentiment rather than buck it. During the early days of the GOP campaigning process for the 2016 nomination, CFOs surveyed said they did not think Trump would prevail. When he was the clearly established leader in the polls, by spring 2016 they came around, but later survey results showed there was never a majority of CF Os who thought he would win the election over Hillary Clinton. Trump’s numbers have taken a hit over fears of an economic slowdown and the trade war with China — CNN/RSS, Washington Post-ABC News, and Quinnipiac University polls all show a drop in the president’s job approval — and his slipping numbers caught Wall Street’s attention. Carl Quintanilla ✔ @carlquintanilla JPMORGAN: cites recent poll numbers showing Trump is under pressure on trade, adds that a recession would be “politically devastating” — and says, as a result, we could see “real progress” with China and “a more sustained rally.” View image on TwitterView image on Twitter 24 4:26 PM - Sep 10, 2019 Twitter Ads info and privacy 21 people are talking about this CNBC’s survey of top corporate executives shows that U.S. trade policy is a headwind. A majority of CFOs say trade policy will be a negative for their business over the next six months. Nearly half say their companies have experienced higher input costs as a result of tariffs, and more than a quarter say they’ve increased prices to offset those higher costs. One other finding from the Q3 survey provides a potential reason why CFOs believe Trump’s chances are good. Trade repercussions are not translating into fears of a recession in 2020. Sixty-five percent of CFOs say the U.S. economy will not experience a recession in 2020, and they hold this belief even though they do not support Trump’s view that more interest-rate cuts are needed from the Federal Reserve to keep the economic expansion going. The majority of CFOs say that the current level of interest rates are “appropriate.” Economic conditions and elections An incumbent president has historically suffered in election years when the economy is struggling, though there have been only two formal recessions during election years since World War II. Harry Truman and Jimmy Carter ran for reelection in the same year as a recession. Truman won; Carter lost. By other economic measures, a weak economy does hurt an incumbent president’s chances. The University of Michigan Consumer Sentiment Index helps track consumer views on, and expectations for, the economy. Over that survey’s history back to the mid-20th century, it has “largely” found that “if the index is low, the incumbent doesn’t get reelected,” said Richard Curtin, director of surveys of consumers at the University of Michigan. GP: President Donald J. Trump Campaigns at SNHU Arena in Manchester, NH President Donald J. Trump’s crowd cheers at the first “Keep America Great” re-election campaign rally at SNHU Arena in Manchester, New Hampshire, on Aug. 15, 2019. Boston Globe | Boston Globe | Getty Images Presidents running for reelection amid weak economic conditions also struggle because they need to find other issues to draw voters, Lynn Vavreck, an American politics and public policy professor at UCLA, recently told CNBC. She added that Trump is “better positioned than most” to withstand a slowdown, because he ran on identity-focused issues like immigration in 2016, “but without a good economy it will be harder for him to swing marginal voters.” A J.P. Morgan report from Thursday put the odds of recession within one year at 40%, citing not only the global economic weakness and the inverted yield curve in U.S. government bonds but tight labor markets, narrowing business margins and high corporate debt as vulnerabilities that are “ample, but not glaring.” It also noted high valuations in the tech sector and the trade war. The CNBC Global CFO Council survey found three regions around the world where CFOs describe economic conditions as “declining”: China, the Euro zone and the U.K. The U.K. has been “declining” for three straight quarters, while both the Euro zone and China slipped from “stable” in Q2 to declining in Q3. The U.S. economic situation shifted from “improving” in Q2 to “stable” in Q3, and an unresolved trade war could further pressure the outlook in future surveys.

### A2 Anti-trust DA

#### \*\*defend 50 states / USFG (if didn’t spec normal means)\*\*

#### 1] No uniqueness – Trump already has an early admissions case that violates anti-trust.

Jaschik 18 Justice Department Investigates Early-Decision Admissions Focus appears to be how some colleges share information about those admitted early. Common App asks applicants to consent to the practice. By Scott Jaschik April 9, 2018 Note: This article has been updated from a version posted Friday evening.

The Justice Department has started an investigation into whether some colleges' early-decision admissions programs violate federal antitrust laws through agreements among institutions or through the sharing of information about accepted applicants. Colleges reported receiving letters from the department Thursday and Friday in which the agency told the institutions of the investigation and demanded that certain documents, if they exist, be maintained. The letter, a copy of which was obtained by Inside Higher Ed, says the investigation pertains to "a potential agreement between colleges relating to their early decision practices." In early-decision programs, applicants pledge to enroll at colleges that admit them. The programs have become quite popular with applicants and colleges. Many colleges that are competitive in admissions admit large shares of their classes this way. The Justice Department letter does not detail what agreement or practices are being investigated. But the letter gives some indication, by outlining the documents that colleges are being required to maintain. The focus of the investigation appears to be whether colleges with early-decision programs are sharing information about admitted applicants with other colleges as a way to enforce the requirement that early-decision applicants attend institutions that admit them. Students appear to give permission for this when they use the Common Application to apply early. And some admissions experts say that some colleges indeed share information about those admitted early. The Justice Department letter asks colleges to maintain: "Agreements, both formal and informal, to exchange or otherwise disclose the identities of accepted students with persons at other colleges or universities. Communications with persons at other colleges or universities relating to the transmission of identities of accepted students, including the justifications for such transmission. Internal documents relating to the transmission of identities of accepted students to or from persons at other colleges or universities. Communications in which identities of accepted students are sent to or received from persons at other colleges or universities. Communications with persons at any other college or university relating to any student accepted at the college or university. Records of actions taken or decisions made based in whole or part on information received from another college or university about the identities of accepted students.

#### 2] no link – they misunderstand anti-trust law – it’s about COOPERATION BETWEEN COLLEGES – i.e. if they shared decisions and stuff – taking uniform action to not take into account tests isn’t cooperation because what one college does doesn’t affect another

#### 3] Their Hoffman evidence says “the DOJ approach has been anything but predictable” – means their link scenario is trash because we can’t predict what the DOJ will or will not do.

#### 4] no internal link between anti-trust enforcement and innovation – large ass companies like Google and Amazon prove that innovation is possible even if they have huge shares of the market.

### \*A2 Rainbow CP

#### 1] Perm do both – rainbow tests aren’t standardized – their evidence says they are used to assess students different learning styles and knowledge in different ways

#### 2] Bites the aff – the CP assumes some notion of a level playing field between students and equality of opportunity when they are taking tests which bites into meritocracy and is used to mask larger forms of structural oppression – that’s Au.

#### 3] Rainbow tests might be able to somewhat lower the differences in test scores between white students and marginalized students but it doesn’t say how much – those differences still exist which mean it doesn’t solve the aff

#### 4] Augmenting the SAT and ACT is bad and means the CP doesn’t solve the aff – a] they are graded on a bell curve, which means some students will always be discriminated against b] questions that black students score bad on being thrown out through bi-serial correlation proves tests will remain biased c] accessibility da – low-income students still can’t pay to take tests d] tutoring da – high-income elites will still get tutors to do better on tests

### \*A2 Lotteries CP

#### 1] perm do both – nothing mutually exclusive about removing tests and also having lotteries

#### 2] perm do the aff then the neg – perm eases the transition – removing tests and then implementing an admissions lottery is logistically easier

#### 3] their counterplan is based in a logic of colorblindness, assuming that not ignoring race, gender, and income completely solves oppression – that bites our critique of meritocracy because it assumes structural oppression doesn’t exist and that everyone is only a level playing field and can be picked by lottery to begin with.

#### The lottery system will not keep colleges from barring admission to certain students

Kamenetz 19 Anaya Kamenetz[Anya Kamenetz is an education correspondent at NPR. She joined NPR in 2014, working as part of a new initiative to coordinate on-air and online coverage of learning. Since then the NPR Ed team has won a 2017 Edward R. Murrow Award for Innovation,] “What if elite colleges switched to a lottery for admissions?” NPR march 27, 2019

But Pathak and Harris aren't so sure, based on their research, that a lottery would actually produce more fairness or equity in higher education — for poor students, students of color or anyone else. They argue that it hasn't done that for K-12.

The reason? Let's return to New Orleans for a second.

K-12 schools in the Big Easy are similar to colleges in terms of demand. Just one in five colleges is actually selective.

Similarly, Harris says only about 20 percent of the city's schools have more applications than students — in other words, they are "oversubscribed," meaning seats must be allocated by lottery. These schools also draw a group of white, affluent applicants who will head to private schools if they don't get into their small number of preferred charter schools.

The other 80 percent of schools, like 80 percent of colleges, have more seats than applicants.

When the competition is so concentrated in a handful of schools, opportunities to "sort and screen" students keep creeping back into the system, Pathak says.

"Centralized systems require a lot of maintenance," he says, sounding a bit like a beleaguered janitor.

In his upcoming book, Harris describes a total of 20 ways that the elite schools "sort and screen" to maintain their eliteness, like their location in a rich or poor neighborhood, the programs they choose to offer or even encouraging current parents to recommend the school to their friends. Intentional or not, this kind of signaling undermines open access, Harris says.

Or take New York City. It has a citywide system of ranked-choice matching, like OneApp for middle and high schools.

Students have hundreds of schools to choose from, and individual high schools had trouble figuring out which students really wanted to go to them. So they created an "open-house priority" for students who demonstrated interest by coming to an open house.

The not-very-surprising outcome? Teens with two working parents who were not native English speakers had a harder time navigating across boroughs to show up to open houses months before the high school application was due. Nor did they necessarily understand the importance of doing so. So New York City nixed the open-house priority.

But still, people are focused on eight high schools out of the hundreds in the city — the ones that have a special standardized test for admissions and that admit tiny numbers of black students.

What education researchers like Harris and Pathak really wish everyone would do is stop worrying so much about admissions. For that to happen, they have to stop confusing selective schools with good schools.

"I think it's unfortunate there's so much attention on a handful of schools that don't represent the schools that most students go to," says Pathak. "My own view? There's a lot of other things we should be thinking about." For example: making all the schools better.

### A2 Test Optional CP

#### 1] TURN – Test optional bad – research across over universities prove they have negligible impact on college diversity.

Belasco et al. 14 The Test-Optional Movement at America’s Selective Liberal Arts Colleges: A Boon for Equity or Something Else? Andrew S. Belasco University of Georgia College Transitions LLC Kelly O. Rosinger James C. Hearn University of Georgia Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis Month 201X, Vol. XX, No. X, pp. 1–18 DOI: 10.3102/0162373714537350 © 2014 AERA. <http://eepa.aera.net> TJHSSTAD

Results The graphs in Figure 1 illustrate changes in institutional diversity and admissions profile during the period of our study for both test-optional and test-requiring colleges. Graphs A and B show, respectively, that test-optional colleges enrolled a lower proportion of Pell recipients and underrepresented minorities, on average, than test-requiring institutions—during all years of the panel. Furthermore, and somewhat to our surprise, Graphs A and B reveal that test-optional colleges did not make any progress in narrowing these diversity-related gaps after they adopted test-optional policies. In contrast, Graphs C and D suggest that test-optional adopters did achieve relative gains on certain admissions-related indicators. For example, while test-optional institutions reported higher average SAT scores in initial years of the panel, their margins increased in later years, by approximately 25 points on average, as Graph C shows.4 Graph D also depicts steadily increasing margins in application Downloaded from http://eepa.aera.net at UNIV OF GEORGIA LIBRARIES on June 13, 2014 10 totals between test-optional and test-requiring schools. In the first year of our panel, (eventual), test-optional colleges received 150 more applications, on average, than their test-requiring counterparts; by the end of our panel, test-optional colleges were receiving approximately 550 more applications.5 While the graphs in Figure 1 illuminate changes in our outcomes of interest, they cannot communicate the magnitude and significance of such changes, especially given that additional factors, besides test-optional policy implementation, may have contributed to differences in diversity and admissions-related trends between test-optional and test-requiring institutions. Indeed, the descriptive statistics in Table 2 reveal substantial growth in other institution-level indicators, which may have contributed to diverging outcomes between the two groups. For example, Table 2 shows that institutional grant dollars per FTE at test-optional colleges more than doubled in constant dollars over the course of our panel, and averaged more than US$13,000 per student by 2010, which may explain relative gains in the number of applications received at these schools. In addition, test-optional colleges experienced greater increases in tuition and fee prices in constant dollars during the period of our study, which may have prevented optimal numbers of low-income and/or minority students from applying, and consequently, may have suppressed the positive effects that test-optional policies might have otherwise had on the diversity of adopting institutions. If tuition remained constant, would test-optional policies have contributed to increases in low-income and minority enrollment—as many test-optional colleges have claimed, and despite what the graph in Figure 1 indicates? Can diverging application totals be attributed to test-optional polices, increased grant aid, or both? Results from our DiD models address these and other such questions. Table 3 displays our regression results, which appear to confirm what the graphs in Figure 1 suggest—that test-optional admissions policies .15 .17 .19 .21 .23 .25 Pell (Proportion) 1992 1994 1996 1998 2000 2002 2004 2006 2008 2010 Year Test−Optional Test−Requiring A .05 .06 .07 .08 .09 .1 .11 .12 Minority (Proportion) 1992 1994 1996 1998 2000 2002 2004 2006 2008 2010 Year Test−Optional Test−Requiring B 900 950 1000 1050 1100 1150 Avg SAT (25%tile) 1992 1994 1996 1998 2000 2002 2004 2006 2008 2010 Year Test−Optional Test−Requiring C 1500 1900 2300 2700 3100 3500 Applications 1992 1994 1996 1998 2000 2002 2004 2006 2008 2010 Year Test−Optional Test−Requiring D Figure 1. Institutional diversity and admissions profile: Averages for test-optional and test-requiring colleges (1992–2010). Note. SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test. Downloaded from http://eepa.aera.net at UNIV OF GEORGIA LIBRARIES on June 13, 2014 11 Table 2 Means (and Standard Deviations) of Independent Variables (Test-Optional vs. Test-Requiring Colleges) Variable Minimum Maximum Test-optional (1992) Test-optional (2010) Test-requiring (1992) Test-requiring (2010) Independent No-loan policy 0.00 1.00 0.00 0.03 0.00 0.11 Undergraduate enrollment (FTE) 59.61 7,686.76 1,541.36 1,951.56 1,489.35 1,750.80 (640.57) (607.10) (869.12) (1,059.47) E&R expenditures (per FTE) 6,744.15 97,196.20 22,861.79 29,151.73 19,753.82 27,946.33 (5,226.24) (7,712.33) (6,870.28) (11,922.24) Tuition & fees 3,124.96 45,895.54 22,682.09 35,477.97 17,397.40 28,909.37 (3,226.14) (4,008.84) (5,361.74) (7,604.14) Institutional grant award (per FTE) 3.26 21,933.67 6,308.39 13,358.18 4,592.59 11,494.75 (1,667.48) (3,079.46) (2,214.47) (4,588.02) Admission rate 0.15 1.00 0.71 0.59 0.72 0.60 (0.10) (0.15) (0.17) (0.20) Dependent Proportion Pell 0.03 0.82 0.19 0.21 0.23 0.25 (0.08) (0.08) (0.12) (0.12) Proportion minority 0.00 0.56 0.06 0.10 0.07 0.12 (0.03) (0.05) (0.05) (0.07) Applications 23 10,068 1,706.16 3,524.38 1,544.91 2,980.06 (927.05) (1,545.08) (1,215.49) (2,121.63) Reported SAT score (25th percentile) 600 1,440 975.48 1,102.90 960.22 1,062.25 (73.30) (97.44) (129.75) (142.60) Institutions (N) 32 32 148 148 Note. FTE = full-time enrollment; SAT = Scholastic Aptitude Test. do not increase the diversity of policy-adopting liberal arts colleges, on average. In particular, when controlling for unobserved heterogeneity (via institution- and year-fixed effects) and other time-varying characteristics, test-optional policies failed to effect a positive change in the proportion of low-income and minority students enrolling at test-optional institutions. This finding contradicts simulated analyses of testoptional programs (Espenshade & Chung, 2011) and is also counter to the reports of several testoptional colleges (Bates College, 2004; Jaschik, 2006; McDermott, 2008). Yet, given the descriptive nature and narrow focus of these past studies—previous reports consisted mostly of case studies focusing on one or a small number of institutions—and the quasi-experimental nature of our own study, we are confident that results yielded from our models are robust and provide some evidence that test-optional policies overall have not been the catalysts of diversity that many have claimed them to be

#### Our study o/w – 1) other studies are case reports of single colleges – this study was over the span of over a decade and across over 100 colleges and universities 2) this study is the first use of linear regression for test optional vs test requiring colleges – other studies are descriptive but not empirical

#### 2] c/a Hernandez – Keeping tests hinders our ability to see the deeper purpose that tests serve and for whom – the CP can’t completely rupture the myth of meritocracy which means it doesn’t solve case.

#### 3] Test optional not good enough – 1) marginalized applicants still feel pressured to take tests and 2) the cost of submitting multiple tests adds up and makes the application process inaccessible.

**Chaaban 18** University should refuse to accept standardized test scores Marc Chaaban, a freshman majoring in political science, is a Hatchet opinions writer. Want to respond to this piece? [Submit](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfQljf0MAJA6as7zb_rYJwCknM6lbTodP0vFT-Bu3mvX6pfzA/viewform) a letter to the editor. This article appeared in the [October 15, 2018 issue](https://www.gwhatchet.com/issue/2018-10-15/) of the Hatchet. The Hatchet has disabled comments on our website. [Learn more.](https://www.gwhatchet.com/where-did-the-comments-go/)

Like every other student that has gone through the college admissions process, I understand the exhausting nature of standardized testing requirements. With different requirements depending on the school, navigating the aggravating world of the SAT, ACT, optional essay portion and subject tests is taxing on even the best student. Aside from just being a cause of undue stress on students, standardized testing has been called into question for its merits in recent years. Studies have [demonstrated](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2014/03/05/these-four-charts-show-how-the-sat-favors-the-rich-educated-families/?utm_term=.e7c0eb3e232f) that the SAT appears to favor high-income and educated families over students from lower-income and minority backgrounds, exhibiting a direct correlation between income level and test score. The University made the right decision by going [test-optional](https://www.gwhatchet.com/2015/07/27/university-will-no-longer-require-act-and-sat-scores-for-undergraduate-applications/) in 2015, a move which has undoubtedly improved the lives of students. But many students still feel [compelled](https://www.gwhatchet.com/2018/09/24/percent-of-students-submitting-sat-drops-after-score-changes-test-optional-switch/) to submit standardized test scores out of fear that their application will be seen as less competitive than their peers. The percentage of students submitting SAT scores to GW has [fallen](https://www.gwhatchet.com/2018/09/24/percent-of-students-submitting-sat-drops-after-score-changes-test-optional-switch/) from 70 to 46 percent since the test-optional policy was adopted but the percentage for students submitted ACT scores has remained stable – suggesting that while the test-optional policy has had an effect, many applicants still feel pressured to submit a test score. The test-optional trend is a positive change in higher education, but there is still room for GW and other universities to improve. The University should take its test-optional policy one step further and become the first U.S. university to not accept standardized test scores at all. No student should feel discouraged from applying to a college because they aren’t a good test taker or didn’t have the resources and support to perform as well as their peers on a standardized test. As long as GW accepts standardized tests, it is supporting a system that values numbers over individuals. The positives of this practice can be seen in the effects since GW implemented its test-optional policy. After GW implemented the new policy, minority representation in the freshman class [increased](https://www.gwhatchet.com/2016/11/21/class-of-2020-marks-most-diverse-freshmen-in-university-history/) by 33 percent in just one year. Even further, officials found students who [don’t submit](https://www.gwhatchet.com/2018/09/24/percent-of-students-submitting-sat-drops-after-score-changes-test-optional-switch/) scores have about the same first-year GPA as those who did, demonstrating that test scores are not a predictor of success in college. Separate data based on other universities also showed that a school going test-optional has little to [no effect](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/04/27/large-study-finds-colleges-go-test-optional-become-more-diverse-and-maintain) on graduation rates. By not accepting test scores, many lower-income students will be able to afford to apply to GW, helping increase student financial diversity. Just as GW focuses on racial diversity, it should also seek to improve financial diversity as about 14 [percent](https://www.gwhatchet.com/2017/02/06/we-can-change-gws-rich-kid-school-stereotype/) of students are in the top 1 percent of median family incomes. Affluent students are able to afford test-prep classes, purchase extra study materials and retake exams, which can cost up to [$64.50](https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/sat/register/fees), multiple times – all factors that are necessary to perform well because standardized tests are more about test-taking strategy than knowledge of the material. Even sending [SAT](https://collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/sat/register/fees) and [ACT](https://www.studypoint.com/ed/sending-act-scores/) scores to colleges costs $12 per school, which can add up quickly for students applying to multiple universities. Students who did not perform to their best ability on their high school report card may use standardized tests to demonstrate they are academically competitive, but there are other ways for applicants to prove they’re capable of success in college than an SAT or ACT score, including a personal statement or strong essay. Standardized tests often measure how many resources are at a student’s disposal rather than a student’s qualifications. The flawed metric is a disservice to all schools and students and although standardized tests are the status quo in college admissions – this practice can be changed starting with GW. As long as GW still accepts standardized tests, students will perceive that those who submit test scores will be viewed more favorably than other students. The cycle of stress for students and their families, both mental and financial, continues every year due to standardized tests. GW has an opportunity to be a leader and pave the way for an admissions process that truly judges students on their merit, which the SAT and ACT have repeatedly failed to showcase. For a school that is often criticized for lacking both racial and socioeconomic diversity, adopting a policy of not accepting standardized test scores in admissions can help GW take another step in the right direction toward a truly fair college admissions process.

#### **4] CP doesn’t solve – admissions officers are inevitably skeptical of students who don’t submit scores and hesitate in granting them admission.**

H&C Education 18 H&C Education is the first premier education consultancy founded by two Ivy League Ph.D. students who tackle every aspect of their clients’ applications together. We are dedicated to helping students from around the world gain admission to elite U.S. universities. We provide our clients with a unique roadmap for success in high school and in the college application process, and help students identify and pursue their passions in a mindful, focused manner. Test-Optional Colleges: What’s The Catch? October 24, 2018

Does not sending test scores hurt applicants? There’s a popular analogy for discussing what the “optional” in “test-optional” really means. It goes like this: imagine someone—let’s call him Brian—is browsing profiles on a dating website where personal photos are optional. Brian might take a chance and go on a date with someone whose bio is truly incredible, even if that person hasn’t chosen to upload a personal photo. But in the case of anyone who seems less than saintly, Brian may very well wonder: why didn’t this person want to upload a picture? What is he or she trying to hide? Clearly, Brian is a little superficial, but that’s what makes this comparison a good one. Admissions folks tend to be a little “superficial” as well—by which I mean that even if they have reservations about standardized test results, they’re used to placing a lot of importance on them. Try as they might to focus on the true qualities of an applicant, admissions officers at test-optional colleges may have a hard time not interpreting students’ decision not to submit their scores. All other things being equal, a student who sends in impressive SAT scores will probably beat out someone who doesn’t. [Bowdoin College](https://www.bowdoin.edu/admissions/apply/testing-policy.shtml)—one of the best liberal arts colleges in the country, which boasts the oldest test-optional policy—says it “allows applicants to decide for themselves whether or not their test results accurately reflect their academic ability and potential.” This same language appears on other test-optional schools’ websites. By not submitting your scores, you are, according to the folks at Bowdoin, stating that your scores don’t reflect your ability and potential. In other words, you’re telling them your scores aren’t as good as the rest of your application. Are you a “bad tester”? I should say something here about “the bad test-taker.” Many students with learning disabilities and other special needs require extra time on standardized tests. Test anxiety is itself recognized as a psycho-physiological condition, and is acknowledged by the [Anxiety and Depression Association of America](https://adaa.org/living-with-anxiety/children/test-anxiety). There is also a culturally accepted notion of “bad testers,” however, which does not refer to students with learning disabilities, special needs, or diagnoses of social phobia. These so-called “bad testers”—the students who excel easily in all things academic, get good grades (even on tests in class)—somehow choke faced with the Scantron test sheet only when it comes to the SAT. These students may simply need to learn and practice the SAT. I understand that even for students who do not have learning disabilities, special needs, or test anxiety, the SAT can be a stressful experience. When I had to take the test, I got caught in a snow storm, and a tree fell across the road on my way to the exam (I swear this is a true story). I had to turn around and improvise an alternate route (this was before smartphones) along back roads and through snowdrifts to the testing facility. I arrived approximately thirty seconds before the test started. All this to say that I understand how terrible the experience can be! But motivated students can generally improve their SAT drastically, provided they take the time to learn and practice the test (just as they had to learn about photosynthesis, Beowulf, or the subjective mood in French). Some students may need extra help, but the fact is that, with a bit of work, students can prepare for, and improve their SAT scores, just as they can study for, and do well on a test in one of their high school classes. To be “a bad tester” is in many cases not a natural condition. Even The College Board knows this. It stopped claiming that the SAT was an “aptitude” test back in the early 1990s. SAT originally stood for Scholastic Aptitude Test—it was supposed to test a student’s intellectual abilities, independent of any learned content, almost like an IQ test. But the “A” in SAT was later changed to stand for “assessment,” and not “aptitude.” In other words, the test abandoned its assertion that it was testing students’ innate abilities (aptitude)—it simply “assessed” them… on how well they prepared for the SAT. Today, SAT literally stands for nothing. It’s no longer an acronym, but rather a brand, a bit like KFC (I’m not the first to make the comparison), which, because of the genetically modified meat they serve, can no longer legally claim to serve Kentucky Fried Chicken. The bottom line Applying to a test-optional school will often not increase a student’s chances of admission. Students should not view test-optional colleges as loopholes in the application process. It goes without saying that anyone who is not a very motivated student doesn’t have much of a shot at getting into UChicago, Bowdoin, Pitzer, Wesleyan, or any of the other highly selective colleges that no longer require SAT or ACT scores. Students who are attracted to test-optional colleges because applying seems like less work will not enjoy the challenging courses at UChicago anyway (NB: many test-optional schools still require that students submit SAT or ACT scores before matriculating for “research purposes”—applicants still have to take the test!). Until U.S. universities decide definitively to abolish the standardized test requirement, students have to embrace studying for the test (maybe think of it as a rite of passage). They will survive it—hopefully even in a blizzard.

### A2 Universalization CP

#### 1] TURN – Making tests universal worsens the notion of meritocracy we critique by saying that making tests more accessible should make it so that the playing field is level – it denies the existence of structural inequalities that disadvantage marginalized students inside and outside the educational system

#### 2] TURN –standardized tests assume measurement against a standard as defined by elite interests – this means tests are intrinsically biased and arbitrary – things like test content choice being confusing and causing violence for black students or bell curves that ensure marginalized students will score lower prove.

#### 3] The CP is the squo – the ACT and SAT are given for free in a dozen states already[[1]](#footnote-2).

## A2 PICs

### O/V

#### 1. The aff defends the resolution as a general principle – PICing out of one part of the aff doesn’t disprove that our orientation is generally good.

#### 2. We turn the net benefit to the PIC – keeping forms of standardized testing allows the myth of meritocracy to disguise itself in new ways and perpetuate structural violence. The idea that tests are objective or merit-based places the burden on marginalized students to perform well or be marked as inferior – this double bind disguises insidious structural inequalities that maintain oppression within institutions writ large.

### Definition – SAT and ACT

#### Standardized test refers only to the SAT or ACT.

West Virginia University 18 (11-9, https://policies.wvu.edu/finalized-bog-rules/bog-academics-rule-2-3-undergraduate-admissions)

DEFINITIONS. “ACT” refers to the standardized ACT® college admission test designed to assess academic readiness for college. “Conditional Admission” means the admission of an undergraduate student who does not meet the requirements for regular admission as outlined in section 2 of this Rule. “Developmental Education” means programs and initiatives established to address academic preparedness, diagnostic assessment and placements, development of general and discipline-specific learning strategies; such courses may be “pre-college” courses that do not count toward a baccalaureate degree, an A.A. degree, an A.S. degree, or an A.A.S. degree or they may be entry-level, credit-bearing academic courses designed to address academic preparedness while also delivering the content of the traditional, entry-level course. “International Student” means a student who is not a U.S. citizen and does not qualify for West Virginia resident status according to BOG Academics R. 2.4 - Residency. “SAT” refers to the standardized SAT® college admission test designed to assess academic readiness for college. “Standardized Test” refers to the SAT or ACT.

#### Only the SAT and ACT affect *university decisions*

McCormick 13 (Lisa Wade, Financial Aid Smarts: Getting Money for School)

These college admissions tests measure students knowledge in such subjects as reading, math, writing, and critical thinking. But the results don't count—not yet, anyway. Only the SAT and ACT tests that students take when they're juniors are used to determine possible scholarships.(21)

### Definition – SAT, ACT, PSAT, TOEFL

#### Standardized tests are SAT, ACT, PSAT, and TOEFL.

DoE International Affairs Office, U.S. Department of Education Feb 2008 http://www.ed.gov/international/usnei/edlite-index.html TJHSSTAD

Structure of the U.S. Education System: Standardized Tests Standardized tests are scientifically normed and machine-graded instruments administered to students and adults under controlled conditions to assess capabilities, including knowledge, cognitive skills and abilities, and aptitude. They are used extensively in the U.S. education system at all levels to assist with admissions, placement, and counseling decisions. Some of these tests include a written portion that is hand-graded. Some of the more common standardized tests that international students may encounter are described below. SECONDARY LEVEL APTITUDE TESTS Secondary School Admission Test (SSAT) is an aptitude test frequently administered to students applying to private secondary schools and some public secondary schools. It measures verbal, reading, and quantitative skills and also includes a writing sample. Preliminary SAT/National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test (PSAT/NMSQT) is a voluntary test given to secondary school students in year 10 or 11 to assist them in preparing for the SAT and to qualify for national merit scholarships. It measures reading, writing, and mathematical problem-solving skills. ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TESTS Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) is a proficiency test designed to measure knowledge and skill in understanding and using written English. It is required of international students whose native language or previous language of instruction was not English, and some U.S. institutions will accept TOEFL scores in lieu of other test scores. UNDERGRADUATE (FIRST DEGREE) APTITUDE TESTS American College Testing Program (ACT) is an aptitude test administered to secondary students in years 11 or 12, and adults, to help determine capability for postsecondary study. It includes measurements of reading, mathematics, English language and science skills and an optional writing sample. Also provided are secondary subject grade reports and a student interests inventory. Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) is an aptitude test administered to secondary students in years 11 or 12, and to some adult students, to help determine capability for postsecondary study. It is divided into two parts, the SAT Reasoning Test measuring reading, writing and quantitative skills; and the SAT Subject Tests measuring knowledge and reasoning ability in various subjects.

### Definition – SAT, ACT, PSAT, AP

#### Standardized tests are SAT, ACT, PSAT, and AP

Kaplan Kaplan is the number one test preparation group, that is meant to specifically help students do well on various Standardized tests, "The ABCs of Standardized Testing: SAT, ACT, PSAT, AP, and More," Kaplan Test Prep, https://www.kaptest.com/study/sat/the-abcs-of-standardized-testing-sat-act-psat-ap-and-more/

As if memorizing the periodic table wasn’t enough, learning about—and retaining—the difference between the various high school exams and standardized testing required for college admissions is just another piece of knowledge every college-bound student (and parent) needs to know. This alphabet soup of standardized testing—standardized so that every student is evaluated on the same knowledge-scoring scale—strikes fear in the hearts of students and parents alike. But diligent coursework and test preparation can allay those anxieties. As early as freshman year, you will want to familiarize yourself with the breadth and focus of each exam, so you can start building a calendar that allows for standardized testing prep well before each test is scheduled. You’ll also want to take an early look at the admissions requirements of your wish-list colleges to make note of the tests they require and the time frame for submitting scores. Here’s a rundown of the common exams with links to Kaplan resources that will help you navigate your choices: AP (Advanced Placement) Tests There are 37 different standardized single-subject AP tests given during the first two weeks of May. Students generally test at their own schools as they complete AP course work, so it is possible to have several AP tests in one year—maybe even two in one day! [AP Prep Books](https://www.kaptest.com/college-prep/ap-exam-prep?utm_source=admission-possible&utm_medium=kaplan-blog&utm_term=pre-college&utm_content=blog-article&utm_campaign=pc-ap-exam-prep) [The Importance of AP Exams](http://www.kaptest.com/blog/prep/college-prep/the-rising-importance-of-ap-exams/) IB (International Baccalaureate) Tests Some 4,000 public and private college preparatory schools worldwide grant International Baccalaureate (IB) diplomas, which are the culmination of a rigorous four-year curriculum and two weeks of standardized testing in May of senior year. While an IB diploma can lead to advanced placement at some colleges, IB exams don’t take the place of SAT Subject tests (or the SAT, for that matter). Make sure to schedule SAT Subject tests as corresponding IB, AP, or honors courses are completed. PSAT/NMSQT (Preliminary SAT/National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test) Juniors take this “practice” SAT in October, not only to get a feel for what it’s like to take the real test, but also to put themselves in the running for National Merit Scholarships and other recognition programs. Register for the Student Search Service option, and you’ll hear directly from colleges looking for students like your. The PSAT is a test you can only take once, prepare well and prepare early. [Kaplan’s free PSAT live course](https://www.kaptest.com/college-prep/psatpreplive) [What’s a Good PSAT Score](http://www.kaptest.com/blog/prep/psat/whats-a-good-psat-score/) SAT What used to be known as the Scholastic Aptitude Test, then later the Scholastic Assessment Test, is now officially a one-syllable acronym—the SAT. This half-day test is the gold-standard pre-college admissions exam that students usually take their junior or senior year, or both. There’s no limit to the number of times you can register for and take the SAT (it’s given seven times throughout the academic year). But before you taking the exam the fifth or sixth time, be sure the schools you’re applying for only see your best score. Learn more about what makes the [SAT so important](https://www.kaptest.com/blog/admission-possible/2016/03/04/why-prepping-for-the-new-sat-matters/?utm_source=admission-possible&utm_medium=kaplan-blog&utm_term=pre-college&utm_content=blog-article&utm_campaign=pc-blog-prepping-for-the-sat). [About the SAT](https://www.kaptest.com/inside-the-tests/sat) [What’s a Good SAT Score](http://www.kaptest.com/blog/prep/sat/whats-a-good-sat-score/) SAT Subject Tests These standardized proficiency tests help colleges evaluate your subject knowledge, but not every college requires them. Check the requirements of schools on your list, then plan to sit for individual SAT Subject exams as corresponding honors or AP coursework is finished. (Yes! In addition to AP tests.) Learn more about [SAT Subject Tests](https://www.kaptest.com/college-prep/sat-subject-tests?utm_source=admission-possible&utm_medium=kaplan-blog&utm_term=pre-college&utm_content=blog-article&utm_campaign=pc-sat-subject-tests) and when to take them. ACT (American College Testing college readiness assessment) Most colleges accept SAT or ACT scores interchangeably, so it’s worth exploring the differences between the two tests. On the surface, they are quite similar: they take roughly the same amount of time to complete, are offered frequently throughout the academic year, and neither test penalizes wrong answers.

### A2 Military Academies PIC

#### **TURN – diversity is more important than predictors of success in academies – a world with testing means academies are less diverse because minorities are less likely to do well on tests.**

#### **diversity in the military is k2 readiness and strength**

Cruz 18 Posted by Melissa Cruz | Nov 12, 2018 | Immigration 101, Integration <http://immigrationimpact.com/2018/11/12/us-militarys-diversity-strength/#.XXu7pChKg2x> TJHSSTAD

The US Military’s Diversity Is Part of Its Strength The United States Armed Forces has done some of its greatest work when it has dismantled barriers to service and opened its ranks to Americans of different backgrounds and identities. Inclusivity within the U.S. military has been hard-fought but admittedly slow. Black service members have fought in every single war since America’s founding, but were not permitted to serve alongside white soldiers until 1948. Similar barriers existed for women and gay service members and continue to prevent many people from serving openly or at all today. Yet a full and robust U.S. military is one that allows all Americans to serve their country, regardless of things such as immigration status, gender identity, religion, and so on. Removing barriers to service allows everyone to protect and fight for the same American dream. Preventing any well-meaning recruits from enlisting only hurts enlistment numbers and the military as a whole. The Trump administration’s decision to begin discharging immigrant reservists and recruits in July 2017, for example, led to over 500 discharges within one year. Many were let go after being labeled “security risks” because they had family members living abroad. Others were given no reason for their discharge at all. The order was eventually reversed in August 2018—but the damage was already done. The armed forces missed out on hundreds of new service members. Beyond the immediate loss, there are likely many others who dreamed of serving in the military but now may question whether they have a place there. Ensuring an inclusive military also bolsters the United States’ global standing. If the military is to meet its geopolitical goals, it needs people with different language skills and cultural competencies. Our nation’s strength is in our diversity and the military must be no exception. In addition, greater diversity among ranks tends to lead to higher innovation and quicker thinking—both important for the military on and off the field. The United States benefits when it can draw a diverse set of talent who want to serve in the military. Whether that means accepting an immigrant recruit with the language skills it needs to operate abroad or allowing women soldiers to fully engage in combat, the military is at its best when it recognizes the value and skills of everyone who wishes to serve.

#### TURN – Military academies are mediocre at best – boosting their effectiveness is a lost cause and trades off with applications to things like ROTC that produce good officers.

Flemingmay 10 The Academies’ March Toward Mediocrity By BRUCE FLEMINGMAY 20, 2010 Annapolis, Md. TJHSSTAD

The incident brings to light an unpleasant truth: the Naval Academy, where I have been a professor for 23 years, has lost its way. The same is true of the other service academies. They are a net loss to the taxpayers who finance them, as well as a huge disappointment to their students, who come expecting reality to match reputation. They need to be fixed or abolished. The service academies are holdovers from the 19th century, when they were virtually the only avenue for producing an officer corps for the nation’s military and when such top-down institutions were taken for granted. But the world has changed, which the academies don’t seem to have noticed, or to have drawn any conclusions from. With the rise after World War II of the Reserve Officer Training Corps programs at universities around the country, the academies now produce 20 percent or less of the officers in each service, at an average cost to taxpayers of nearly half a million dollars per student, more than four times what an R.O.T.C.-trained officer costs. Continue reading the main story The institutions are set on doing things their own way, yet I know of nobody in the Navy or other services who would argue that graduates of Annapolis or West Point are, as a group, better than those who become officers through other programs. A student can go to a civilian school like Vanderbilt, major in art history (which we don’t offer), have the usual college social experience and nightlife (which we forbid), be commissioned through R.O.T.C. — and apparently be just as good an officer as a Naval Academy product. Instead of better officers, the academies produce burned-out midshipmen and cadets. They come to us thinking they’ve entered a military Camelot, and find a maze of petty rules with no visible future application. These rules are applied inconsistently by the administration, and tend to change when a new superintendent is appointed every few years. The students quickly see through assurances that “people die if you do X” (like, “leave mold on your shower curtain,” a favorite claim of one recent administrator). We’re a military Disneyland, beloved by tourists but disillusioning to the young people who came hoping to make a difference. In my experience, the students who find this most demoralizing are those who have already served as Marines and sailors (usually more than 5 percent of each incoming class), who know how the fleet works and realize that what we do on the military-training side of things is largely make-work. Academics, too, are compromised by the huge time commitment these exercises require. Yes, we still produce some Rhodes, Marshall and Truman Scholars. But mediocrity is the norm.

#### **TURN – shift to GPA is good – it’s a very significant predictor at academies.**

Hardison et al 16 Hardison, Chaitra M., Susan Burkhauser, Lawrence M. Hanser, and Mustafa Oguz, How Effective Are Military Academy Admission Standards?. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2016. <https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB9905.html>. TJHSSTAD

The U.S. Air Force Academy (USAFA), the U.S. Military Academy (USMA), and the U.S. Naval Academy (USNA) provide undergraduate education and training for students who will become commissioned officers in the Armed Forces. Like all institutions of higher education, military academies rely on a set of admission criteria, but beyond that, they are particularly concerned about the outcomes of those admitted, because the goal is for those who graduate to move on and become successful as commissioned officers. RAND was asked to examine admission standards at these academies to see whether they were enrolling individuals who would both graduate and become successful officers, but the USNA chose not to participate. Thus, this brief summarizes the results of analyses of the applicant scoring systems that USAFA and USMA use for admission. Assessment of USAFA Admission Standards Context. The USAFA admissions process is highly competitive. Although the entire admissions process takes many months and includes many factors, final decisions are based on scores calculated as a weighted combination of the three elements in Table 1. The computed total score for a candidate — called the selection composite score — is used to rank-order candidates and determine admissions. Table 1. Elements of USAFA Admission Decisions Element Description Percent Weight Academic Composite Consists of SAT/ACT score and prior academic ranking (high school class rank, grade point average [GPA], transcript, strength of high school, rigor of curriculum) 60 Leadership Composite Called the extracurricular composite; includes activities, leadership, and résumé 20 Selection Panel Score Consists of the selection panel's evaluation of the candidate, which includes a review of admissions liaison officer (ALO) evaluations, writing samples, teacher evaluations, recommendations, and the candidate fitness assessment 20 This selection formula has been in place for decades and is designed to yield a class of students highly respected both in the Air Force and in the educational community, but can the formula be improved? The study begins to answer that question by examining how well the three elements in the table predict outcomes that matter to the Air Force. The key outcomes of interest for performance at USAFA are GPA, failure to graduate for academic reasons, failure to graduate because of a desire for a career change, military performance average (MPA), and overall performance average (OPA). In terms of future performance, key outcomes of interest are promotion to O-4, O-5, and O-6. To explore relationships between admission factors and outcomes, researchers relied on statistical regression techniques using data on the nearly 35,000 cadets who attended USAFA from 1980 to 2011 that included records from three data sources: USAFA registrar admissions records, USAFA cadet records, and Air Force personnel records. Findings. Two of the three existing admissions factors are useful in predicting outcomes at USAFA. The overall selection composite and some elements within it (including academic composite and leadership composite) are significant predictors of failure to graduate for academic reasons, failure to graduate because of choosing a career change, GPA, MPA, and OPA. High school class rank was also a significant predictor of graduating versus failing for academic reasons and of GPA, MPA, and OPA.`

#### TURN – removing tests increases the number of military students graduating from academies which makes the US have a larger military

\*no uniqueness?

<https://ssi.armywarcollege.edu/pdffiles/PUB1374.pdf> – something?

Tech solves readiness? - <https://warontherocks.com/2017/03/science-fiction-no-longer-enhancing-military-readiness-through-synthetic-training/>

Meritocracy myth?

### A2 TOEFL PIC

#### TURN – TOEFL is a form of imperialism that aims to Americanize institutions. The result is a linguistic world order that perpetuates capitalism and other forms of oppression.

Yoo and Namkung 12 English and American Linguistic Hegemony : A Case Study of the Educational Testing Service Yeonhee Yoo and Gon Namkung (Ewha Womans University) <http://www.kaisnet.or.kr/resource/down/10_2_03.pdf> The Korean Journal of International Studies, Vol. 10, No. 2 (December 2012), 221-253. 2012 The Korean Association of International Studies TJHSSTAD

English and American Linguistic Hegemony 229 underlying assumptions.18) On the basis of American philanthropy in education and foreign language teaching, it is closely connected to the creation of American EFL tests. In addition, the College Board and the universities played an important role in developing the American EFL tests. Most significantly, the ETS under the status of nonprofit organizations has been supported by the US government, such that the ETS is exempt from paying federal corporate income tax on many of its domestic operations when paying tax from overseas markets. This section examines the mechanism of American hegemony and four actors constituting the power coalition of linguistic hegemony: the US foundations, ETS, universities, and the US government. 1. US Philanthropy: The Role of US Foundations The US foundations, in cooperation with US foreign policy agencies, provide the financial resources to construct US linguistic power structure. They grant financial aid to educational institutions, not only internationally, but also domestically. According to Inderjeet Parmer, “the international efforts of the US foundations are widely acknowledged to have their origins in their prior domestic experience.”19) This humanitarianism approach of the US institutions was shaped by their ethnocentrism, class interests, and their support of imperialist objectives of their own country. Though their humanitarianism was expressed in their programs, their underlying assumption was to deliver American norms and values through American education in the medium of American standardized English. Moreover, it was so intertwined with the interests of American capitalism as to be indistinguishable. The Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation represented ‘scientific philanthropy’, which is a rational activity that sought to maximize its effects on social and other problems of order and stability.20) In order to justify their activities, these foundations advanced the theory of human 18) Inderjeet Parmar, “American Foundations and the Development of International Knowledge Networks,” Global Network 2-1 (2002), pp. 13-30. 19) Ibid. 20) Ibid., p. 16. 03유연희,남궁곤 2012.12.27 5:58 PM 페이지229 230 The Korean Journal of International Studies 10-2, December 2012 capital development by funding higher education and research on education. In this approach, all people are considered educable so that education became a means of constructing human capital.21)

#### **TURN –** English proficiency exams like the TOEFL serve as barriers to international applicants and disproportionately affect African students – this form of exclusion perpetuates the legacy of anti-black colonialism.

**AD 14:** African Dynamo. “TOEL English Testing Scandal is part of a larger trend”. February 3rd, 2014. <https://www.africandynamo.com/2014/02/tyranny-in-testing-how-standardized.html>. FD-RW

One of the biggest examples of this is the requirement to prove English proficiency through TOEFL or IELTS testing. This single requirement can completely stifle the hopes of a student despite any of their academic achievements, and completely end any plans for studying abroad. Countries like Sweden, Norway and Finland are all moving towards the provision of this requirement before admission, so it has become imperative for the International community to finally recognize the reality of this situation, and the impact of policies that promote this testing. The “IELTS” (International English Language Testing System) and “TOEFL” (Test of English as a Foreign Language) are standardized tests used by universities to assess the English language ability of applicants. IELTS is widely used in the UK and Australia and also recognized by most American and Canadian universities; IELTS assesses all of your English skills — reading, writing, listening and speaking, and is designed to reflect how you will use English while studying, at work, and at leisure in your life abroad. The TOEFL is used mainly by American Universities, though also accepted in the UK and Australia. This test not only serves as a requirement for admission to most Universities abroad, but also as a requirement for the acquisition of a visa. The requirement of English proficiency testing should serve as a basic marker of ones control over the English language, but in reality it has been used as a “screening machine” to limit the number of Africans who study abroad. This fact becomes clear once you examine the treatment of exemption policies certain countries commonly offer: You will meet the requirement if you can show that you: Are a national of a majority English-speaking country; or Have passed an English language test approved by us at the appropriate level; or ● Hold a degree that was taught in English and is equivalent to a UK bachelor's degree or above. None of the above exemptions are considered politely when an African requests them. They are either told that they do not form part of the category or that their level of English proficiency is not accepted. In the research report by [Glenys Merrifield](http://www.ielts.org/PDF/vol13_Report1.pdf), “It was also found that language proficiency thresholds could be manipulated to limit numbers of immigrants and relieve pressure on funding of community support organizations. The mad scramble for Africa by colonial powers three centuries ago led to the imposition of culture and specifically language. Most countries in Africa adopted the language of their colonial masters, replacing the traditional local languages. Today, countries like Nigeria and Ghana use English as their official language, while countries like Cote d’lvoire and Togo use French as their official language. The British colonized Ghana and Nigeria and imposed English upon the population by using English as the sole medium of instruction in their educational systems. It is bizarre that the UK today requires its own former colonies to prove their English proficiency level, were they such inadequate instructors of the English language? Education in West Africa, particularly in Ghana and Nigeria is still done in English. Instruction and daily duties and responsibilities are conducted using the English language. English is the medium of instruction from the crèche level to the University level. Every student who in one way or another gets the opportunity to sit in class has been taught some level of English, thus most students have a basic level of English and are able to communicate and write in the language. Those who are lucky enough to further their education to the High School level, sit for the West African Examination Certificate, which has a compulsory English language component of reading, writing, and comprehension. Those who are fortunate to move on again to the tertiary level are all given the opportunity to take the famous “Communication Skills” examination. This examination facilitates the deepening of the writing, speaking and listening abilities of most students, it is a potent, well-developed program with a much broader and more comprehensive structure than the IELTS OR TOEFL. The costs associated with IELTS AND TOEFL constitute another layer of issues. These tests are extremely expensive, to a degree, which is completely untenable for all but the wealthiest in Africa, and frequently the western organizations behind these tests formulate corrupt schemes that bilk poor or uninformed students out of their money. Due to the imposition of these requirements by various emigration authorities and universities, many organizations have developed various ways to dupe the poor student who has little or no knowledge about the processes, claiming that additional testing is required or that mysterious fees need to be paid. Although most advanced countries like to refer to Africa as a place of poverty and hardship, they tend not to care much about the various ways they are contributing in making the situation worse. What are the costs? The cost incurred in sitting for one test in Africa is far greater than the minimum wage of most Africans. Most people who are able to afford this cost are mostly those from affluent homes. What happens to the poor kid at Teshie in Ghana or Oyo Town in Nigeria who is brilliant but financially needy and aspires to travel abroad to further his/her education? The cost of IELT as published by [British Council](https://ielts.britishcouncil.org/nigeria) in Nigeria and [Ghana](http://www.britishcouncil.org/africa-gh-ielts.htm) shows an amount that is very difficult to get by most students. Although research shows that, almost half of the population in the sub-Saharan Africa lives on less than [$1.25](http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/report-2013/mdg-report-2013-english.pdf) a day there is still pressure forcing many graduates and undergraduates to push the little they have into the pockets of organizations that are providing something they have already acquired. Consider also the principle of Reciprocity: It is not only Africans who travels abroad to study, other countries too do travel to Africa to study, and the question is, are they asked to provide a language proficiency? Since our English language prowess is not accepted internationally even though a simple Wikipedia search shows our official language to be English, should we reciprocate by requiring international students coming to Africa to provide proof of language proficiency in Yoruba, TWI or GA? In a global environment in which the mass movement of people across borders is increasing, immigration authorities need to be increasingly proactive in setting standards that are fair and equitable, but preserve standards of living and work. The use of IELTS or TOEFL is restricting the number of brilliant Africans who wish to study abroad, not because they fail the test, but rather because the system is an abomination. The cavalier attitude taken by western countries while disregarding our educational system is **symptomatic of the ugly prejudices left behind by the colonial era**. Today Africa is a land of many fluent English speakers and writers, and that’s something the whole world should be aware of. If language is used as a tool of controlling immigration, it provides the platform for countries to use various methods and grounds to prevent the free movement of people. Culture is a way of life, and socialization is the process of acquiring new ideas and experiencing culture and it must be allowed to occur freely and naturally, without force or undue discrimination.

#### **TURN – English proficiency tests are a form of imperialism that otherizes the learner.**

Phillipson 08 Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 5(1):1--43, 2008 Copyright © Taylor & Francis Group, LLC ISSN: 1542-7587 print/1542-7595 online DOI: 10.1080/15427580701696886 THE LINGUISTIC IMPERIALISM OF NEOLIBERAL EMPIRE1 ROBERT PHILLIPSON Department of International Language Studies and Computational Linguistics, Copenhagen Business School TJHSSTAD

important to recall that TESOL (the Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages) itself is a significant export item—teaching materials, examinations, know-how, teachers et al.—for the British and Americans, and a vital dimension of English linguistic neoimperialism. The asymmetrical relationship between ‘natives’ and ‘non-natives’ is confirmed in the naming of the profession. ‘The naming ‘‘TESOL’’ already assigns dichotomous Self-Other subject positions to teacher and learner. It interactionally and officially positions the Anglo-teacher as Self, and positions the learner in a life trajectory of forever being Other—continuing the colonial storyline : : : ’ (Lin and Luke, 2006, p. 67). Language is a central dimension of ideological control, perpetuating the subordination of colonial times into the present: ‘: : : colonization’s legacy has become invisible ideological hegemony—domination with consent; that is, the previously colonized peoples still worship the languages, cultures, music, arts, knowledges, pedagogies, or most aspects of Western life as more advanced, progressive and superior—as lying closer towards the end point of modernity’ (ibid., p. 69). Discrimination against immigrants to the United States, for whom English is a foreign language, is integral to public education, ESOL being construed as deficit and inferior, with all Other languages having low status (Motha, 2006). Some of the key players are disarmingly frank about their global ambitions. The Web site of Educational Testing Services of Princeton, NJ, which is responsible for the TOEFL test of English language proficiency, states:7 As ETS’s wholly-owned subsidiary, ETS Global BV is structured to bring ETS’s expertise and experience with tests, assessments, and related services to educational and business communi7See Templer, 2004. Linguistic Imperialism 11 ties around the world. ETS Global BV now has subsidiaries in Europe and Canada, and it will be expanding into other countries and regions as well. Our subsidiaries offer a full range of ETS products, services and learning solutions, including English language learning products and services, training and technical assistance, design, development and delivery of large-scale assessments, test design and delivery. Our global mission goes far beyond testing. Our products and services enable opportunity worldwide by measuring knowledge and skills, promoting learning and performance, and supporting education and professional development for all people worldwide. U.S. interests and services are thus in symbiosis with the evaluation of proficiency in English, with the assessment of linguistic capital. Those wishing for credentials in this linguistic market must invest in the form of ‘global’ English that ETS (and its U.K. equivalent, www.cambridgeesol.org) profitably dispense. They administer what Bourdieu refers to as the sanctions of the (global) linguistic market. We need to trace its origins.

### A2 SAT Subject Tests PIC

#### **1.** The aff outweighs – just because black or Hispanic students score slightly better on language tests doesn’t justify keeping all subject tests. All subject tests perpetuate the same myth of meritocracy that the aff says causes cycles of structural violence – that outweighs the marginal impact of keeping language tests on magnitude and also means they don’t solve case.

#### 2. TURN – the race gap still exists on subject tests and exacerbates structural inequality. This outweighs – keeping subject tests kills the chance for marginalized students to be admitted.

Thomas 04 The SAT II: Minority/Majority Test-Score Gaps and What They Could Mean for College Admissions Author(s): M. Kathleen Thomas Source: Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 85, No. 5, A Special Issue: Social Science Examines Education (December 2004), pp. 1318-1334 Published by: Wiley Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/42955998 Accessed: 13-09-2019 10:53 UTC

Conclusions and Policy Recommendations The sobering result of this analysis is that switching to a more curriculum- based exam does not eliminate the score gaps already present with the SAT I. Furthermore, the varying sizes and even directions of the score gaps between white and minority students taking the SAT II writing subject test illustrate the difficulty researchers face in explaining differences in test scores - even for the brightest and most ambitious students. Family income and school effects explain away only small percentages of the total score gap, a finding consistent with other tests and students of other age groups (Phillips et al., 1998). Pertinent information, but data not collected on the SDQ, includes parenting practices, grandparent characteristics, prevalence of ability grouping, teacher characteristics, and broader measures of socioeconomic status (Jencks and Phillips, 1998). One encouraging result from this study is that black students no longer lag behind white students when controlling for limited measures of socioeconomic status and school effects - if the estimation allows for different returns to individual characteristics by race. Presumably, the degree to which black students outperform white students on the writing subject test would increase if more detailed information regarding family background were 13The underlying regressions are available from the author on request. This content downloaded from 174.204.13.214 on Fri, 13 Sep 2019 10:53:20 UTC All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms 1332 Social Science Quarterly available. Although this news is encouraging, educators and policy- makers face a daunting task. The score gap reverses only if the average black student is given the same characteristics as the average white student. Unequal incomes, educational opportunities, neighborhoods, and home environments virtually ensure these score gaps will endure well into the future. Perhaps the more compelling question to address is whether these score gaps matter in college admission decisions. Not controlling for any characteristics, the average black SAT II taker scores 81 points less than the average white student on the writing subject test. The raw gap for Hispanics is 70 points. Although these gaps are smaller than the typical gaps on the SAT I (JBHE , 1998), are they large enough to make a difference to college admissions officers? One way to analyze the impact of the score gap is to discover where the average Texas student falls in the University of California Eligibility Index used to identify the top 12.5 percent statewide pool of California high school graduates (Geiser and Studley, 2001). Given a weighted test score, the index lists the minimum high school GPA required for automatic admission, as shown in Table 7. The weighted test score consists of the composite SAT I (or ACT score) plus twice the sum of the SAT II writing subject test, math subject test, and a third subject test of the student's choosing. Based on the average test scores presented in Table 2 and a national mean score for black students of 520 on the chemistry exam TABLE 7 The University of California System Eligibility Index HS GPA Weighted Score 2.80-2.84 4,640 2.85-2.89 4,384 2.90-2.94 4,160 2.95-2.99 3,984 3.00-3.04 3,840 3.05-3.09 3,720 3.10-3.14 3,616 3.15-3.19 3,512 3.20-3.24 3,408 3.25-3.29 3,320 3.30-3.34 3,248 3.35-3.39 3,192 3.40-3.44 3,152 3.45-3.49 3,128 3.50 and above 3,120 Weighted Test Score = SAT I Composite+2 (SAT II Writing+SAT II Math+SAT II Third Subject Test). Source: Saul Geiser and Roger Studley, University of California, Office of the President. This content downloaded from 174.204.13.214 on Fri, 13 Sep 2019 10:53:20 UTC All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms Minority! Majority Test-Score Gaps and College Admission 1333 ( JBHE , 1998), the average black student in this sample would receive a weighted score of 4,469, corresponding to a minimum required GPA of 2.85. 14 The average African-American student taking the writing exam in this sample has a high school GPA of 3.6 and would be automatically granted admission into the UC System. The previous outcome is dependent on the current limited use of the SAT II in college admissions. If less selective colleges and universities began re- quiring the SAT II for admissions and more students of varying abilities began to take the SAT II, the outcome could be markedly different. Assume that the average subject test scores presented in Table 2 would be one standard de- viation below the current subject test means if the entire sample of SAT I takers were included. The average black student in this sample would receive a weighted score of 3,568 under these circumstances, corresponding to a minimum high school GPA of 3.1 5. 15 The average black student in the sample, including those that took the SAT II and those that did not, has a high school GPA of 3.12. This hypothetical student would just miss the cutoff and not be granted automatic admission to the UC System. Are the current score gaps likely to cause the average minority SAT II taker to be denied admission to a college or university of his or her choice? No. But under different conditions, the probability of rejection could grow. This may sound like useless speculation, but it is our respon- sibility as public policy researchers to inform policymakers of potential outcomes - especially if the conditions necessary to bring these out- comes about can reasonably be expected to occur. If the president of the largest public university system in the country advocates replacing the SAT with the SAT II or some other achievement test, it is not unreasonable to assume that other universities of varying selectivity might one day follow suit. Furthermore, although the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a university's right to use race in its admissions process in the University of Michigan law school case, the Court struck down the affirmative action policy at Michigan's undergraduate institution.

#### **3. TURN – Racial discrepancy in test scores is still high on subject tests. Even if the gap seems lower, that’s because it measures top performing marginalized students against average privileged students. Their stats mask structural inequalities that make it harder for marginalized students to access higher ed.**

JBHE 97 SAT-II Achievement Tests: Explaining the Wide Discrepancies in the Racial Scoring Gap Source: The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, No. 18 (Winter, 1997-1998), pp. 60-62 Published by: The JBHE Foundation, Inc Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2998754 Accessed: 13-09-2019 10:42 UTC TJHSSTAD

The Gap at the Top At the nation's highest-ranked colleges and universities, admissions officers are seeking students who turn in very high scores on their SAT-II tests. Nationwide, only 197 blacks scored above 700 on any of the SAT-II tests. In WINTER 1997/1998 61 This content downloaded from 174.204.13.214 on Fri, 13 Sep 2019 10:42:49 UTC All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms THE JOURNAL OF BLACKS IN HIGHER EDUCATION contrast there were more than 12,000 white students who scored 700 or above. Nationwide, blacks made up only 0.9 percent of all students scoring 700 or above. If we drop the scoring threshold to those who scored 650 or above, the situation does not improve a great deal. Nation? wide, 722 African Americans scored 650 or above on any of the SAT-II tests. But more than 53,000 nonblack stu? dents scored 650 or above. Blacks make up only 1.4 per? cent of the students who score at or above the 650 scoring level. Seven percent of all black students who took SAT-II tests scored 650 or above compared to 24 percent of all white students who took the SAT-II tests. "The shrinkage in the racial scoring gap on SAT-II tests suggests that environmental influences including cultural and economic forces are a major culprit in producing substandard test results among African Americans. " Undoubtedly, many of the same forces producing the wide racial scoring gap on other standardized tests also apply to the SAT-II tests.\* Black students are less likely to have received adequate preparation in school for the subject exams and are less likely to be able to afford SAT-II test coaching classes that have a significant effect in im? proving scores. The reason the racial scoring gap is lower on the SAT-II than it is on other standardized tests seems to be that in this test we are invariably comparing black and white students who are in the category of top academic performers. In each case this cohort of black and white students is more likely to have come from families with upper-middle-class incomes and high levels of parental education. And they are more likely to have attended su? perior secondary schools than are SAT test takers as a whole. For these students, test scores are generally higher and the gap between the races is generally lower. The shrinkage in the racial scoring gap on SAT-II tests suggests that environmental influences ? including cul? tural and economic forces ? are a major culprit in pro? ducing substandard test results among African Ameri? Cans

#### **4. The PIC is not competitive – vast majority of colleges and universities don’t consider SAT II subject tests in admissions decisions:**

College Transitions 19 <https://www.collegetransitions.com/blog/do-i-need-to-take-sat-subject-tests/> Do I need to take SAT Subject Tests? February 26, 2019 TESTING TJHSSTAD

According to a 2018 survey conducted by the National Association for College Admission Counseling (NACAC), just 6.6% of U.S. colleges and universities view Subject Test scores as “considerably important” in guiding admissions decisions. The number of schools who view Subject Tests as having “moderate importance” was a paltry 3%. These stats alone will inform you that SAT Subject Tests (formerly known as SAT IIs) are not important factors at the vast majority of universities.

### A2 GED PIC

#### 1. The PIC is not competitive:

#### a] **The aff doesn’t defend GED – it’s a prerequisite for applying to schools not a test considered by officers for admission.**

Ipatenco 17 GED Vs. the SAT By Sara Ipatenco ; Updated September 26, 2017 <https://classroom.synonym.com/do-interpret-wonderlic-score-8698497.html> TJHSSTAD

Purpose, Requirements and Benefits The purpose of the GED is to prove that you're a candidate for a high school diploma. While not exactly the same as a diploma, a passing score on the GED proves that you're academically advanced enough to otherwise have graduated from high school. In order to receive a passing score, you need to answer a certain number of questions from each of the five sections correctly. Once you've received a passing score, you'll be able to apply to college or apply for a job that requires a high school diploma. VIDEO OF THE DAY SAT The SAT, or Scholastic Assessment Test, is a standardized test that most colleges require high school juniors or seniors to take before accepting them for admission, according to Sharon Weiner Green, author of "Barron's SAT." The test assesses knowledge in reading, writing and math, and each receives a separate score. The test takes four hours to complete and is divided into 10 separate sections, some of which are multiple choice and some of which are essay questions. For each of the three knowledge areas, you'll receive a score between 200 and 800, with around 500 being average. A score of 2400 is the highest score possible, and the average score is 1500. Taking an SAT preparation class, as well as practice exams, will help you score as high as possible. Purpose, Requirements and Benefits Most colleges require a certain SAT score to gain admission. Depending on which college you're applying to, that score tells the college that you're academically advanced enough to be successful at that school. Different colleges require different scores, so you'll need to check with the admissions department at the schools you're applying to so you know exactly what score you need to strive for. The higher your score, the more options you'll have in terms of which colleges you meet the minimum requirements for.

#### The GED just certifies that people have received the equivalent of a high school education i.e. its an equivalency test – this isn’t considered in distinguishing between applicants during the admissions process as admissions tests like the SAT or ACT are.

#### b] their interp is unreasonable – the logic of defending the GED implies having to defend every test taken in a student’s education which completely skirts the topic and creates a ridiculous aff burden.

#### 2. College bad – impact turns all their offense:

#### **a**] “**College for all” discourse is bad and re-entrenches material inequalities – the idea that more minority students getting into colleges resolves oppression IS the problem because it disavows structural factors.**

Glass and Nygreen 2 Class, Race, and the Discourse of “College for All” A Response to “Schooling for Democracy” Ronald David Glass and Kysa Nygreen <https://democracyeducationjournal.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1006&context=home> democracy & education, vol 19, n-o 1 2011 TJHSSTAD

History shows that, despite vastly expanded access to postsecondary schooling for the working class (following the WWII GI Bill) and people of color (following Brown v. Board of Education, the civil rights movement, and the passage of affirmative action legislation), the basic economic, social, and political divisions and inequities among classes and races remain structurally dominant, even within the college-going population itself. Such disjunctures between the “college for all” narrative and the material realities of the persistent educational and economic inequalities that maintain and harden the status quo (Carnoy, 1994) mean that the “college for all” discourse hides and reinforces the very mechanisms producing the results it claims to be remedying. For example, more young people from all three major racial and ethnic groups attend and graduate from college today than ever before, and the proportions are expected to continue rising, yet racial disparities remain and widen, and income inequality continues to grow (Aud, Fox, & KewalRamani, 2010). Additionally, the college participation rate of low-income students (whose families earn less than $25,000 per year) remains 32% behind high-income students (whose families earn more than $75,000 per year)—just as it was 30 years earlier (Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, 2001). Thus, existing patterns of class and race inequality, as measured by level of educational attainment, remain firmly intact even as more and more students from all social groups are attending college. It is important to note that these figures only measure attendance rates at public and private four-year institutions, but they do not disaggregate by level of college selectivity and prestige, and thus they obscure other stratified disparities. In fact, at the more elite universities, despite significantly expanded financial aid, the percentage of students from families in the bottom quartile of national family income is only about 3% (Fischer, 2006).1 At the same time, students from the top income quartile in elite colleges have risen to constitute half of the enrollment (Bowen et al., 2005). Moreover, the consistent growth in college-going rates across all social groups has done little to stem the larger national trend of increasing wealth and income inequality. In recent years, overall wages have continued to fall even as profits and productivity have grown to new heights, and the United States remains the most unequal society in the developed world despite having one of the largest proportions of young adults who attend at least some college (Mishel, Bernstein, & Allegretto, 2006).

#### **B] Massive student loans kill social mobility – staying away from colleges is net better for low-income and minority students**

Glass and Nygreen 11 Class, Race, and the Discourse of “College for All” A Response to “Schooling for Democracy” Ronald David Glass and Kysa Nygreen <https://democracyeducationjournal.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1006&context=home> democracy & education, vol 19, n-o 1 2011 TJHSSTAD

These labor market realities are an even greater concern when we consider the alarming debt burden that LI/RCLD students acquire while pursuing their college educations and the often mythic wage and job premium promised in the “college for all” discourse. In the last decade, the cost of higher education has increased faster than the rate of inflation and the median income (Aud, et al., 2010).4 Meanwhile, federal Pell grants (the primary form of government financial aid that students do not need to pay back) have failed to keep pace: the purchasing power of the maximum Pell grant fell from 84% of tuition costs in 1975 to 39% in 2002 (King & Bannon, 2002). Consequently, more students are depending on loans and borrowing in greater amounts (Wirt, et al., 2004b). Today approximately two-thirds of college graduates have some student loan debt, and those most likely to carry debt are students who are also low-income, African American, and/or Latina/o (King & Bannon, 2002).5 While many carry relatively minor student debt, those most in need of the college wage premium actually graduate with the most debt: further, over half of African American (55%) and Latina/o (58%) borrowers carry “unmanageable” student debt, defined by the loan industry as monthly payments that exceed 8% of monthly income before taxes (King & Bannon, 2002). These figures include nearly half of African American and one-third of Latina/o college graduates who carry unmanageable student debt, and their economic condition is further exacerbated by the fact that they earn less than White college graduates (King & Bannon, 2002). The impact of rising tuitions and debt burdens needs to be contextualized within three additional observations. First, LI/ RCLD students are more likely to borrow, and to borrow in greater amounts, than their higher-income peers, while at the same time they are less likely to get help from their families to pay off their loans and often have financial responsibilities to their families while in school and after graduating (Choy & Li, 2005; King & Bannon, 2002). Thus, the figures actually underestimate their true student debt “burden.” Second, although college is more expensive for everyone, changes to the structure of financial aid since the 1990s have actually benefited students from high-income families (Wirt, et al., 2004b).6 Further, the growth in merit-based aid (which reinforce the advantages possessed by upper-income students) has exceeded the growth in need-based grants (which benefit lowerincome students), even though upper-income families are the only group for whom rising annual income is actually outpacing the rise in college tuition (Fitzgerald, 2003). Third, our analysis underaccounts for the many LI/RCLD students who borrow but never graduate. If we consider the proportions of LI/RCLD graduates with “unmanageable” student debt in conjunction with the college persistence rates for these same groups, we can begin to see the true scale of the problem. For example, of students who entered democracy & education, vol 19, n-o 1 article response 6 four-year postsecondary institutions in 2004 with a bachelor’s degree goal, just 50.5% had graduated by 2009, with substantially lower proportions for LI/RCLD students: 40.8% for low-income students (those whose families earned less than $32,000 in 2002); 34.8% for African Americans; 36.1% for Latina/os; and only 36.4% for first-generation college students, which may be the most accurate indicator of social class from these choices (Radford, Berkner, Wheeless, & Shepherd, 2010). One study of the debt burden of postsecondary “noncompleters,” those students who had not graduated five years after enrolling in a four-year postsecondary institution, reports that 19% carried student debt, and their monthly payments averaged 8.6% of their salary, an “unmanageable” level (US Department of Education, 1999). This study did not break the figures down by race, ethnicity, or class. Given the patterns in borrowing and college completion rates that we have summarized above, we can expect that a disproportionate number of young adults carrying heavy student debts without a college degree are likely to be low-income and/or African American or Latina/o. These disturbing patterns are omitted in the “college for all” discourse.

#### **Passing the GED results in a certificate that admissions officers receive instead of a high school diploma.**

Lindsay 9/1 SAT / ACT Prep Online Guides and Tips What Is a GED? Should You Get One? Posted by Samantha Lindsay | Sep 1, 2019 11:00:00 AM OTHER HIGH SCHOOL, COURSEWORK/GPA <https://blog.prepscholar.com/what-is-a-ged-vs-high-school-diploma> TJHSSTAD

If you don't have a traditional high school diploma, you can still earn an equivalent credential by getting your GED. But what is a GED? What does GED stand for? Basically, a GED is a credential that can substitute for a high school diploma. Since most employers (and all colleges) will require you to have graduated from high school, it's usually a good idea to get a GED if you don't complete high school. Doing so helps to ensure that you'll have access to more opportunities later in life. In this article, I'll go through the GED meaning, the advantages this credential can give you, and how to get your GED. What Is a GED? How Is It Different From a High School Diploma? What does GED stand for? GED is an acronym that stands for General Educational Development. It's a test that measures whether students possess the academic skills equivalent to those of graduating high school seniors. People who dropped out of high school initially, but are concerned about their prospects without a diploma, often take the GED Test. The four content areas that comprise the GED Test correspond to the four most prominent core subjects in high school: Reasoning Through Language Arts Mathematical Reasoning Social Studies Science This is a recent change instituted in 2014 (there used to be five subject areas, with Reading and Writing as separate tests). [The test has been updated](https://ged.com/) from the 2002 version to require a deeper understanding of the material and more advanced reasoning skills. If you pass the GED Test, you will earn a GED credential, which may be a diploma or certificate depending on the state. A GED certificate or diploma is technically considered just as valid as a regular high school diploma. However, some employers and colleges will favor students with high school diplomas over those with GEDs because of the skills each measures.

#### This means the test i

College bad?

GED® High School Equivalency Credential Policy, Practice and Perceptions Results of the AACRAO and ACE October 2015 60 Second Survey AACRAO October 2015 60 Second Survey Results 1 The October 2015 AACRAO 60 Second Survey focused on the GED® High School Equivalency Credential (GED® ) (Appendix A). AACRAO and the American Council on Education (ACE) partnered on this survey to better understand institutional policies, practices and perceptions of students who enter postsecondary education after having successfully completed the GED® test, thereby earning their states’ high school diploma or equivale

The survey asked whether the institution’s admissions process was the same for traditional high school graduates and GED® graduates. The majority (91.8%, n=364) indicated that the AACRAO October 2015 60 Second Survey Results 4 admissions process is the same. While institutional control is not related to this practice, institutional size and type in this sample are both significantly, albeit subtly, related to whether an institution has the same admission process for both student populations (Table 3).

#### This means the GED test itself is not considered – just the certificate attached to it.

#### **Passing the GED results in a certificate that officers receive instead of a diploma – scores on the standardized test itself aren’t considered by officers which means the PIC is not competitive.**

Chen 18 High School Diploma vs. GED Updated July 13, 2018 | by Grace Chen <https://www.communitycollegereview.com/blog/high-school-diploma-vs-ged> TJHSSTAD

GED stands variously for General Educational Development, General Education Diploma, or General Equivalency Development. As the name implies, the GED was designed as a high school equivalency test for non-graduates. According to the GED Testing Service, the GED originated after World War II to allow veterans to complete their high school education and attend college. Subsequently, civilians were allowed to take the GED test as well. Throughout the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, the GED was taken primarily by individuals who were seeking to improve their credentials for work purposes. Since 1978, the GED test has been revised four times, the most recent of which was launched in January 2014. Today, the GED provides a second chance for those who have been unable to complete their studies in a traditional high school setting to demonstrate their mastery of high-school level coursework. Eligibility. A person is eligible to take the GED test if they meet three criteria. First, a person cannot have graduated from an accredited high school or received a high school equivalency certificate or diploma. Second, the person cannot be currently enrolled in a regular high school. Lastly, individuals must be at least 16 years of age. Subjects Tested. The GED test is designed to assess the educational and developmental levels of those who did not graduate from high school. The test covers five areas: writing skills, reading (interpreting literature and the arts), mathematics, science and social studies. The questions are all multiple choice with the exception of an essay given in the writing skills portion of the test. To pass the GED test, a person must attain a minimum score on each test and a minimum combined score on all tests. Those who pass the GED test receive a certificate acknowledging that state high school graduation requirements have been met. Administration. The General Educational Development Testing Service administers the GED test in each state, which is a program of the American Council on Education. The test must be taken at an official testing center and cannot be taken online. In response to online programs offering GEDs, the American Council on Education issued a warning that a GED cannot be earned online or by correspondence programs. The warning further provides that a purported GED earned online may be of "dubious value" and may not be accepted by employers, colleges and universities, or the military. Hiring personnel, college admissions officers, and military enlistment personnel are encouraged to verify the authenticity of an individual's GED credential by contacting the jurisdiction that administered the test. Note: In contrast to online GED test-taking programs, online GED preparation programs can serve as useful alternatives to attending local preparation courses. Many online preparation programs are state-sponsored and contain information about regular classroom instruction and authorized testing centers. Acceptance. In the academic and business sectors, holders of GEDs have almost the same opportunities as diploma holders, although the edge does go to those who graduated from high school. All community colleges and almost all four-year institutions accept GEDs, and most businesses that require high school graduation also accept the GED. There seems to be, however, a general impression that a high school diploma is a better credential than a GED. For example, if two applicants are otherwise equally qualified, the applicant with the high school diploma may be preferred to the holder of a GED. For purposes of military service, a GED is regarded as Tier 2 education. The armed forces limit the percentage of Tier 2 candidates accepted in any enlistment year. In addition, GED holders must score higher on the ASVAB to qualify. The status of the GED is based on decades of statistics showing that high school graduates have a much lower attrition rate than other enlistees. The percentage of Tier 2 candidates accepted depends upon the particular branch of service. The Air Force accepts less than one percent, and the Navy and Marines accept less than ten percent. There continues to be a stigma associated with the GED. The negative connotation seems to be related to the perception of high school dropouts rather than to the GED itself. A common assumption may be that students drop out of high school because of behavioral or academic problems, whereas in practice there is a range of circumstances that keep students from finishing high school from personal medical issues to family emergencies or other life circumstances that prevent an otherwise capable student from completing their studies. In addition, getting a GED may be associated with cutting corners or with a lack of perseverance. Most individuals spend less time preparing for the GED test than they would spend attending one year of high school. Educators assert that GED holders do not get the benefit of the breadth of subject matter and social interactions that are part of a high school education. Nevertheless, those who pass the GED test demonstrate that they have achieved a comparable level of knowledge as those in their state who graduated from high school.

### A2 CLT PIC

#### **TURN – Classics is a field irreversibly damaged by colorblindness – it encourages abstraction away from material inequalities.**

Kennedy 1/11 By [Rebecca Kennedy](https://www.blogger.com/profile/09189847760200499244) at [January 11, 2019](https://rfkclassics.blogspot.com/2019/01/what-future-classics.html) What Future, Classics? <https://rfkclassics.blogspot.com/2019/01/what-future-classics.html> TJHSSTAD

This weekend's events at the 2019 AIS/SCS annual meeting in San Diego will go down as some of the most important in our field's history, I think. In part because so much of it has been captured on video and on Twitter. But also because it forced to the surface what has been percolating below the surface forever--the field of classics has now and has always had a racism problem. It isn't just the use of classics by overt white nationalist and white supremacist groups. It isn't something locked in the past like the use of the Apollo Belvedere and Myron's Discobolus as examples of perfected white bodies. Laurence Fishburne as Prof. Maurice Phipps Higher Learning It's the assumptions, in fact, that scholars of color in our field only have places because they are not white, as if only white people are capable of truly understanding the classics, while black people are incapable. This is a very old and toxic lie, but one that continues to haunt our field. As I said in a Facebook comment to a friend: "This whole desire to abstract both ourselves and our work from who we are is a way to ensure that there is an invisible norm against which anyone else can be measured. You can't say who the norm is, though, because then it reveals all the -isms it is laden with." It's the only that is the problem. Because sometimes, as stated so eloquently by Dan-el Pedilla Peralta, ones blackness should be the reason they are hired: I should have been hired because I was black: because my Afro-Latinity is the rock-solid foundation upon which the edifice of what I have accomplished and everything I hope to accomplish rests; because my black body’s vulnerability challenges and chastizes the universalizing pretensions of color-blind classics; because my black being-in-the-world makes it possible for me to ask new and different questions within the field, to inhabit new and different approaches to answering them, and to forge alliances with other scholars past and present whose black being-in-the-world has cleared the way for my leap into the breach. Yes, please. Let's all say this together: they should have been hired because they are black. A few years ago, I was the chair of my university's personnel committee. We had spent a couple of years trying to remove exclusionary language from our job ads and ranking criteria--for example, when you say "small liberal arts experience preferred" you ensure that your applicant pool will likely be about 85-90% white, and that any candidate who applies who did not attend or previously work at a small liberal arts college will start at a deficit in the rankings and thus not rise to the top of the pool, regardless of other qualifications. Such criteria also ensures a level of group-think or sameness in educational philosophy among the candidate pool. This isn't a good thing, if you want a vibrant and dynamic faculty and one that will better match the growing diversity of the student populations on campus. There were other measures as well to increase the number of applicants and ensure fairer treatment for non-white non-middle/upper class candidates, too, like an improved diversity statement, implicit bias training, etc. Whether it has worked or not is an issue for another day. For now, it is enough to note that it made some faculty uncomfortable. One faculty member whose department was conducting a search sent me an email and wanted to ask some questions about the diversity statement and other measures the university was taking around hiring. He wanted to propose a hypothetical situation and see what I would say. The hypothetical was the following: say their department was hiring someone in perception psychology and they had two candidates who were in all ways equal except for one way--one of the candidates was blind. He wanted to know if, according to our 'new' hiring policies, would they be required to hire the blind candidate. In other words, would he have to hire someone only because they were blind. The problem with this hypothetical is the only. The reason for hiring the blind candidate is not only because they are blind, but because they are blind. Being blind means that the individual has experienced the world differently to other members of the department. It means that the way they perceive and receive and comprehend the world has to happen differently. This difference means that they will bring something to the program, to the classroom, to faculty meetings, to their scholarly inquiries that are unlike what others who have not experienced the world in the same way. In other words, they bring something dynamic and vibrant and meaningful that didn't exist there before. The other thing they do, of course, is to provide an opportunity to students who may have thought that being in front of a classroom and being a scholar was not for them to learn that it is for them. This value cannot be underestimated. Those experiences are embodied in the person standing before them, in the voice of the scholar, in the ideas and the questions and the answers, in the assignments they craft, the syllabi they decide upon. If you continue to hire similar people, then what happens in the classroom and in the scholarship and in the leadership and contributions to the college are the same. I explained this to my colleague, who seemed unconvinced at the time that there was no such thing as only when it came to hiring someone who had experienced and navigated the world differently. Some people, after all, like sameness. They don't want surprise. Difference makes them uncomfortable. And they are willing to hire someone only because they are like them because it means they can avoid that discomfort.

#### **AND don’t let them shift out of this turn – the CLT is a result of the classics learning movement – giving it greater weight encourages further color-blindness and ensures larger parts of the applicant pool are white which kills diversity.**

#### **The field of classics is mired by racism and colorblindness.**

Pettit 1/7 After Racist Incidents Mire a Conference, Classicists Point to Bigger Problems By Emma Pettit JANUARY 07, 2019 TJHSSTAD

Claims of racism at a classics conference — which are being investigated by the two hosting academic societies — have prompted scholars to criticize the field on Twitter for what they say is a broader indifference toward race-related issues. Two incidents happened at a joint meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America and the Society for Classical Studies, held this past weekend in San Diego. On Saturday, at a panel called “The Future of Classics,” four scholars, including Dan-el Padilla Peralta, an assistant professor at Princeton University, fielded questions from the audience. That’s when an independent scholar took the microphone, said she’s not a “socialist” who doesn’t believe in merit, and told Padilla he’d gotten his job “because he’s black,” according to multiple accounts. ([Video published in February 2019](https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=2970&v=lcJZCVemn-4) shows the scholar pointing at Padilla and saying, "You may have got your job because you’re black, but I would prefer to think you got your job because of merit.") The speaker, Mary F. Williams, was identified by Sarah E. Bond, an associate professor at the University of Iowa who is chair of the classics society’s communications committee. Williams did not immediately respond to a request for comment. (Reached by email, she told [Inside Higher Ed](https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2019/01/07/racist-comments-directed-classics-scholar-disciplinary-meeting-floor-classicists) that it’s important to unapologetically “stand up for classics as a discipline,” and that she didn’t think her comments were racist.) On Monday, Padilla described the verbal attack in a [Medium post.](https://medium.com/@danelpadillaperalta/some-thoughts-on-aia-scs-2019-d6a480a1812a) “What will be stored in the vaults of my memory,” he wrote, “are not just the accusatory words themselves, but the expression on the face of their white-supremacist purveyor as she relieved herself of them,” along with “the looks on the faces of students of color in the room.” “Most of all,” Padilla wrote, “I will remember the rage: not the impotent rage of Mary Frances Williams, but my rage on realizing that her personal assault would divert attention from the paper I had just delivered on the whites-only neighborhood of journal publication in classics.” Williams was subsequently asked to leave the conference because she had violated the event’s harassment policy, tweeted Bond. A More Persistent Truth On Friday, two scholars of color, who were being honored at the conference for improving equality and diversity in the field, [said they had been stopped](https://twitter.com/djesikabel/status/1081299948174434304) by security guards at the Marriott hotel where the conference was being held. (The hotel did not immediately respond to a request for comment.) The scholars, Djesika Bel Watson and Stefani Echeverría-Fenn, founded [The Sportula,](https://thesportula.wordpress.com/) an organization that helps undergraduate classicists pay for tuition, textbooks, and other expenses. Bel Watson and Echeverría-Fenn had received a professional-equity award for their work, presented by the Women’s Classical Caucus. The security staff members asked to see the two scholars’ badges, The Sportula tweeted, while many white and “non-working-class-dressed” scholars without badges were standing around them. “Still confused as to why your security felt fit to question us alone out of all of the guests that were on the balcony today without name badges,” Bel Watson tweeted at the Marriott account. “I’ll wait for an answer.” Both academic societies said they were investigating the incidents, although details were sparse. “All our welcome at our meeting,” the [groups said](https://twitter.com/archaeology_aia/status/1081964003214192643) on Twitter. “We expect all our attendees to follow our guidelines on respectful behavior … It is our practice to investigate reports of incidents that affect our attendees, including those that involve our contractors and vendors.” “We’re talking with the hotel right now about this incident, and will provide updates when we have them,” the Society for Classical Studies [tweeted](https://twitter.com/scsclassics/status/1081301882834845696) on Friday. The Board of Directors “condemns the racist acts and speech that occurred,” the organization also tweeted. Some classics scholars said the incidents should not be viewed in isolation. The episodes are not anomalies, they said, but evidence of a more persistent truth — that the predominantly white discipline often falls short on issues of race. (Medieval studies has faced similar critiques. A cohort of [scholars spoke out](https://www.chronicle.com/article/Medieval-Scholars-Call-for/243919) during its annual conference last year.) Classics has a diversity problem, said Young R. Kim, a historian who now works at a nonprofit organization and was in the audience at Saturday’s panel. When Williams reached the climax of her tirade, Kim said, he and others moved toward her to take the mic away. Kim said that he was angered by Williams’s comments, but also that he wants a broader conversation about racism in the discipline. “If the field is to survive and thrive into the next 150 years,” he said, “what will it have to look like?” ‘Rampant With Discrimination’ Padilla said this wasn’t the first time he’d heard the accusation that he had achieved something because he’s black. Many scholars of color, he said, had told him they’d heard the same claim. (He also argued in the Medium piece that his “Afro-Latinity” is, in fact, a valid reason to hire him.) Padilla hoped, he wrote, that what had happened to him would spark an “honest conversation” about the classics colleagues who hold beliefs similar to Williams’s. In recent years, he said, racist views have been posted on Famae Volent, an anonymous blog devoted to the classics and archaeology job markets. The blog — known across the profession for its tendency to devolve into vitriol — shut down in April. What had once been the occasional “problematic post” had crossed the border into “more serious territory,” the blog’s anonymous architect wrote. As loud as the pushback against Williams was in the moment, tweeted Scott Lepisto, a visiting assistant professor at the College of Wooster, most classicists aren’t on Twitter. “Most who hold the same views as the racist won’t say them in public,” he said, “and way more people hold those views than most either realize or want to admit.” Though the racist events at the conference were “appalling,” tweeted Christopher Polt, an assistant professor at Boston College, nobody should be acting surprised. “The field is rampant with discrimination,” he said. “Ask any minority or working-class classicist, and they can give you countless stories.” Sharmila Sen, executive editor at large for Harvard University Press, who immigrated to the United States from India, identified with Padilla’s experience. “Too tired to feel outrage at racist incidents at #AIASCS,” she tweeted. The expectation to be “poised & eloquent” and to “supply solutions” is something that people in the United States who aren’t white have to carry. “Our additional baggage fees,” she said, “are astronomical.”

### A2 Research PIC

#### The PIC is not competitive – the aff doesn’t defend removing standardized tests, just that colleges shouldn’t consider them – that means in the world of the aff tests can still be used for research purposes, because the aff just defends not considering tests in undergraduate decisions for applicants

Used to justify removing black teachers from schools and mark certain schools as inferior – perpetuates meritocracy

### A2 K-12 PIC

#### **The PIC is not competitive – K-12 tests are not used in admissions now and measure different things than what colleges what to see.**

Atkinson and Geiser 09 Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.4.09 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY http://cshe.berkeley.edu/ REFLECTIONS ON A CENTURY OF COLLEGE ADMISSIONS TESTS\* April 2009 Richard C. Atkinson University of California — President Emeritus Saul Geiser University of California, Berkeley — Center for Studies in Higher Education Copyright 2009 Richard C. Atkinson and Saul Geiser, all rights reserved TJHSSTAD

California’s experience illustrates a more general problem likely to confront any effort to develop standards-based assessments that bridge the institutional divide between state university and K-12 school systems: Standards for what is expected of entering freshmen at selective colleges and universities are different and usually much more rigorous than K-12 curriculum standards. They may overlap, to be sure, but they are not the same, and institutional conflicts over standards and testing are probably inevitable for this reason. College and university faculty are right to be skeptical about using K-12 tests in admissions if it means relinquishing control over entrance standards. And it is understandable that secondary-school educators should be concerned that, in seeking to adapt and modify K-12 tests for use in admissions, colleges and universities may exert undue influence over curriculum standards for the schools.

#### They continue:

Yet the preoccupation with prediction has gradually given way to another idea. E.F. Lindquist’s philosophical opposition to the SAT and his introduction of the ACT, the renewed interest in subject tests at leading colleges and universities, the explosion of standards-based tests in our K-12 schools, and the as yet unsuccessful efforts to adapt them for use in college admissions

## 1AR – Dedev

**1AR – Dedev**

**Economic collapse is inevitable in the future – only transitioning now can solve environmental collapse – tech cannot solve.**

**Trainer 16** Ted, Senior Lecturer, School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, “Sustainability – The Simpler Way perspective,” Resilience, 5/10/2016, <http://www.resilience.org/articles/General/2016/07_July/Sustainability%20The%20Simpler%20Way%20Perspective.pdf> TJHSSTAD

Firstly let’s set the scene; The deteriorating state of the planet. **The resource base and environmental conditions on which the present levels of global production and consumption are built are obviously deteriorating at an alarming rate**. Few if any would not be aware of this but it is important to briefly remind ourselves before focusing on how **impossible it would be for this base to sustain affluence and growth for all. A glance at the situation reveals that resources are becoming more scarce and costly, including energy, productive land, minerals, food, fish, wood and water, and ecosystems are being severely damaged**. We are losing species, forests, land, coral reefs, grasslands and fisheries at accelerating rates. A sixth era of massive biodiversity loss appears to have begun. We are polluting the planet with excess carbon dioxide, nitrogen and many toxic chemicals. The **mass of big animals on the planet has declined sharply in recent decades, probably down by 90% in the sea**. The World Wildlife Fund says that in general the quality of global ecosystems has deteriorated 30% since about 1970, and its “Footprint” measure indicates that we are now taking biological resources at a rate that would take 1.5 planets to provide in a sustainable way. (2014.) The reason for all this massive resource depletion and damage to the environment is simply that **there is far too much producing and consuming going on. This is causing too many resources to be taken from nature and too many wastes to be dumped back into nature**. Now consider the limits case: Could everyone live as we do? The 10-15% of the world’s people living in regions such as North America, Australia and Europe have per capita levels of resource use that are around 20 times the average for the poorest half of people. How likely is it that all the 9.7 billion people expected by 2050 could rise to the present rich world level of resource use? If they did live as we do then world annual resource production and consumption, and ecological damage, would be approaching 6 times as great as at present. Yet present levels of resource use and environmental impact are far from sustainable. The World Wildlife Fund’s ”Footprint” analysis yields an even higher multiple. They estimate that it takes about 8 ha of productive land to provide water, energy settlement area and food for one person living in Australia. **So if 9 billion people were to live as we do we would need about 72 billion ha of productive land. But that is about 9 times all the available productive land on the planet**. Now add the absurdly impossible implications of economic growth. But the foregoing argument has only been that the present levels of production and consumption are quite unsustainable. Yet we are determined to increase present living standards and levels of output and consumption, as much as possible and without any end in sight. In other words, our supreme national goal is economic growth. Few people seem to recognise the absurdly impossible consequences of pursing economic growth. If we rich countries have a 3% p.a. increase in economic activity until 2050 then our output, resource use and environmental impact will be around 4 times as great as it is now, and doubling every 23 years thereafter. **Now what if by 2050 all the expected 9.7 billion people expected to be living on earth had risen to the “living standards” we in rich countries would then have given 3% economic growth. Total world output, resource, use and environmental impact would be approaching 15 times as great as they are now** … unless technical advance and efficiency gains could greatly reduce them. (See below.) These multiplies must be the focal point in discussions of sustainability. Grasping the magnitude of the overshoot and of the unsustainability is crucial here. The numbers show that present, let alone probable 2050 rich world levels of consumption, are grossly unsustainable and could never be extended to all people. But can’t technical advance solve the problems? Most people hold the "technical fix faith", believing that technical advance will solve the resource and environmental problems and thereby make it unnecessary for us to question the commitment to affluence and growth. When considering the following evidence keep in mind that what we need is not just to stop increases in impacts as growth goes on -- we need to reduce impacts dramatically before sustainable levels are reached. There is a very strong case that technical advance is nowhere near capable of solving the sustainability problems facing us. Note that many miraculous technical developments, e.g., in physics, astronomy, genetics, and medicine, are not so relevant here **where the focus is on the possibility of making big improvements in the efficiency and energy costs of producing energy and materials, and of cutting ecological impacts. Following are some of the main elements in the case**. 1. Efficiency gains to date. It is not the case that technical achievements in the relevant areas have been very encouraging. Ayres and Vouroudis (2009) note that for many decades the efficiency of production of electricity and fuels, electric motors, ammonia and iron and steel has more or less plateaued. In many crucial areas such as producing energy and minerals (below) **the trend is towards worse efficiency**, i. e., the need is for increasing inputs per unit of output. 2. The deteriorating productivity growth rate. Technical advance is regarded as a major determinant of productivity growth and that has been in long term decline since the 1970s. Even the advent of computerisation has had a surprisingly small effect, a phenomenon now labelled the “Productivity Paradox.” In fact the UK productivity growth rate has recently has gone below zero; i.e., productivity has actually deteriorated. (Weldon, 2016.) 3. Little or **no “decoupling” is occurring for materials or energy use. This is the most important issue; does recent history indicate that economic output has been or can be separated from materials and energy use, so that growth can continue while resource demand falls? The “Tech-Fix faith” is fundamentally dependent on the assumption that massive decoupling is possible. But all the evidence seems to say that the amount of materials or energy needed to produce a unit of GDP in rich countries has not improved** much if at all in recent years. The box below refers to some of the evidence. Weidmann et al. (2014) say “…for the past two decades global amounts of iron ore and bauxite extractions have risen faster than global GDP.” “… resource productivity…has fallen in developed nations.” “There has been no improvement whatsoever with respect to improving the economic efficiency of metal ore use.” Giljum et al. (2014, p. 324) report in the world as a whole only a 0.9% p.a. improvement in the dollar value extracted from the use of each unit of minerals between 1980 and 2009, and that over the 10 years before the GFC there was no improvement. “…not even a relative decoupling was achieved on the global level.” They point out that the picture would have been worse had they included the many materials in rich world imports. Diederan’s account (2009) of the productivity of minerals discovery effort is even more pessimistic. Between 1980 and 2008 the annual major deposit discovery rate fell from 13 to less than 1, while discovery expenditure went from about $1.5 billion p.a. to $7 billion p.a., meaning the productivity of expenditure fell by a factor in the vicinity of around 100, which is an annual decline of around 40% p.a. Recent petroleum figures are similar; in the last decade or so the discovery rate has not increased but discovery expenditure more or less trebled. (Johnson, 2010.) Schandl et al. (2015) say “ … **there is a very high coupling of energy use to economic growth, meaning that an increase in GDP drives a proportional increase in energy use**.” “Our results show that while relative decoupling can be achieved in some scenarios, none would lead to an absolute reduction in energy or materials footprint.” In all three of their scenarios “… energy use continues to be strongly coupled with economic activity...” Alvarez found that for Europe, Spain and the US, GDP increased 74% in 20 years, but materials use actually increased 85%. (Latouche, 2014.) Similar conclusions re stagnant or declining materials use productivity etc. are arrived at by Aadrianse, 1997, Dittrich et al., (2014), Schutz, Bringezu and Moll, (2004), Warr, (2004), Berndt, (1990), Smil, (2014) and Victor (2008, pp. 55-56). (Note that economists often claim that the “energy intensity” of rich world economies is improving, but this is only because they fail to take into account the huge amounts of energy used overseas to produce imports, and “fuel switching”; see Kaufman, 2004.) 4. There is ecological deterioration in almost all domains. **Technical advance has obviously not slowed, halted or reversed overall damage to the planet’s ecosystems. The “Environmental Kuznets Curve” thesis is an application of the decoupling claim to environmental impacts, asserting that as countries become richer impacts increase for a time but then plateau and fall. There is little doubt now that the thesis is not valid. Rich countries are in general not solving their most serious environmental problems. Alexander’s review (2014) concludes that for the world as a whole, ”… decades of extraordinary technological development have resulted in increased, not reduced, environmental impacts.”** These many sources and figures show the extreme implausibility of the tech-fix faith that in future technical advances will enable us to stop worrying about limits and any need to dramatically reduce consumption or the obsession with economic growth. Conclusions on the limits to growth case. In view of these lines of argument it is difficult to see how anyone could disagree with the basic limits to growth case. Present ways are so grossly unsustainable there is no possibility of all people rising to the living standards we take for granted today in rich countries, let alone those we are seeking. Again the most important point is the magnitude of the overshoot. Most people have no idea of how far beyond sustainable levels of consumption we are or how big the reductions should be. For decades many scientists and agencies are have been emphasizing the validity and importance of the basic limits case. Sustainable ways that all could share appear to require us to go down to per capita rates of resource consumption around 10% of those we have now. It follows from the above discussion that **the only solution is to shift to some kind of Simpler Way, i.e., to lifestyles, settlements and systems that make it possible for us to live well on a small fraction of our present rich world levels, with no economic growth**. THE INJUSTICE OF THE GLOBAL ECONOMY. Our goal should be societies that are sustainable and just. The present economy is massively and unavoidably unjust; it does not and it can not distribute things fairly or develop the right things. (For the detail see TSW: The Economic System.) As well as being an economic system that must have growth, the fundamental driving mechanism in this economy is the market, and this never distributes things according to what is needed, or according to rights, or what is ecologically desirable. Markets always allocate most scarce things to those who can pay most for them, i.e., richer people and nations. That explains the huge differences between rich and poor nations in resource and energy consumption; we get most of the oil and everything else for sale because we can pay more than poor people who need things much more than we do. About 600 million tonnes of grain, one third of world production, is fed to animals in rich countries every year while over 800 million people are hungry. Why? Because the market determines who gets the grain; it is more profitable to feed it to animals to produce meat for richer people. Even more importantly, **this economy never develops what is most needed; it always develops only what is most profitable for people with capital to invest. It is not difficult to list things the majority of people in Haiti need, but what industries has this economy developed there?** Mostly plantations and factories paying very low wages to a few, to produce goods to export to rich countries. Haiti has rich resources that could enable all its poor people to provide for themselves most of the simple things they need for quite good lifestyles, but this economy gears those resources to the enrichment of the local capitalist class, foreign corporations and people who shop in rich world supermarkets. For these reasons, conventional Third World development can be seen as a form of legitimised plunder. (See TSW: Third World Development, and TSW: Our Empire. For an indication of the alternative approach to development see TSW: Chikukwa.) It should be noted here that this does not mean that there can be no role for markets in a satisfactory society. It does mean that they must not be allowed to determine our fate. The account below indicates how communities might work out what things markets might be left to do, and eventually whether there is any need for them. So again we are confronted with the way consumer-capitalist society inevitably causes the most serious global problems; it cannot cut production to sustainable levels and it cannot enable just distributions or appropriate development priorities. **The problems in both these domains can only be solved if people in rich countries shift down to living on something like their fair share of global resources**. This cannot be done unless there are huge and radical changes in systems, lifestyles and values. Few people in rich countries understand that they could not have their high "living standards" if the global economy was not enabling them to take far more than a just share of world resources and to deprive Third world people of a fair share. This also reveals the link between resource scarcity and limits on the one hand, and conflict and war in the world. Most armed conflict it is due to struggles to get or maintain access to scarce resource wealth in other countries. Rich nations support repressive regimes willing to rule in our interests and they work to bring down governments that don’t. If you are not prepared to move down to living on something like your fair share of world resources then you will continue to need lots of arms to maintain your empire. (See TSW: Peace and Conflict.) The loss of social cohesion and quality of life. 7 In addition to the foregoing problems, in the richest countries we are experiencing accelerating social breakdown and a falling quality of life. This too is largely the result of the mindless pursuit of limitless material wealth. It has been clear for a long time that in rich countries raising GDP and monetary “wealth” adds little or nothing to the quality of life. In fact it is because “…getting the economy going” is the top priority that the quality of life is suffering. Many people do not get a satisfactory share of the wealth, jobs or resources and are having to work harder in more stressful conditions. Many are being dumped into “exclusion”. It is no surprise therefore that there is much drug abuse, crime and social breakdown, or that stress, anxiety and depression are now possibly the most common illnesses. Most people work far harder than would be needed in a sane society. Large numbers of young people will never be able to afford a house. There is little or no investment in the development of community or cooperative institutions. Neo-liberal doctrine advocates that all must compete against each other as self-interested individuals for as much wealth as possible, when the sensible way for humans to relate to each other is via cooperation, sharing, giving and nurturing. It is evident that social attitudes are becoming more selfish and increasing numbers of people believe the future will be worse than the present. Most of this is due to allowing the market to become the dominant determinant of what happens in society. Market forces drive out good social values and behaviour, because they make us focus only on competing to maximise self interest. There is no place in markets for giving, generosity, care, collectivism or concern for the public good. In addition when market forces are freed to determine what happens then what is developed is what will maximize the profits of those few with most capital, not what will most benefit society. It is not possible to have a good society unless we make sure that considerations of morality, justice, the public good and environmental sustainability are the primary determinants of what happens. This means what is done must be basically determined by rational collective discussion of what is needed, just and ecologically wise… again implying a need for fundamental economic change.

**Environmental collapse means extinction**

David **Shearman 7**, Emeritus professor of medicine at Adelaide University, Secretary of Doctors for the Environment Australia, and an Independent Assessor on the IPCC; and Joseph Wayne Smith, lawyer and philosopher with a research interest in environmentalism, 2007, The Climate Change Challenge and the Failure of Democracy, p. 153-156 TJHSSTAD

**Hundreds** of scientists writing in Millennium Assessment and other scientific reports pronounce that humanity is in peril from environmental damage. If liberal democracy is to survive it will need to offer leadership, resolve, and sacrifice to address the problem. To date there is not a shred of evidence that these will be provided nor could they be delivered by those at the right hand of American power. Some liberal democracies that recognize that global warming is a dire problem are trying but nevertheless failing to have an impact on greenhouse emissions. To arrest climate change, greenhouse reductions of 60 to 80 percent are required during the next few decades. By contrast the Kyoto Protocol prescribes reductions of only a few percent. The magnitude of the problem seems overwhelming, and indeed it is. So much so, it is still denied by many because it cannot be resolved without cataclysmic changes to society. Refuge from necessary change is being sought in technological advances that will allow fossil fuels to be used with impunity, but this ignores the kernel of the issue. If all humanity had the ecological footprint of the average citizen of Australia or the United States, at least another **three planets would be needed** to support the present population of the world.2 The ecological services of the world cannot be saved under a regime of attrition by growth economies that each year use more land, water, forests, natural resources, and habitat. Technological advances cannot retrieve dead ecological services. The measures required have been discussed and documented for several decades. None of them are revolutionary new ideas. We will discuss the main themes of a number of important issues such as the limits to growth, the separation of corporatism and governance, the control of the issue of credit (i.e., financial reform), legal reform, and the reclaiming of the commons. Each of these issues has been discussed in great depth in the literature, and a multitude of reform movements have been spawned. Unfortunately, given the multitude of these problems and the limited resources and vision of the reformers, each of the issues tends to be treated in isolation. From an ecological perspective, which is a vision seeking wholeness and integration, this is a mistake. These areas of reform are closely interrelated and must be tackled as a coherent whole to bring about change. Banking and financial reform is, for example, closely related to the issue of control and limitation of corporate power, because finance capital is the engine of corporate expansion. The issue of reclaiming the commons and protecting the natural environment from corporate plunder is also intimately connected to the issue of the regulation of corporate power. In turn this is a legal question, and in turn legal structures are highly influenced by political and economic factors. Finally, the issue of whether there are ecological limits to growth underlies all these issues. Only if an ecologically sustainable solution can be given to this totality of problems can we see the beginnings of a hope for reform of liberal democracy. And even then, there still remains a host of cultural and intellectual problems that will need to be solved. The prospects for reform are daunting, but let us now explore what in principle is needed. THE LIMITS TO GR OWTH Our loving marriage to economic growth has to be dissolved. The dollar value of all goods and services made in an economy in one year is expressed as the gross domestic product (GDP). It is a flawed measurement in that it does not measure the true economic and social advance of a society,3 but it is relevant to our discussion here for most of the activities it measures consume energy. Each country aims for economic growth, for every economy needs this for its success in maintaining employment and for the perceived ever-expanding needs of its populace. Politicians salivate about economic growth, it is their testosterone boost. Most would be satisfied with 3 percent per annum and recognize that this means that the size of the economy is 3 percent greater than the previous year. On this basis the size of the economy doubles every 23 years. In 43 years it has quadrupled. Now in 23 years let us suppose that energy needs will also double in order to run this economy. Therefore if greenhouse emissions are to remain at today’s level, then approximately half the energy requirements in 23 years’ time will have to be alternative energy. The burgeoning energy requirements of the developing countries have not yet been included in these considerations. To date, these countries have been reluctant to consider greenhouse reductions saying that they have a right to develop without hindrance, and in any case the developed countries are responsible for most of the present burden of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. It is not difficult to calculate therefore that there is no future for civilization in the present cultural maladaptation to the growth economy. Sustainable economic growth is an oxymoron. These arguments about doubling time apply to all other environmental calculations. Other forms of pollution that arise from the consumer society will also increase proportionally to growth, the human and animal wastes, mercury, the persistent organic pollutants, and so on. And even if some of these are ameliorated, others will arise from the activities of the burgeoning population. Science tells us that we have already exceeded the capacity of the earth to detoxify these. In advocating a no-growth economy it has been shown in many studies that beyond the basic needs of health, nutrition, shelter, and cultural activity, which can be provided with much less income than Westerners presently enjoy, there is little correlation between wealth and happiness or well-being. A no-growth economy4 would supply the essentials for life and happiness. Human and economic activity fuelling the consumer market would be severely curtailed and the resources redeployed to truly sustainable enterprises, basic care and repair of the environment, conservation of energy, and the manufacture of items and systems that support these needs. The standard of living as measured at present (again by flawed criteria) will fall, but there may be no alternative. The fundamental question is how can a transition be made under a liberal democracy that has consumerism and a free market as its lifeblood?

**2AR Analysis**

**We make two claims – first, over-consumption and population growth NOW means that an economic collapse in the future would be even more devastating than an economic collapse today and second, economic collapse is INEVITABLE – it will happen at some point in the future. We say that it’s better for economic collapse to happen now rather than later when there is a larger risk of mass extinction. Further, an economic collapse now solves because it forces us to start from scratch with a more sustainable system for the future.**

## A2 Phil

### Ideal Theory Bad

#### **Ideal theory is bad – three warrants, drop one and lose**

Mills 05 Mills, Charles. W, Professor of Moral and Intellectual philosophy at Northwestern University, “Ideal Theory” as Ideology. Hypatia, Volume 20, Number 3, Summer 2005, pp. 165-184. <http://www.nsdupdate.com/assets/2017/02/Ideal-theory-as-ideology.pdf> TJHSSTAD

Three objections:

1. Legitimacy: ideal theory presumes the normative concept in question is legitimate, when in fact it might be ideological – example of purity
2. Application: applying ideal theory will be affected by oppressive relations in society – example of autonomy – some groups excluded
3. Absence: ideal theory makes lived experiences irrelevant and fails to recognize how social position effects the development of concepts

Ideal theory might at least seem to be unproblematic in the realm of the ideals themselves: normative concepts. Here if nowhere else, it might be felt, idealization is completely legitimate. But even here the adequacy of ideal theory can be challenged on at least three dimensions: the legitimacy of the normative concept in the first place; the particular way that the normative concept is applied, or operationalized; and the absence of other normative concepts. Consider purity as an ideal. In abstraction, it sounds innocent enough—surely purity is good, as against impurity. Who could object to that? But consider its historic use in connection with race. For many decades in the United States and elsewhere, racial purity was an ideal, and part of the point of antimiscegenation law was to preserve the “purity” of the white race. Since blackness was def ned by the “one-drop rule”—any black ancestry makes you black (Davis 1991)—the idea of black purity would have been a contradiction in terms. So there was a fundamental asymmetry in the way “purity” was applied, and in practice both the law and social custom was primarily on the alert for black male/white female “miscegenation,” not white male/black female “miscegenation,” which was widely winked at. Apart from what we would now, in a more enlightened age, see as its fundamental incoherence—that since races have no biological existence, they are not the kinds of entities that can be either pure or impure—the ideal of purity served to buttress white supremacy. So here a normative concept once accepted by millions was actually totally illegitimate (Alcoff 1995). (Similarly, think of the historic role of “purity” as an invidious Charles W. Mills 177 standard for evaluating female sexuality, and the corresponding entrenchment of the double standard.) Or consider a (today) far more respectable ideal, that of autonomy. This notion has been central to ethical theory for hundreds of years, and is, of course, famously most developed in Kant’s writings. But recent work in feminist theory has raised questions as to whether it is an attractive ideal at all, or just a reflection of male privilege. Human beings are dependent upon others for a long time before they can become adult, and if they live to old age, are likely to be dependent upon others for many of their latter years. But traditionally, this work has been done by women, and so it has been invisible or taken for granted, not theorized. Some feminist ethicists have argued for the simple abandonment of autonomy as an attractive value, but others have suggested that it can be redeemed once it is reconceptualized to take account of this necessarily interrelational aspect (MacKenzie and Stoljar, 2000). So the point is that idealization here obfuscates the reality of care giving that makes any achievement of autonomy possible in the first place, and only through nonideal theory are we sensitized to the need to balance this value against other values, and rethink it. Somewhat similarly, think of the traditional left critique of a liberal concept of freedom that focuses simply on the absence of juridical barriers, and ignores the many ways in which economic constraints can make working-class liberties largely nominal rather than substantive. Finally, it may be that the nonideal perspective of the socially subordinated is necessary to generate certain critical evaluative concepts in the first place, since the experience of social reality of the privileged provides no phenomenological basis for them: Marxist concepts of class alienation and labor exploitation; feminist concepts of sexual alienation and affective exploitation; critical race theory concepts of whiteness as oppressive and “colorblindness” as actually whiteness in disguise. Insofar as concepts crystallize in part from experience, rather than being a priori, and insofar as capturing the perspective of subordination requires advertence to its reality, an ideal theory that ignores these realities will necessarily be handicapped in principle.

#### The ultimate goal of ethics is to generate a guide for actions – ideal theory fails to do this.

Mills 05 Mills, Charles. W, Professor of Moral and Intellectual philosophy at Northwestern University, “Ideal Theory” as Ideology. Hypatia, Volume 20, Number 3, Summer 2005, pp. 165-184. <http://www.nsdupdate.com/assets/2017/02/Ideal-theory-as-ideology.pdf> TJHSSTAD

I suggest that this spontaneous reaction, far from being philosophically naïve or jejune, is in fact the correct one. If we start from what is presumably the uncontroversial premise that the ultimate point of ethics is to guide our actions and make ourselves better people and the world a better place, then the framework above will not only be unhelpful, but will in certain respects be deeply antithetical to the proper goal of theoretical ethics as an enterprise. In modeling humans, human capacities, human interaction, human institutions, and human society on ideal-as-idealized-models, in never exploring how deeply different this is from ideal-as-descriptive-models, we are abstracting away from realities crucial to our comprehension of the actual workings of injustice in human interactions and social institutions, and thereby guaranteeing that the ideal-as-idealized-model will never be achieved. It is no accident that historically subordinated groups have always been deeply skeptical of ideal theory, generally see its glittering ideals as remote and unhelpful, and are attracted to nonideal theory, or what signif cantly overlaps it, “naturalized” theory. In the same essay cited above, Jaggar identif es a “unity of feminist ethics in at least one dimension,” a naturalism “characteristic, though not def nitive, of it” (Jaggar 2000, 453). Marxism no longer has the appeal it once did as a theory of oppression, but it was famous for emphasizing, as in The German Ideology, the importance of descending from the idealizing abstractions of the Young Hegelians to a focus on “real, active men,” not “men as narrated, thought of, imagined, conceived,” but “as they actually are,” in (class) relations of domination (Marx and Engels 1976, 35–36). And certainly black Americans, and others of the racially oppressed, have always operated on the assumption that the natural and most illuminating starting point is the actual conditions of nonwhites, and the discrepancy between them and the vaunted American ideals. Thus Frederick Douglass’s classic 1852 speech, “What to the Slave Is the Fourth [of] July?” points out the obvious, that the inspiring principles of freedom and independence associated with the celebration are not equally extended to black slaves: “I am not included within the pale of this glorious anniversary! Your high independence only reveals the immeasurable distance between us. . . . The rich inheritance of justice, liberty, prosperity and independence, bequeathed by your fathers, is shared by you, not by me. . . . This Fourth July is yours, not mine. You may rejoice, I must mourn” (1996, 116, emphasis in original). So given this convergence in gender, class, and race theory on the need to make theoretically central the existence and functioning of the actual non-ideal structures that obstruct the realization of the ideal, what defensible arguments for abstracting away from these realities could there be?

#### **Even if ideal theory is generally good, it’s uniquely necessary to use non-ideal theory in the context of debates about education. The power of privileged groups in education discourse manifests under the guise of neutrality – an egalitarian starting point and rhetoric maintains oppression in education.**

Ferri and Connor 05 Tools of Exclusion: Race, Disability, and (Re)segregated Education Article in  Teachers College Record · March 2005 Beth A. Ferri Syracuse University 52 PUBLICATIONS   1,125 CITATIONS   David Connor City University of New York - Hunter College 80 PUBLICATIONS   1,479 CITATIONS TJHSSTAD

In these connected histories, individuals deemed undesirable were kept out of the schools and classes of those with more power. As noted, technologies of power manifest themselves in many forms, including excessive and biased testing, educational norms determined by the dominant group, and stigmatizing labels, all contributing to the re-segregation of classrooms along the 468 Teachers College Record same axes of power. Taken together and accepted without question, these technologies of difference construct and fortify existing rationales behind exclusive practices and continue to create new forms of containment to maintain traditional divisions among students. Many unarticulated assumptions undergird thinking about desegregation and inclusion. Implicit in the discourse of exclusion are perceptions of Black and disabled people as unequivocally inferior. Such widespread deficit-model perceptions are deeply entrenched in the cultural imagination and are evident in oppressive legislation, educational practice, as well as in the distorted portrayals of ‘‘others’’ in academic scholarship, literature, media, and film (Adams, 2001; Bell, 1992; Fleischer, & Zames, 2001; Gould, 1996; Thomson, 1997). Recently, however, concepts of ‘‘race’’ and ‘‘disability’’ have become challenged by scholars within the fields of Critical Race Theory and Disability Studies as long-standing socio-cultural constructs. Lawrence (1993) writes . . .race is a social construction. The meaning of ‘Black’ or ‘White’ is derived through a history of acted-upon ideology. . .the cultural meaning of race is promulgated through millions of ongoing contemporaneous speech acts. . . segregation and White supremacy . . .constitutes and maintains a culture in which non-Whites are excluded from full citizenship (p. 62). A similar argument is made by disability studies scholars who critique the fiction of normalcy and disability, and instead characterize these concepts as mutually dependent social (rather than biological) constructions (Davis, 1995; Linton, 1998; Oliver, 1996). The exclusion of both groups from full citizenship can, therefore, be seen as a form of containment. How might the notion of containment be linked to the idea of change? If, generally speaking, educational change is perceived by the dominant group as a form of loss (Guskey, & Huberman, 1995) what are people who advocate maintaining exclusive practices fearful of losing? West (1993) argues that ‘‘. . .White America has been historically weak-willed in ensuring racial justice and has continued to resist fully accepting the humanity of blacks’’ (p. 3). As Bell (1995) confers, ‘‘. . .few are willing to recognize that racial segregation is much more than a series of quaint customs that can be remedied effectively without altering the status of Whites’’ (p. 22). These statements convey that Whites’ fears and Blacks’ hopes are diametrically opposed: each group perceives the potential changes integration may bring very differently. If Black people are seen as equal to Whites, then White people lose their historical positioning, replete with unexamined privileges, and in doing so, their sense of superiority. Similarly, if disability is Tools of Exclusion: Race, Disability, and (Re)segregated Education 469 ‘‘a social state rather than a biological difference’’ (Barnes, Mercer, & Shakespeare, 1999, p. 37) then ability and normalcy must also be socially constructed, rather than innate. Therefore, blocking the access of Black people and people with disabilities to all levels of society rests on a central, but often unarticulated, assumption of superiority by the dominant group. This very superiority is threatened by integration, which historically has evoked many fears, including an increased competition for jobs, miscegenation, and ‘‘pollution’’ of the nation’s gene pool. Thus, access appears to literally diminish White and able-bodied presence, and therefore, power. Schools uphold and reinforce the dominant beliefs of society. As such, they are examples of racism and ableism in practice, although they are rarely portrayed in this way. The power manifested within them is masked by purported neutrality. Foucault underscored how technologies of power are accepted ‘‘only as a condition that it masks a substantial part of itself. Its success is proportional to its ability to hide its own mechanisms’’ (1990, p. 86). The ‘‘undesirability’’ of Black children and/or children with disabilities in schools is indicative of the values of our larger society, which seeks to deny access by containing individuals in markedly asymmetrical positions of power. However, this legacy is coming under increased scrutiny, reflected in recent research sponsored by the Civil Rights Project at Harvard University (see Losen, & Orfield, 2002). Of course, technologies of exclusion, including ability testing, tracking, labeling, and special education, have played a major part in the resegregation of our schools. By engaging critically with how desegregation and inclusion were framed in these different but connected histories, we gain a deeper understanding about the resistance to integrated schooling for all students and about the unchanging nature of public education.

### A2 Yardstick

#### 1. Saying ideal theory is a yardstick misunderstands our goal – we first need ethics that can guide us towards action resolving unjust behavior – this requires incorporating non-ideal facts. Even if ideal theory is a yardstick, it doesn’t help guide action against or resolve any oppression.

#### 2. We don’t need an objective or goal to measure our progress against – moving in the direction of always rejecting instances of oppression is obviously a good thing which means ideal theory is useless because it just re-affirms stuff we already know

### Philosophical Freeze DA

#### Their complex ethics cause a philosophical freeze which makes it impossible to resolve oppression in the short term – that’s bad because it allows violence to continue without prescribing action against it

## A2 Kant

### Kant Ableist

#### Kantianism requires rationality that constructs a perfect subject – this form of rationality isn’t accessible to all people, reifying ableism

Ryan 11**:** Ryan [Philosophy student] “Cognitive Disability, Misfortunate, and Justice.” *Introduction to Ethics, Binghamton University.* 2011. RP

**In Kant's deontological ethics, one has a duty to treat humanity not as a means, but as an ends. However, Kant's criterion for being part of humanity and moral agency is not biological. In order to be considered fully human, and a moral agent, one must be autonomous and rational**. If one lacks rationality and autonomy they cannot escape the chain of causality to act freely from moral principles, and hence are not moral agent's. **Kant's moral program fails to account for those who are cognitively impaired because they lack autonomy and rationality.** Since Kant's requirement for moral agency is so cut-and-dry and leaves no room for ambiguity, there is no clear moral distinction made between the cognitively impaired and other non- human animals. **In the case of Kant, there could be no universal moral law from the categorical imperative that would apply to the cognitively impaired and not non-human animals as well**. McMahan reaches the same conclusion as Kant, namely that, there is no meaningful moral distinction to be made between the cognitively impaired and other non-human animals. McMahan takes it to be the case that certain psychological attributes and capacities constitute a minimum for us to value a person as a moral agent. **The cognitively impaired fall below the threshold for moral agency because they do not have certain psychological attributes and capacities that McMahan takes to be constitutive of moral agency**. Therefore, as morality dictates we be impartial, we cannot give favor to the cognitively impaired over animals with similar psychological endowments. According to McMahan we have no non-arbitrary basis to do so. While McMahan agrees that many accept that we have reasons to give priority to those most proximal to us (which would give the family of someone cognitively impaired reason to favor them over a similarly endowed non-human animal) it does not give a reason for society as a whole to give this preference. **Kant and McMahan are similar, in that their standards for moral agency exclude the cognitively impaired (rationality/autonomy and psychological capacities respectively). In Kant's morality, those who are rational and autonomous are to be treated as ends in themselves. In the case of the cognitively impaired, there is no such requirement.** Similarly, in McMahan's moral theory, those who are human and unfortunate are entitled to compensation by society under the dictates of justice. **However, according to McMahan the cognitively impaired are not human in the relevant sense (possessing certain psychological capacities and features) so they are not entitled to compensation. In excluding the cognitively impaired from moral agency, both Kant and McMahan reach a conclusion that many of us find unsettling, in which we might give the cognitively impaired a moral preference over a similarly endowed non-human animal, is because of a responsibility to respect the family members of the cognitively endowed, not because they have any value as moral agents**

#### And that’s a voting issue – their framework makes the debate unsafe and inaccessible for disabled folk by normalizing ableist philosophy as something that can be read

### \*A2 Farr

#### 1. Recognition necessitates an outside – structures of oppression allow other groups to selectively be recognized within structures of capitalism and liberal democracy but always end up excluding others.

#### 2. No impact – no reason why using kant to recognize things that are clearly messed up as oppressive is necessary or matters – we know what oppression is and know we should reject it

#### 3. Farr assumes all groups have a universal ability to be recognized – this assumption is implicated by all our ideal theory bad arguments.

### Offense

#### 1. TURN – standardized tests are intrinsically unfair – if a test is “standardized,” that test is a measurement of a “standard” as defined by particular interests – those who are better equipped to assimilate to those interests are those who would be deemed more successful or better aligned with the creators of the test.

#### 2. TURN – tests are not objective – our evidence indicates TOEFL is constructed by colleges and universities who have their own biases and social position – these things subconsciously affect test creation which means they can never be completely objective or universalizable.

#### 3. TURN – the intrinsic merit of standardized testing has been compromised by neoliberalism – tests are used to sort students who best serve the ends of corporations rather than to identify students committed to the search for truth. This contradicts Kant’s belief that academia should work to fulfill the autonomous pursuit of knowledge.

Fender 11 We Need Education – Not Just Thought Control: Kant, Foucault and Tempered Thoughts Katherine Ann Fender[1], Department of English and Comparative Literary Studies, University of Warwick <https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/cross_fac/iatl/reinvention/archive/volume4issue1/fender> 2011 TJHSSTAD

the integrity of academia as a 'valuable human activity' has been compromised merely for the sake of 'transferable skills', university rankings and overt economic use. Responsible for consumerising the institution in this power discourse are, one may argue, private businesses: those on whom universities are becoming increasingly reliant due to the fact that government investment in education is ever decreasing. In the light of the current economic recession, universities are now typically commended as sites of 'Knowledge Transfer…[with] businesses […] expected to generate innovation and stimulate the economy' (Valade-DeMelo, 2009: 6), rather than as sites of independent enquiry free from ideological influence: that for which they were traditionally revered. The academic's predicament is disillusioning for students and lecturers alike; demoted to the roles of consumers and producers of 'knowledge' in what should, surely, be a 'protected space for the autonomous pursuit of fundamental inquiry' (Fuller, 1999: 584), the case of the modern university constitutes the most incontrovertible evidence that Kant's dichotomic ideal of reason is simply impracticable. The legacy of a capitalist age is emerging: a business mentality thrives among and drives competitive young students, perhaps understandably so. All too aware that the experience is one afforded by great financial expense, a knowledge/money exchange, it is unsurprising that most are eager to ascertain the criteria by which their essays and exams are marked so that they may obtain the highest class of degree possible and, thus, win the best (highest-paying) job that they can. This is not, clearly, academic meritocracy: a Kantian belief that, in a just world, [academic] reputation is 'proportioned to merit' (Wolff, 1973: 118), esteem established because of the intrinsic value of one's thoughts in themselves.

## A2 Spikes

### O/V

#### Allow 2ar responses to blippy 1nc tricks

#### a. Key to protect time-crunched 1ars and disincentivize blip-storms that aren’t complete arguments

#### b. Topic ed- encourages substantive debate on real world issues instead of recycled garbage

### Spikes Ableist

#### Tricks reproduce ableism – kills inclusivity within debate

MISCELLANEOUS THOUGHTS FROM THE DISORGANIZED MIND OF MARSHALL THOMPSON Posted by Terrence Lonam | Apr 21, 2015 | Debate Commentary, Featured, Uncategorized, Vintage | 0

The second use of spikes is the attempt to win an argument by not having to defend it. To win the argument because it was conceded rather than because you were able to answer your opponents objections effectively. It seems to me, that the skill set that this reward are not the same skill sets that we want to be assessing when we consider who was the ‘better debater.’ Now I acknowledge that many will disagree about what it mean to be the ‘better debater’ and thus my intuition pump may not generate universal appeal, but it seems to me that being the better debater should track more closely with your ability to defend your arguments, than your ability to hide your arguments. For those to whom that is not intuitive, perhaps the following arguments will provide it more credence (these are more illustrative than anything, I personally think the above intuition pump is just as basic as these). First, I think that evaluating who is the better debater via who dropped spikes excludes lots of specific individuals, especially those with learning disabilities. I have both moderate dyslexia and extreme dysgraphia. Despite debating for four years with a lot of success I was never able to deal with spikes. I could not ‘mind-sweep’ because my flow was not clear enough to find the arguments I needed, and I was simply too slow a reader to be able to reread through the relevant parts of a case during prep-time. I was very lucky, my junior year (which was the first year I really competed on the national circuit) spikes were remarkably uncommon. Looking back it was in many ways the low-point for spike. They started to be used some my senior year but not anything like the extent they are used today. I am entirely confident, however, in saying that if spikes had had anywhere near the same prevalence when I started doing ‘circuit’ debate as they do now, I—with the specific ways that dyslexia/dysgraphia has affected me—would never have bothered to try to debate national circuit LD (I don’t intend to imply this is the same for anyone who has dyslexia or dysgraphia, the particular ways that learning disabilities manifest is often difficult to track). Now, the mere fact that I would have been prevented from succeeding in the activity and possibly from being able to enjoyably compete is not an argument. I never would have been able to succeed at calligraphy, but I would hardly claim we should therefore not make the calligraphy club about handwriting. Instead, what I am suggesting is that the values that debate cares about and should be assessing are not questions of handwriting or notation. We expect notation instrumentally to avoid intervention, but it is not one of the ends of debate in itself. Thus, if there is a viable principle upon which we can decrease this strategic dimension of spikes but maintain non-intervention I think we should do so. I was ‘good’ at philosophy, ‘good’ at argument generation, ‘good’ at research, ‘good’ at casing, ‘great’ at framework comparison etc. It seems to me that as long as I can flow well enough to easily follow a non-tricky aff it was proper that my learning disabilities not be an obstacle to my success. (One other thing to note, while I was a ‘framework debater’ who could never have been good at spikes because of my learning disability I have never met a ‘tricky debater’ who could not have succeeded in debate without tricks simply in virtue of their intelligence and technical proficiency; that is perhaps another reason to favor my account.)
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