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#### Current investment into objective and measurable forms of education by the university serves to perpetuate Neoliberalism. Education is no longer considered a cultural space or as a public good but rather as a commodity that possesses only economic value.

Patrick ’13 **(**Fiona – Lecturer in Higher Education at the University of Glasgow, “Neoliberalism, the Knowledge Economy, and the Learner: Challenging the Inevitability of the Commodified Self as an Outcome of Education,” in ISRN Education, Volume 2013, <http://www.hindawi.com/journals/isrn/2013/108705/>)

Arguably, the acceptance of marketisation and associated forms of neoliberal governance has led to the undermining of universities as “independent source[s] of knowledge and inquiry” [33, page 192]. One of their primary functions is now to raise their own productivity in order to survive. They must package knowledge, deliver flexible education through ICT, provide adequate training for “knowledge workers”, and produce more of them at lower unit cost. While this scenario portrays universities as guiding social change, there is evidence of a reverse tendency: that they are becoming subordinate to corporate-style managerialism and income-maximization. [35, page 3] A result of this emphasis is that universities are no longer considered primarily as “cultural spaces” that can enable individual students and teachers to engage in critique and discussion [3, page 495]. Education tends not to be considered as a public or individual good in any meaningful sense [3,page 494]. It is simply a commodity, much like any other, and higher education (both as a sector and as individual institutions) seems to have lost any will to debate openly the values and goals that students might develop [36]. There is little sense of an alternative to the neoliberal vision of the purposes of education as creating the “economically self-interested” individual [2, page 314]. Cribb and Gewirtz claim that universities have now become “hollowed out,” lacking any “distinctive social role and no ethical raison d’etre” [37, page 3, original emphasis]. Neoliberalism seems to have “taken away the joy of learning, the creativity of teaching and the formation of strong public intellectuals” [5, page 489]. Educational institutions have become part of a social reality that is “identified with an economic value system that shapes all reality in its own image” [23, page 502]. Within this value system, knowledge becomes “objectified, measurable and transferable” [23, page 506]. One effect of this is that credentialism becomes inherent in the system: the more credentials possessed in the shape of certificates and degrees, the more marketable the individual. The self as learner becomes tied to “an economic empirical base” [23, page 517]. However, as higher education sectors have expanded, the value of credentials has lowered rather than increased [31]. Graduate oversupply is now a characteristic of the job market in the United Kingdom as is the driving down of graduate wages [31]. In addition, disciplinary forms of knowledge become credited with differing economic and practical value. The applied sciences together with information and communication technologies are raised in status with regard to assumed economic utility rather than the arts and humanities. Nussbaum argues that the arts and humanities become feared by those who educate for economic growth, because it is “easier to treat people as objects to manipulate if you have never learned any other way to see them” [38, page 23]. When knowledge is seen as having different levels of economic value, and when that economic value becomes predominant, the complexities of defining the heuristic, epistemological, and ontological value of knowledge as a socially constructed phenomenon are lost [39]. This is seen all too clearly in discourses of the knowledge economy in which the word knowledge is used “in an almost entirely rhetorical way; the meaning of knowledge is at best implicit and at worst virtually empty of content” [40, page 193]. Differential value also accrues to individuals as knowledge workers, their value being linked to the world of immaterial labour within which knowledge is the valorized commodity [26]. Fumagalli argues that within the knowledge economy, “[p]roductive activity is increasingly based on immaterial elements, that is to say, on intangible “raw materials,” … which come directly from the utilization of the relational, sentimental, and cerebral faculties of human beings” [26, page 10]. However, this does not bring the individual knowledge worker power over the products of their intelligence, nor does it bring them increased agency or autonomy in their work [31]. Of concern, here is the way in which neoliberalism and the knowledge economy are presented in global and national policy as inevitable aspects of modern capitalist economies. The trend in neoliberal policy to reposition the individual within a framework of economic utility and knowledge capital can seem irrevocable. However, as Torres argues, neoliberalism has “utterly failed as a model of economic development” [33, page 193]. Neoliberal rationality is now acknowledged to have contributed to the 2008 financial crisis [22] through creating conditions of global economic governance which led to the emergence of “devastating forms of financial instability” [22, page 537]. Yet, as Cahill [41] highlights, claims that the financial crisis might signal a revisioning if not an end to neoliberal hegemony were overstated: neoliberalism remains in the ascendancy. Cahill argues that this is because neoliberalism is embedded ideologically and discursively at national and global policy level, at institutional level, and at the level of social class relations [41, pages 486-487]. He concludes that the ideologically embedded nature of neoliberalism “means that a generation of policy makers has only known neoliberalism as the common sense frame for conducting and evaluating policy” [41, pages 486-487]. There are signs that, in terms of labour relations and in terms of social movements, neoliberal economic policy is being challenged [41]. For example, resistance has come from individuals in trade unions, from student bodies, and from gatherings of citizens in protest at the austerity measures undertaken by governments in the United Kingdom and Greece [41, page 488]. As Cahill says, these challenges may not dismantle neoliberalism, but [i]n the current context, even just halting further neoliberalisation would be a welcome development. It would stymie the practice whereby capital and political elites force the costs of the crisis onto labour. It would also halt the forcing of people into greater levels of market dependence for their basic needs by maintaining current levels of decommodification. [41, page 489] Cahill [41] concludes that decommodification requires economic, social, and employment strategies that would enable socially protective rather than socially destructive policy to be enacted. Moving from neoliberalism to consider other economic alternatives is a laudable aim but, as part of this aim, there needs to be reconsideration of the effects of commodification in education, particularly at the level of the individual learner.

#### Standardized tests are only baseline assesments and they don’t go into the nuances of education.

Gawthrop, 14 (Jeremiah Gawthrop has taught 9th and 10th grade in Washington D.C. and graduated from William Jessup University’s Public Policy program, April,29, 2014, “Measuring Student Achievement: A Study of Standardized Testing & Its Effect On Student Learning” http://my.jessup.edu/publicpolicy/wp-content/uploads/sites/39/2014/04/Gawthrop\_Jeremiah\_Final.pdf)

The primary function of standardized testing is to provide information, specifically calibrated to be helpful to legislators, school officials, university recruiters and other administrative positions, all of which operate from outside the classroom.10 Mass-producing assessment tests that are valid, reliable and norm-referenced make it relatively easy for policy makers to accumulate data on students. This is interesting, since the second key assumption about standardized testing, is that its primary function is to determine a student’s academic standing. However, test data is certainly more useful to administrators than students, because a competent teacher can determine a student’s proficiency level based off homework, quizzes or classroom participation. If standardized tests are not necessary to determine a student’s academic level, it raises an important question, whether test results (versus other sources such as teacher input), are the best source for determining policy or curriculum changes. Since standardized tests can only assess, not determine, a student’s academic status, the argument is made that it is dangerous for policy makers to rely predominantly on the data provided by these tests. The price and efficiency of using standardized testing, to accumulate vast amounts of information, is quite appealing to administrators, who require such information to make policy decisions. Standardized tests have been increasingly used, “to make major decisions about students, such as grade promotion or high school graduation, and schools. More and more often, they also are intended to shape curriculum and instruction.”11 It is assumed that newer tests have overcome the flaws of past tests and are accurately able to measure important data that is worth “testing to”. However, this argument completely ignores the real-world limitations to what a standardized test can actually do.12 Tests are created to assess a student’s knowledge base; meaning test results are not representative of the student’s total academic ability.

#### Standardized tests can’t accurately gauge educational learning they’re a one-size fits all that fits no one.

Popham, 99 (W. James Popham began his career in education as a high school teacher in Oregon. He is professor emeritus at the University of California, Los Angeles Graduate School of Education and Information Studies. He is the author of twenty-five books and a former president of the American Educational Research Association., March 1999, "Educational Leadership:Using Standards and Assessments:Why Standardized Tests Don't Measure Educational Quality," Educational Leaderhsip, http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/mar99/vol56/num06/Why-Standardized-Tests-Don%27t-Measure-Educational-Quality.aspx)

Measuring Temperature with a Tablespoon For several important reasons, standardized achievement tests should not be used to judge the quality of education. The overarching reason that students' scores on these tests do not provide an accurate index of educational effectiveness is that any inference about educational quality made on the basis of students' standardized achievement test performances is apt to be invalid. Employing standardized achievement tests to ascertain educational quality is like measuring temperature with a tablespoon. Tablespoons have a different measurement mission than indicating how hot or cold something is. Standardized achievement tests have a different measurement mission than indicating how good or bad a school is. Standardized achievement tests should be used to make the comparative interpretations that they were intended to provide. They should not be used to judge educational quality. Let's look at three significant reasons that it is thoroughly invalid to base inferences about the caliber of education on standardized achievement test scores. Testing-Teaching Mismatches The companies that create and sell standardized achievement tests are all owned by large corporations. Like all for-profit businesses, these corporations attempt to produce revenue for their shareholders. Recognizing the substantial pressure to sell standardized achievement tests, those who market such tests encounter a difficult dilemma that arises from the considerable curricular diversity in the United States. Because different states often choose somewhat different educational objectives (or, to be fashionable, different content standards), the need exists to build standardized achievement tests that are properly aligned with educators' meaningfully different curricular preferences. The problem becomes even more exacerbated in states where different counties or school districts can exercise more localized curricular decision making. At a very general level, the goals that educators pursue in different settings are reasonably similar. For instance, you can be sure that all schools will give attention to language arts, mathematics, and so on. But that's at a general level. At the level where it really makes a difference to instruction—in the classroom—there are significant differences in the educational objectives being sought. And that presents a problem to those who must sell standardized achievement tests. In view of the nation's substantial curricular diversity, test developers are obliged to create a series of one-size-fits-all assessments. But, as most of us know from attempting to wear one-size-fits-all garments, sometimes one size really can't fit all. The designers of these tests do the best job they can in selecting test items that are likely to measure all of a content area's knowledge and skills that the nation's educators regard as important. But the test developers can't really pull it off. Thus, standardized achievement tests will always contain many items that are not aligned with what's emphasized instructionally in a particular setting. To illustrate the seriousness of the mismatch that can occur between what's taught locally and what's tested through standardized achievement tests, educators ought to know about an important study at Michigan State University reported in 1983 by Freeman and his colleagues. These researchers selected five nationally standardized achievement tests in mathematics and studied their content for grades 4–6. Then, operating on the very reasonable assumption that what goes on instructionally in classrooms is often influenced by what's contained in the texbooks that children use, they also studied four widely used textbooks for grades 4-6. Employing rigorous review procedures, the researchers identified the items in the standardized achievement test that had not received meaningful instructional attention in the textbooks. They concluded that between 50 and 80 percent of what was measured on the tests was not suitably addressed in the textbooks. As the Michigan State researchers put it, "The proportion of topics presented on a standardized test that received more than cursory treatment in each textbook was never higher than 50 percent" (p. 509). Well, if the content of standardized tests is not satisfactorily addressed in widely used textbooks, isn't it likely that in a particular educational setting, topics will be covered on the test that aren't addressed instructionally in that setting? Unfortunately, because most educators are not genuinely familiar with the ingredients of standardized achievement tests, they often assume that if a standardized achievement test asserts that it is assessing "children's reading comprehension capabilities," then it's likely that the test meshes with the way reading is being taught locally. More often than not, the assumed match between what's tested and what's taught is not warranted. If you spend much time with the descriptive materials presented in the manuals accompanying standardized achievement tests, you'll find that the descriptors for what's tested are often fairly general. Those descriptors need to be general to make the tests acceptable to a nation of educators whose curricular preferences vary. But such general descriptions of what's tested often permit assumptions of teaching-testing alignments that are way off the mark. And such mismatches, recognized or not, will often lead to spurious conclusions about the effectiveness of education in a given setting if students' scores on standardized achievement tests are used as the indicator of educational effectiveness. And that's the first reason that standardized achievement tests should not be used to determine the effectiveness of a state, a district, a school, or a teacher. There's almost certain to be a significant mismatch between what's taught and what's tested. A Psychometric Tendency to Eliminate Important Test Items A second reason that standardized achievement tests should not be used to evaluate educational quality arises directly from the requirement that these tests permit meaningful comparisons among students from only a small collection of items. A test item that does the best job in spreading out students' total-test scores is a test item that's answered correctly by about half the students. Items that are answered correctly by 40 to 60 percent of the students do a solid job in spreading out the total scores of test-takers. Items that are answered correctly by very large numbers of students, in contrast, do not make a suitable contribution to spreading out students' test scores. A test item answered correctly by 90 percent of the test-takers is, from the perspective of a test's efficiency in providing comparative interpretations, being answered correctly by too many students. Test items answered correctly by 80 percent or more of the test takers, therefore, usually don't make it past the final cut when a standardized achievement test is first developed, and such items will most likely be jettisoned when the test is revised. As a result, the vast majority of the items on standardized achievement tests are "middle difficulty" items. As a consequence of the quest for score variance in a standardized achievement test, items on which students perform well are often excluded. However, items on which students perform well often cover the content that, because of its importance, teachers stress. Thus, the better the job that teachers do in teaching important knowledge and/or skills, the less likely it is that there will be items on a standardized achievement test measuring such knowledge and/or skills. To evaluate teachers' instructional effectiveness by using assessment tools that deliberately avoid important content is fundamentally foolish.

#### Standardized tests do measure specific instances of learning – they’re more nuanced then “30 questions right 5 questions wrong”

Jennifer Borgioli 13, 4-22-2013, "A Principled Defense Of Standardized Testing," Chalkbeat, <http://www.chalkbeat.org/posts/ny/2013/04/22/a-principled-defense-of-standardized-testing/>

Learning, like health, is a construct. Your doctor can’t directly measure how healthy you are, but he or she can directly measure variables that reflect health. For example, your heart rate at this moment doesn’t describe if you are healthy or not. It’s just a number that reflects an attribute of health. Your doctor can take your blood pressure, your temperature, and ask you how you’re feeling and combine those data points to ascertain if you’re healthy. Test design is similar. When we assess (strategically collect evidence of students’ learning), we can only assess a proxy or an attribute of that learning. We can’t pull out a child’s brain, slap it on a scale and say, yup, they’ve learned this much (and for the record, I didn’t just reveal some grand conspiracy. No one wants to weigh children’s brains). No standardized test that a child will experience can capture those amazing traits and attributes that make that child such a beautiful little person. Most importantly — they don’t claim to. A test designer’s job is to create a tool that can measure particular skills and particular standards in a particular way. Designers will tell us what they are measuring in two ways. First, they will establish the purpose for an assessment. Second, they will release a table of specifications (also known as a test map). New York State shares both of these details from its tests (here and here).The history of assessment design has some parallels in the evolution of the medical field. A hundred years ago, doctors were boring into patients’ brains to relieve migraines. The profession got better as the science got better. Much of the science behind medicine is inaccessible to the public, but SED, and psychometricians, put the science of their field right out for the public to access. (It was this transparency that uncovered the serious problems with the way Pearson scored New York City’s gifted and talented exams, discussed in more detail later on). The technical reports describe step by step how NYSED ensures the tests are measuring the right constructs and the design consideration documents clarifies what the designers need to attend to. This transparency is important yet often overlooked.

#### Standardized testing was never meant to evaluate all the nuances of student knowledge – They’re suppossed determine relative measures of success compared to other schools

Magee &, Robert G.; Jones, Brett D. 2012 “An Instrument to Assess Beliefs about Standardized Testing: Measuring the Influence of Epistemology on the Endorsement of Standardized Testing” Australian Journal of Educational & Developmental Psychology, v12 p71-82 2012, University of Newscastle, ERIC. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1002248

The confirmatory factor analysis and the item correlation results provide evidence of the reliability of the BAST scale scores and its subscale scores. The comparison of the BAST scale and subscale scores to scores on the PDK/GP item scores through regression provides evidence for the validity of the BAST scale scores and its subscale scores. These results are promising and suggest that the BAST could be used to assess the extent to which individuals support standardized testing. Respondents’ opposition to high-stakes standardized testing stemmed from worldview-related beliefs about truth and objectivity. Those who believed that knowledge is complex, and that students are unique opposed efforts to assess students’ knowledge via a single test. Further, doubts that standardized tests can provide an objective and unbiased assessment also had an impact on respondents’ opposition to standardized tests. Not surprisingly, this opposition also extended to policy efforts to use standardized tests as a criterion for making decisions about retention and rewards. Importantly, neither respondents’ knowledge of the NCLB nor their personal experience with testing predicted their beliefs about standardized testing. These findings provide evidence that individuals’ worldviews, and not their knowledge about high-stakes testing nor their experiences of testing affected their beliefs about standardized testing. Because support for and opposition to standardized testing are affected strongly by individual’s epistemological beliefs, discussion on testing should take into account how differences in worldviews can shape the assumptions that individuals make about testing. Changing an individual’s worldviews does not occur quickly or easily (Murphy & Mason, 2006). Given this, it will be difficult to change someone’s beliefs about standardized testing. It might involve making individuals aware of their epistemological stances and how their assumptions about the world shape their views on public policy. Future directions for research in this area include studying whether a change in epistemological beliefs is necessary for individuals to change their beliefs about standardized testing, or whether a person’s stance on testing can be uncoupled from epistemological beliefs. Understanding some of the processes individuals go through when they change their beliefs about standardized testing would be useful and would help to answer questions such as what worldview-related issues must be addressed to change individuals’ perceptions about standardized testing and what types of dialogue are needed for individuals to change their beliefs about standardized testing? Answering these questions would help to explicate the relationship between individuals’ worldviews and their beliefs about standardized testing. There are many reasons for supporting or opposing standardized testing. We argue that addressing the role of epistemology in these reasons will advance the discussion of standardized testing.

### T Definitions

#### Standardized Tests requires 1) test takers to answer the same questions, or same selection of questions and 2) be scored in a standard or consistent manner

GER 15 [The Glossary of Education Reform, Created by the [Great Schools Partnership](https://www.greatschoolspartnership.org/), the GLOSSARY OF EDUCATION REFORM is a comprehensive online resource that describes widely used school-improvement terms, concepts, and strategies for journalists, parents, and community members, 11-12-15, “STANDARDIZED TEST,” <https://www.edglossary.org/standardized-test/>] LHSBC

A standardized test is any form of test that (1) requires all test takers to answer the same questions, or a selection of questions from common bank of questions, in the same way, and that (2) is scored in a “standard” or consistent manner, which makes it possible to compare the relative performance of individual students or groups of students. While different types of tests and [assessments](https://www.edglossary.org/assessment/) may be “standardized” in this way, the term is primarily associated with large-scale tests administered to large populations of students, such as a multiple-choice test given to all the eighth-grade public-school students in a particular state, for example.

In addition to the familiar multiple-choice format, standardized tests can include true-false questions, short-answer questions, essay questions, or a mix of question types. While standardized tests were traditionally presented on paper and completed using pencils, and many still are, they are increasingly being administered on computers connected to online programs (for a related discussion, see [computer-adaptive test](https://www.edglossary.org/computer-adaptive-test/)). While standardized tests may come in a variety of forms, multiple-choice and true-false formats are widely used for large-scale testing situations because computers can score them quickly, consistently, and inexpensively. In contrast, open-ended essay questions need to be scored by humans using a common set of guidelines or [rubrics](https://www.edglossary.org/rubric/)to promote consistent evaluations from essay to essay—a less efficient and more time-intensive and costly option that is also considered to be more subjective. (Computerized systems designed to replace human scoring are currently being developed by a variety of companies; while these systems are still in their infancy, they are nevertheless becoming the object of growing national debate.)

#### Here are examples of T standardized tests

GER 15 [The Glossary of Education Reform, Created by the [Great Schools Partnership](https://www.greatschoolspartnership.org/), the GLOSSARY OF EDUCATION REFORM is a comprehensive online resource that describes widely used school-improvement terms, concepts, and strategies for journalists, parents, and community members, 11-12-15, “STANDARDIZED TEST,” <https://www.edglossary.org/standardized-test/>] LHSBC

Standardized tests may be used for a wide variety of educational purposes. For example, they may be used to determine a young child’s readiness for kindergarten, identify students who need special-education services or specialized [academic support](https://www.edglossary.org/academic-support/), place students in different academic programs or course levels, or award diplomas and other educational certificates. The following are a few representative examples of the most common forms of standardized test:

Achievement tests are designed to measure the knowledge and skills students learned in school or to determine the academic progress they have made over a period of time. The tests may also be used to evaluate the effectiveness of a schools and teachers, or identify the appropriate academic placement for a student—i.e., what courses or programs may be deemed most suitable, or what forms of academic support they may need. Achievement tests are “backward-looking” in that they measure how well students have learned what they were expected to learn.

Aptitude tests attempt to predict a student’s ability to succeed in an intellectual or physical endeavor by, for example, evaluating mathematical ability, language proficiency, abstract reasoning, motor coordination, or musical talent. Aptitude tests are “forward-looking” in that they typically attempt to forecast or predict how well students will do in a future educational or career setting. Aptitude tests are often a source of debate, since many question their predictive accuracy and value.

College-admissions tests are used in the process of deciding which students will be admitted to a collegiate program. While there is a great deal of debate about the accuracy and utility of college-admissions tests, and many institutions of higher education no longer require applicants to take them, the tests are used as indicators of intellectual and academic potential, and some may consider them predictive of how well an applicant will do in postsecondary program.

International-comparison tests are administered periodically to representative samples of students in a number of countries, including the United States, for the purposes of monitoring achievement trends in individual countries and comparing educational performance across countries. A few widely used examples of international-comparison tests include the [Programme for International Student Assessment](http://www.oecd.org/pisa/) (PISA), the [Progress in International Reading Literacy Study](http://timss.bc.edu/) (PIRLS), and the [Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study](http://timss.bc.edu/) (TIMSS).

Psychological tests, including IQ tests, are used to measure a person’s cognitive abilities and mental, emotional, developmental, and social characteristics. Trained professionals, such as school psychologists, typically administer the tests, which may require students to perform a series of tasks or solve a set of problems. Psychological tests are often used to identify students with learning disabilities or other special needs that would qualify them for specialized services.

#### Standardized tests have exceptions for people with disabilities

ETS 19 [Ets, 2019, "How ETS Approaches Testing: Glossary of Standardized Testing Terms," No Publication, http://www.ets.org/understanding\_testing/glossary, accessed 8-14-2019] LHSBC

Standardized test

A test in which the content and format of the test and the conditions of testing (such as timing, directions, use of calculators) are controlled to make them the same for all test takers. (Exceptions may be made for test takers with disabilities.)

#### These tests are for Grad school – that’s not T. Our evidence outweighs because it’s from the Department of Education.

Federal Student Aid [Federal Student Aid, Federal Student Aid, a part of the U.S. Department of Education, is the largest provider of student financial aid in the nation, "Taking Required Tests," https://studentaid.ed.gov/sa/prepare-for-college/tests, accessed 9-9-2019] LHSBC

Tests for Graduate Programs

Just as with undergraduate admissions, graduate school applications usually require standardized test scores. The test(s) you’ll take depend on what type of graduate degree you’re seeking. Check with the schools you plan to apply to for information about required exams.

Graduate Record Examinations (GRE)

Many students planning to attend graduate school take both the General and Subject GRE tests.

The GRE General Test measures your verbal, quantitative (mathematical), and analytical writing skills. It is offered throughout the year at specially equipped testing centers (some on college campuses). The test runs approximately three hours.

GRE Subject Tests measure your knowledge in specific subject areas. You usually take a Subject Test related to your undergraduate major. Subject Tests are given three times a year: in October, November, and April. Offered on college campuses, the tests usually take 3 ½ hours to complete.

[Learn more about the GRE tests](http://www.gre.org/), including how to register and how to prepare.

Law School Admission Test (LSAT)

The Law School Admission Test (LSAT) is required by nearly all law schools approved by the American Bar Association. The test is offered four times a year, usually at hundreds of locations around the world. The LSAT measures aptitude rather than knowledge, and is designed to indicate your readiness for success in law school.

The LSAT consists of

a reading comprehension section,

an analytical reasoning section,

a logical reasoning section, and

an unscored section, commonly known as the variable section, which is used to test new questions or new test forms.

You’ll be given a 35-minute writing sample section at the end of the test. Your writing sample is not scored, but copies are sent to all law schools to which you apply. The LSAT takes about four hours to complete. [Get more information about the LSAT](http://www.lsac.org/jd/lsat/about-the-lsat/).

Medical College Admission Test (MCAT)

The Medical College Admission Test (MCAT) is primarily a multiple-choice exam that tests your knowledge of science as well as skills, such as problem solving and critical thinking, desirable for success in the medical profession. The test is made up of four sections: verbal reasoning, physical sciences, biological sciences, and writing. You will provide essay responses to questions for the writing sample section.

The MCAT is given at various times throughout the year at hundreds of test centers around the U.S. You should expect to spend more than five hours at the testing center; short breaks throughout the session are included. [Learn more about and register for the MCAT](http://www.aamc.org/mcat).

Graduate Management Admission Test (GMAT)

If you’re planning to apply to graduate management programs such as a Master of Business Administration (MBA) program, you’ll likely be required to take the Graduate Management Admission Test (GMAT). The three-section test measures your skills—verbal, mathematical, and analytical writing—rather than knowledge. Actual testing takes approximately four hours; short breaks are given between sections. The test is offered at centers across the country, and each center has its own schedule. [Make a test appointment and prepare for the GMAT](http://www.mba.com/the-gmat.aspx).

#### These tests are for Undergrad school – that’s T. Our evidence outweighs because it’s from the Department of Education.

Federal Student Aid [Federal Student Aid, Federal Student Aid, a part of the U.S. Department of Education, is the largest provider of student financial aid in the nation, "Taking Required Tests," https://studentaid.ed.gov/sa/prepare-for-college/tests, accessed 9-9-2019] LHSBC

Tests for Undergraduate Programs

Most colleges require you to take one of the most common tests, the SAT or the ACT. Check with the colleges you plan to apply to for their testing requirements.

Most community colleges have open enrollment and don’t require standardized test scores. However, they will usually require placement tests. SAT or ACT scores may exempt you from placement tests. If you want to enroll in a selective program at a community college (nursing, computer science, law enforcement), then standardized test scores may be required. Later, if you transfer from a community college to a university or another school, test scores may be required.

SAT

The SAT measures your ability rather than knowledge. The 3 ¾-hour test contains three sections: writing, critical reading, and math. Most of the questions are multiple-choice.

Some colleges may also require you to take an SAT Subject Test. SAT Subject Tests measure your knowledge in specific subjects within five general categories: English, mathematics, history, science, and languages. Specific subjects range from English literature to biology to Modern Hebrew. SAT Subject Tests are primarily multiple-choice, and each lasts one hour.

Both the SAT and SAT Subject Tests are offered several times a year at locations across the country. The College Board provides detailed information about the [SAT and SAT Subject Tests](http://sat.collegeboard.org/home), including information about preparing to take the test, what to take with you on test day, and understanding your scores.

ACT

Like the SAT, the ACT is accepted by almost all colleges and universities. But instead of measuring how you think, the ACT measures what you’ve learned in school.

The ACT consists of four multiple-choice tests: English, reading, mathematics, and science. If your college requires a writing test, you can take the ACT Plus Writing, which includes a writing test in addition to the other four tests. These tests are offered several times a year at locations (usually high schools and colleges) across the country.

[Check out detailed information about the ACT](http://www.act.org/), including preparing to take the test, what to take with you on test day, and understanding your scores.

Other Common Tests

Test

Description

Preliminary SAT/National Merit [Scholarship](https://studentaid.ed.gov/sa/taxonomy/term/134?width=300px&height=auto&className=glossaryterm&closeButton=true) Qualifying Test (PSAT)

A good way to practice for the SAT tests. Students typically take the PSAT in their junior year of high school. The test also serves as a qualifying exam for the National Merit Scholarship Corporation’s scholarship programs. The PSAT measures skills in critical reading, mathematics, and writing. [Check out detailed information about the PSAT](http://www.collegeboard.com/student/testing/psat/about.html), including preparing for the SAT and qualifying for scholarships.

Advanced Placement (AP) exams

You usually take AP exams after you’ve completed an AP course in the relevant subject at your high school. A good grade on an AP exam can qualify you for college credit and/or “advanced placement” in that subject in college. For example, if you score well on the AP English Literature exam, you may not have to take the college’s required freshman-level English course. If you are interested in taking an AP class at your school, talk to your high school counselor.

Most AP exams last two to three hours, and include essay questions and possibly multiple-choice questions. The tests are offered each spring. Each test is offered only once, with a makeup day a few weeks later. [Check out detailed information about AP exams](http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/Controller.jpf), including courses and exams.

College-Level Examination Program (CLEP)

CLEP gives you the opportunity to earn college credit in different subjects by taking exams. Not all colleges offer credit based on CLEP tests, and different colleges offer different amounts of credit for the same test, so do your research before committing to an exam. Your best source of information is your college. [Check out detailed information about the CLEP](http://clep.collegeboard.org/), including getting college credit for what you already know.

International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme (IB)

The IB is a two-year curriculum designed for college-bound high school students. It is accepted by hundreds of colleges and universities in the U.S. and can help you earn college credit. Ask your high school counselor if your school offers the IB.

### Fem

#### Standardized testing privileges men over women
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Abstract The emerging female advantage in education has received considerable attention in the popular media and recent research. We examine a persistent exception to this trend: women’s underrepresentation in America’s most competitive colleges and universities. Using nationally generalizable data spanning four decades, we evaluate evidence for three possible explanations. First, we analyze whether men’s academic profiles more closely match the admissions preferences of elite institutions. Next, we consider organizational preferences for male applicants. Finally, we test whether women self-select out of elite institutions through their application choices. Using Blinder–Oaxaca non-linear decomposition tech- niques and multinomial logistic regression, we find that men’s advantage in standardized test scores best explains the enrollment gap. Our analyses thus suggest that the gender enrollment gap in elite colleges and universities is a matter of access, not student choice. We discuss the implications of these results for educational equity and college admissions.

#### Women’s underrepresentation is an effect of standardized testing scores that are skewed towards men.
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Prior research suggests women’s underrepresentation in elite institutions may be caused by gender disparities in pre-collegiate academic achievement, gender disparities in student application patterns, and/or gender disparities in institutional preferences. Pre-collegiate academic achievement is positively associated with college enrollment, the selectivity of institution attended, and college completion (e.g., Bastedo and Jaquette 2011; Buchmann and DiPrete 2006; Cho 2007; Hearn 1991; Posselt et al. 2012). Interestingly, gender disparities in pre-collegiate academic achievement may contribute to both women’s enrollment advantage in some institutional types and their persistent disadvantage in the most competitive ones. Goldin et al. (2006), for example, found that women catching up and surpassing men in high school grades and courses taken explained the growing female advantage in college enroll- ment and completion since 1970. However, men continue to have higher average SAT math scores than women, and comprised 62.75 % of SAT math scores in the 700–800 range in 2012 (College Board 2012). Alon (2009) showed that the effect of SAT/ACT scores on admissions decisions at selective colleges has increased over time. However, prior research has not examined whether male advantage in the upper distribution of college entrance exams explains the male enrollment advantage in selective institutions.

#### Best evidence flows aff – biased standardized testing scores lead to less female enrollment
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Reliance on SAT Scores in Admissions Creates De Facto Preferences for Men

We find strong evidence for Hypothesis 1, that admissions offices’ reliance on SAT scores explains the gender enrollment gap in most-competitive institutions. Table 2 provides descriptive statistics about differences by gender over time on academic preparation metrics in most-competitive institutions (H1a). These bivariate analyses of measures that admissions offices commonly consider lay a foundation for the multivariate analyses. Men had an advantage on a majority of the metrics of academic preparation except GPA, although course-taking differences are non-significant and SAT differences are only significant in 1992 and 2004. The average male SAT score was between 15 and 40 points higher than the average female score, while the average female GPA was 0.14 points higher in the 1982 cohort and 0.06 points higher in the 2004 cohort than the average male GPA.

Results of the non-linear decomposition analyses testing H1 and H2 are presented in Table 3. We conducted two sets of analyses. The first model, considered our baseline, uses only demographic controls to predict the enrollment gap in most-competitive institutions. The second model adds academic preparation and high school related variables that are expected to contribute to the enrollment gap.3 The top three rows present results from the significance test for the estimated gap in enrollment between men and women, as well as bootstrapped estimates of the significance of the explained and unexplained portions of that gap. The ‘‘Unexplained’’ row indicates the portion of the gap that is due to differences in coefficient values between men and women; this is the portion of the gap that may be due to gender discrimination.

As displayed in the top of Table 3, comparing the baseline and full models from the non-linear decomposition reveals that accounting for academic preparation (a) reduces the unexplained gender enrollment variance and (b) increases the explained gender enrollment variance in each of the four cohorts. The specific admissions criteria that influence the gap and to what degree they do so are then clarified in the lower portion of Table 3, where we report individual contributions of each variable to the explained portion of the gender gap. Here, we are most interested in the factors with negative coefficient estimates, which provide evidence of men’s continued enrollment advantage in most-competitive institutions.

The most consistent predictor of men’s enrollment advantage is SAT score, which increases in importance over time as both a predictor of enrollment and as an explanation of the gender gap. In fact, SAT score is the only variable that is statistically significant across all four cohorts. In each model, the coefficient associated with each variable can be interpreted as the expected shift in the enrollment gap as that variable varies, when holding all other variables constant.4 For example, in 1972, the coefficient associated with SAT suggests that the gender gap on average SAT scores (approx. 17 points, see Table 2) accounts for a 4.2 percentage point enrollment advantage for males, or about 63 % of the total 1972 enrollment gap. In 2004, there is a 4.6 percentage point enrollment gap, which SAT scores fully explain (see Footnote 6). Coefficients associated with SAT scores remain relatively consistent; however, because the size of the estimated enrollment gap varies, we can conclude that the contribution of SAT score to the gender enrollment gap also changes over time. In summary, differences in average SAT scores between males and females are the largest contributor to each of the estimated gender gaps.

Other academic preparation variables that contribute to the male advantage include highest science (1992) and mathematics (2004) course taken and involvement in a voca- tional club (1972) or athletics (2004). The only academic preparation variable that sig- nificantly benefits women is involvement in an honor society (1972), which reduces the gender gap for females by about 16 percentage points.5 However, this marginal effect was insufficient to offset men’s overall enrollment advantage that year. Taken together, these findings provide strong support for H1b, that men’s enrollment advantage in most com- petitive institutions is due to their higher performance on standardized test scores.

#### Vote aff to reject white privilege – standardized tests scores embed discrimination into educational institutions
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Our analyses suggest that the gender enrollment gap in access to the nation’s most com- petitive institutions is not a matter of student choice, but instead an issue of admissions reliance on a criterion that privileges male applicants. Just as previous research has found that admissions is one process by which privileges of Whiteness and wealth are indirectly embedded in elite institutions (Bastedo and Jaquette 2011; Karabel 2005; Posselt et al. 2012; Stevens 2007), present admissions norms also help embed male privilege in the organizational climate for diversity (Milem et al. 2005). Men and women graduating from high school in 2004 did not have significantly different probabilities of applying to the most competitive colleges and universities, and this trend did not seem to be affected by considering the proportion of STEM degrees such institutions offer.

Neither did we find evidence for gender sensitive admissions favoring men. In three of four cohorts, unexplained variation did not account for a significant portion of the gender enrollment gap, casting doubt on the presence of overt preferences for male applicants. Apparent gender bias against women in 1972 disappears when we control for academic preparation, standardized test scores, and extracurricular involvement. So-called male affirmative action may therefore be occurring within select institutions and/or institutional types such as liberal arts colleges, as found by Baum and Goodstein (2005) and Conger and Dickson (2011), but does not seem to be a sufficiently widespread to be captured in the nationally generalizable sample of high school graduates we analyze.

Rather, the evidence best supports a conclusion that women’s lower average stan- dardized test scores, combined with the importance attributed to those scores in admissions decisions, creates de facto preferences for men that drive women’s under-enrollment in these institutions. SAT score is the single most important predictor of enrollment for men and women across all four cohorts and the importance of this predictor has grown over time; therefore, women’s failure to attain scores that are, on average, equivalent to men means that their enrollment rates are also not equivalent.

#### The SAT gender gap hurts – women graduate more and outperform men
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We find that de facto institutional preferences for men can be traced to overreliance on high SAT scores in admissions decision making. This practice is problematic not only from the standpoint of equity and access, but also given what we know about SAT scores’ predictive validity. By the College Board’s (2008) own admission, SAT scores under-predict the first year GPA of women college students. Analyzing SAT sections and high school GPA separately and together, the College Board’s analysis supports previous work of Ramist et al. (1994) and Bridgeman et al. (2000) to conclude that differential validity by gender is smallest for GPA and highest for all sections of the SAT. Disproportionately excluding women from institutions on the basis of a criterion that under-predicts their performance is especially difficult to justify considering, on average, women outperform men once they arrive on campus and have higher probabilities of graduating in a timely manner (Bowen and Bok 1998; Snyder and Dillow 2007).

#### SAT scores are the problem – colleges will always value them for their nation-wide ranking.
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Overreliance on SAT scores can be traced both to elite institutions’ efforts to maintain high average test scores to preserve their rankings, as well as to admissions file readers’ subconscious judgment processes (Bastedo 2014). Each of these implies different strategies for reducing gender inequities in admissions. From an institutional stratification perspec- tive, elite institutions’ status has much to do with their high selectivity, and they therefore have a vested interest in maintaining a high level of competition for slots in their programs.

The pursuit of prestige indirectly limits access for women and other underrepresented groups by emphasizing an admissions criterion that ‘‘further privilege[s] the already advantaged’’ (Karabel 2005, p. 386). Magazine rankings serve as the major catalyst driving the focus on increasing standardized test scores, and the recent decision by U.S. News and World Report to increase the weight of SAT scores in their formula (U.S. News 2013) serves only to perpetuate negative impacts on gender equity. For colleges and universities unwilling to challenge the system of prestige, one strategy aimed at building diversity while maintaining high average SAT scores is micro-targeted recruitment—identifying and investing in small lists of students who match very specific desired profiles.

#### Counterplan text: In the United States, the admissions offices of colleges and universities ought to develop practices to address psychological biases among admissions officers that produce preferences for students who have higher standardized test scores.

#### Solves the aff – it reduces the importance of tests scores. The only reason discrimination plagues universities because socio-economic status is not weighted equal to tests.
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However, SAT scores’ undue importance is also a micro-level problem. As academi- cally qualified students apply to more and more schools to maximize their enrollment choices (An 2010), enrollment competition is stiffening, and this leads those who read admissions files to seek efficient means of distinguishing applicants. Test scores, unlike the rest of the file, may seem quantified, decontextualized, and unambiguous, and thus have a disproportionate influence on the final admission decision. Interventions in admissions offices are needed to place test scores in their appropriate place in holistic admissions processes. For example, admissions offices should develop practices that address common psychological biases among admissions officers that produce preferences for students who have higher standardized test scores, despite institutional policies to interpret academic achievement in the context of family and school contexts (Bastedo 2014). And for admissions offices to accept students with weaker standardized test scores than others who have applied, there needs to be leadership from the top of the university that emphasizes the importance of student diversity and other academic and personal characteristics of students that SAT and ACT scores do not represent.

## Race

#### Collegiate racism is a no-no – it spills up to society causing racialized inequality and illegitimate leaders.
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Selective institutions do not fit all high school graduates’ learning needs, and we do not wish to elevate their intrinsic value over other institutional types. However, the paradox of expanding access and continuing stratification is a pertinent concern given continued enrollment imbalances by race/ethnic- ity and accumulating evidence about the gains that accompany education in selective institutions. Baccalaureate completion rates increase with institu- tional selectivity, both nationally (Astin, 1985; Bowen, Chingos, & McPherson, 2009; Carnevale & Rose, 2003; Long & Kurlaender, 2009) and among students of color specifically (Bowen & Bok, 1998; Melguizo, 2010). Graduation from selective institutions is also associated with a range of positive labor market outcomes (Brewer, Eide, & Ehrenberg, 1999; Hoxby & Long, 1998; Monks, 2000). Furthermore, diversifying selective American colleges and universities has the potential over time to help counter racialized patterns of class inequality and, as Justice Sandra Day O’Connor wrote in her opinion for Grutter v. Bollinger (2003), ‘‘cultivate a set of leaders with legitimacy in the eyes of the citizenry,’’ whose increasing diversity is a demographic fact. In light of the increasing benefits of selective college enrollment and concerns about ethnic diversity in such institutions, it is important to understand changes over time in students’ postsecondary destinations.

#### SAT scores still set the standard – equally rising academic preparation and the increased importance of the SAT preserves racism
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Rising academic standards for admission, especially SAT scores, have negative consequences for equitable enrollment in selective colleges. With each cohort of high school graduates, high school grade point average, SAT scores, and high school math curriculum are associated with greater odds of enrolling in institutions that are even minimally selective. Academic preparation among Black and Latino students has improved across the board, but similar rates of improvement among White and Asian students on some indicators paired with institutions’ increasing reliance on SAT scores help to preserve institutional stratification by race. While the share of Latino high school graduates enrolling in these institutions has more than doubled since 1972, it remains half the national average. Similarly, Black high school graduates’ enrollment in highly selective institutions remains less than one- third of the national average. When we do not hold constant students’ aca- demic profiles—as is the case in schools and society—Black students’ odds of enrollment have decreased relative to White students’ since 1982.

#### SAT scores are the line in the sand for admissions that preserve status-quo racism
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College access programs and targeted standardized test preparation are two possible, short-term solutions. First, programs such as Upward Bound encourage underrepresented students’ college access by providing college knowledge, test preparation, and advanced curriculum that selective institu- tions desire but that are not available in all families and secondary schools (Ga ́ndara, 2001; Perna, 2005; St. John et al., 2010; Swail & Perna, 2002). Multisite evidence is needed, however, about these programs’ outcomes, the mechanisms by which outcomes are achieved, and the programmatic components that most contribute to outcomes. Second, one study finds that targeted preparation on the SAT and ACT for Black and Latino students reduces test score gaps (Buchmann, Condron, & Roscigno, 2010), suggesting test preparation may also indirectly reduce selective college enrollment gaps. Test preparation might include training to counter the tendencies toward stereotype threat that standardized tests can induce in Black and Latino students (Steele, 1997; Taylor & Antony, 2000). A very high score does not ensure admission, but a very low one precludes it, and we find that SAT scores are the single strongest predictor of enrollment.

However, we do not presume that the SAT should be the strongest factor in enrollment. Often efforts to close gaps on criteria that historically hurt Black and Latino students’ attainment are really short-term solutions to a lon- ger term social justice challenge: whether and how America’s values and pat- terns of power will be transformed with its increasing racial and ethnic diversity. For decades, education scholars have identified high-stakes testing as a barrier to social justice (Banks, 1995). In college admissions, notions of equal opportunity are compromised by the SAT and ACT’s entrenched role in determining access to the educational sector that produces the greatest long-term economic benefits. This incompatibility is also problematic because underrepresented groups are also growing most quickly in the over- all population (National Academy of Sciences, 2011). We need additional ways of identifying talent.

#### Unequal SAT scores are leading to unequal enrollment
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Specifically, we have examined how escalation since 1972 in the neces- sary and sufficient conditions for admission to selective colleges and univer- sities may be hindering more equitable enrollment outcomes. For instance, having a minimum SAT score and taken calculus seems to have become a necessary but not sufficient condition for enrollment in very selective insti- tutions. Admissions committees at selective institutions clearly care a great deal about students’ academic profiles and are increasingly unwilling to admit applicants’ whose numbers are 1 to 2 standard deviations below that of their average student. Taking this approach with measures unequally distributed by race—such as the SAT—encourages unequal enrollment.

## Predictor

#### Ignore their ev in policy debates – it’s not a complete measurement nor does it take into account other variables
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A large body of research suggests that the SAT and other tests are among the best single predictors of 1st-year grades. This study does not question the years of research that support this conclusion, although there are those who do (e.g., “Common Sense,” 1997; Crouse & Trusheim, 1998; Duran, 1986; Hathaway, 1984). However, the meaning of “the best” is often ignored in the policy debates. First, the “best” predictor is not necessarily a good or adequate predictor for individual academic success. Most research suggests that tests such as the SAT predict at best 20% of the variance of success (Beatty, Greenwood, & Linn, 1999; Schrader, 1978; Schwan, 1988). Many studies show much lower relationships, and others continue to show little or no relationship (Carver & King, 1994; Dalton, 1976; Fleming & Manning, 1998; Morrison & Morrison, 1995; Thacker & Williams, 1974). These studies suggest that 80% of student success or failure is explained by other factors such as institutional efforts (Hurtado, Milem, Clayton-Pederson, & Allen, 2000; Lowman & Spuck, 1975), noncognitive factors (Sedlacek, 1998), or psychological constructs (Steele & Aronson, 1995). Second, numerous studies suggest that the SAT’s power as a predictor varies dramatically for different groups of students by race/ethnicity, age, and gender (“Common Sense,” 1997; Crouse & Trusheim, 1998; Dalton, 1976; Duran, 1986; Guinier, Fine, & Balin, 1997; Hathaway, 1984; Rosser, 1992). Third, most research has focused on the role of the SAT in predicting 1st-year grades—leaving ultimate college success, as measured, for example, by graduation, largely unexplored (e.g., Wallach, 1976; Wightman, 2000, 19).

#### Few studies take into account long-term achievement – the ones that do conclude aff
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In general, this review indicates that relatively few studies focus on longer term success, and those that do point to a diminished capacity of tests for addressing admissions concerns. Indeed, few data outside individual institutions allow for the exploration of success looking back to entrance scores. Even fewer data sources are available that permit desegregation by such factors as race/ethnicity, gender, age, and field of study. Finally, the existing research most often relies on the statistical terminology concerning “variance” to communicate the predictive power of tests, leaving open the very real possibility of misusing the results in policy and legal settings.

##  Case turns /Neg stuff

#### Colleges don’t consider standardized tests if you applied late or are economically disadvantaged – Brown proves

Brown [Brown University, Brown is a college, no date, “Standardized Tests,” <https://www.brown.edu/admission/undergraduate/apply/first-year-applicants/standardized-tests>] LHSBC

We recommend, but do not require, the submission of two SAT Subject Tests of your choice. Strong Subject Test scores can be a positive piece to include with your application to Brown. The absence of scores will not disadvantage a student, particularly in cases when financial hardship prevents students from registering for the tests, or for those who may have found Brown too late in their college search to register for the Subject Tests. If you are applying to the Program in Liberal Medical Education, we strongly recommend one Subject Test in either biology, chemistry or physics.

#### Standardized tests do predict college success – meta studies prove

Buckley et al. 18 [Jack Buckley, Lynn Letukas, Ben Wildavsky, 2018, "Measuring Success testing, grades, and the future of college admissions ,” Johns Hopkins University Press , <https://b-ok.org/book/3425926/69156b>, accessed 8-9-2019] LHSBC

* This section is written by Paul R. Sackett and Nathan R. Kuncel

As a result, thousands of studies have been conducted examining the relation- ship between standardized admissions tests and subsequent grades at both the college and graduate school levels. Meta-analyses and large-scale studies give the clearest information and indicate that test scores are predictive of grades. On av- erage, tests tend to be the second-best predictor of college grades (after high school GPA) and the best predictor of grades in graduate school (beating out college GPA) (Berry and Sackett 2009; Kuncel, Hezlett, and Ones 2001). The combination of the two works even better.

Sometimes the observed correlations between tests and subsequent GPA, which tend to fall around .35 for college and .24 for graduate school, are criticized for be- ing too small to be useful. Even correlations of .20 can be extremely important (more on this later), but critics overlook two ways in which these are actually gross underestimates. The rst is that these values are obtained on groups of people who are far more homogenous on scores than applicants or the overall population of test takers. This is akin to looking at height among elite basketball players and ask- ing if height matters in basketball. Of course it does, but we won’t see a huge e ect for the centimeters that separate players at most positions izn professional play while ignoring the half meter or greater between top players and the public at large. The same restriction of range issue holds true for test scores among students admitted to college and graduate school. We don’t directly observe how students with low test scores would have performed because they were not admitted. Because the goal is to understand the relationship between test scores and performance for the full range of college applicants, we need to account for the full applicant population rather than just admitted students.

The second issue with taking the observed relationship at face value is that stu- dents in college don’t all take the same classes. There is an unequal flow of talent (as measured by test scores and prior grades) into different disciplines at the start of school. In addition, disciplines do not have the same grading standards or typi- cal course difficulty. Since students are not equally prepared or motivated, they often end up taking different sets of courses. This movement of students contin-ues and even contributes to switching majors. The classic example is students who intend to go into medicine but then run headlong into organic chemistry and promptly choose another path. Different course taking will tend to reduce the relationship between test scores and earned grades.

#### Tests gauge not just grades but also postgrad success

Buckley et al. 18 [Jack Buckley, Lynn Letukas, Ben Wildavsky, 2018, "Measuring Success testing, grades, and the future of college admissions ,” Johns Hopkins University Press , <https://b-ok.org/book/3425926/69156b>, accessed 8-9-2019] LHSBC

* The PDF did this weird thing with the copy and past that doesn’t let me copy and paste some F’s for some reason
* This section is written by Paul R. Sackett and Nathan R. Kuncel

Before entering college, test scores are associated with the academic direction students take, including the majors they are interested in and the majors they ultimately graduate in. Figure 1.2 shows how strong scores on basic verbal and reading skills are generally more strongly associated with the choice of majors such as English and journalism, while mathematic skills are generally associated with STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) fields. At an individual level, the di erence between math and verbal skills is sometimes call “tilt” and is important in understanding who will chose what major.

But after entering college, there are other outcomes that are related to test scores. We know that not every student who earns a bachelor’s degree takes the same classes, and even within the same major one student can focus on lower division courses and avoid the more challenging ones. The difference can be dramatic, with one student taking numerous graduate-level courses and another taking the minimum of upper- level courses. Both test scores and prior grades are associated with taking more challenging courses. Results from a study of 61 colleges and universities and across 178,878 students are presented in figure 1.3. Stronger SAT and high school grades are associated with taking more advanced courses (Shewach et al. 2017). Multiplied by millions of college students, this link indicates a large cumulative difference in the pursuit of more in-depth and advanced knowledge.

Even within the same course level, students with stronger test scores challenge themselves by taking courses that are more difficult (Keiser et al. 2016). Within a college, high scorers are more likely to take courses that have better academically prepared students and are more harshly graded. Both sets of evidence suggest that students with strong test scores end up better educated, even at the same institution. They tend to pursue more challenging majors and take more difficult and advanced courses while earning the best grades (which are, again, related to job performance and salary). These patterns hold even when prior grades are controlled.

#### Tests level the playing field – they combat inflated GPA’s

Bhatia 3/5 [Avvalzameer Bhatia, Bhatia is an Opinion columnist., 3-5-2019, "Standardized test scores are a necessary assessment to equalize UC admissions," Daily Bruin, https://dailybruin.com/2019/03/05/standardized-test-scores-are-a-necessary-assessment-to-equalize-uc-admissions/, accessed 8-16-2019] LHSBC

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.

## Ev indicts

#### Discount evidence from “[Measuring Success: Testing, Grades and the Future of College Admissions](https://jhupbooks.press.jhu.edu/content/measuring-success)” – their authors are tied to college board.

Jaschik 18 [Scott Jaschik, 4-27-2018, "Large study finds colleges that go test optional become more diverse and maintain academic quality," Inside Higher Ed, https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/04/27/large-study-finds-colleges-go-test-optional-become-more-diverse-and-maintain?utm\_source=Inside+Higher+Ed&amp;utm\_campaign=f1998791b7-DNU20180111&amp;utm\_medium=email&amp;utm\_term=0\_1fcbc04421-f1998791b7-198588045&amp;mc\_cid=f1998791b7&amp;mc\_eid=a06e6828b9, accessed 8-9-2019] LHSBC

But even as more colleges drop the testing requirements, the College Board has insisted evidence backs its view that the best way to predict college success is to review both grades and test scores. [Measuring Success: Testing, Grades and the Future of College Admissions](https://jhupbooks.press.jhu.edu/content/measuring-success), published by Johns Hopkins University Press in January, was a major salvo in the debate. Essays in the book (edited by three scholars with ties current or past to the College Board) described research that generally questioned test-optional policies. The policies, the book argued, have failed to add to diversity -- or at a minimum have not led to increases in diversity that outpace gains at institutions with testing requirements. Further, the book highlighted research [on high school grade inflation](https://www.insidehighered.com/admissions/article/2017/07/17/study-finds-notable-increase-grades-high-schools-nationally), which some see as an argument for standardized testing. ([Of course, others don't.](https://www.insidehighered.com/admissions/article/2018/04/02/florida-state-illustrates-worries-and-reasons-not-worry-about-high))

#### Here’s the acknowledgement section from their book – they thank College Board.

Buckley et al. 18 [Jack Buckley, Lynn Letukas, Ben Wildavsky, 2018, "Measuring Success testing, grades, and the future of college admissions ,” Johns Hopkins University Press , <https://b-ok.org/book/3425926/69156b>, accessed 8-9-2019] LHSBC

This volume took shape thanks to the efforts of many colleagues, beginning with the contributors, who wrote insightful chapters and patiently responded to our many editorial queries. At the College Board, we are grateful for support from David Coleman, Stefanie Sanford, Cyndie Schmeiser, Jessica Howell, and Jennifer Merriman; for invaluable assistance from Danielle Roberts, Deb Martinelli, Ginny Heidel, and Mario Da Costa; and for the hard work of Sandra Riley, Zachary Goldberg, and Abby Jacobs on our communications team. We are also fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with the talented team at Johns Hopkins Uni- versity Press and would like to thank in particular editorial director Greg Britton, managing editor Julie McCarthy, and assistant editor Catherine Goldstead.

## Race aff

#### Status quo Standardized testing prioritizes resources and socio-economic privilege over merit and academic potential.

Hernandez 18 [Theresa E. Hernandez, Theresa E. Hernandez is a scholar of higher education policy working toward her doctorate at the University of Southern California. Her research examines issues of race, gender, class and intersectional equity in academia, 5-22-2018, "Abolish Standardized Testing For College Admissions," HuffPost, https://www.huffpost.com/entry/abolish-standardized-testing-for-college-admissions\_n\_5b045869e4b003dc7e470ee3?guccounter=1&amp;guce\_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&amp;guce\_referrer\_sig=AQAAAADVq90A1bxdRZz3-PUs8htGkYhgIpqszLvxmKDrwcEekitkschI10y5eMcuLRsJy\_K7xYM7C6QuXN2OEmjos-1lUjaf3D6dNmMVh30fU\_8GvRE2LARqfz\_uXTF5PjFO60PHB3l5iGbbE3ACeqfCnFEepSE7\_x4L69741wGehR48, accessed 8-9-2019] LHSBC

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](https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ687735) than educational outcomes. This disproportionately excludes [racial minorities](http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.3102/0002831212439456), [women](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11162-014-9334-y) and [low-income persons](http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.3102/0162373711406718) 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](http://culturalorganizing.org/the-problem-with-that-equity-vs-equality-graphic/).

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](https://www.amazon.com/Chosen-History-Admission-Exclusion-Princeton/dp/061877355X?tag=thehuffingtop-20), 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](https://cue.usc.edu/files/2016/01/Bensimon_The-Underestimated-Significance-of-Practitioner-Knowledge-in-the-Scholarship-on-Student-Success.pdf) 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](https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/676910?journalCode=aje) may be better at [judging a student’s potential given the context of their prior experiences](https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/676909).

Many highly selective institutions such as [Harvard](https://college.harvard.edu/admissions/application-process/what-we-look), [Yale](https://admissions.yale.edu/advice-selecting-high-school-courses) and [Columbia](https://undergrad.admissions.columbia.edu/apply/first-year/holistic) already claim to practice [a version of holistic review](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00221546.2018.1442633?tokenDomain=eprints&tokenAccess=vNZyqvZRtFkAmPyIdi7G&forwardService=showFullText&doi=10.1080%2F00221546.2018.1442633&doi=10.1080%2F00221546.2018.1442633&journalCode=uhej20) due to the U.S. Supreme Court’s backing of [this approach in affirmative action cases](https://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/02-241.ZO.html). 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.

#### Negative scholarship is biased and paid-off.

Syverson et al. 18 [Steven T. Syverson, Valerie W. Franks, William C. Hiss , Spring 2018, " DEFINING ACCESS: How Test-Optional Works ," National Association for College Admission Counseling , https://www.nacacnet.org/globalassets/documents/publications/research/defining-access-report-2018.pdf, accessed 8-9-2019] LHSBC

There has also been a proliferation of research on standardized testing in admission focused on the predictive value of testing and its fairness relative to various subpopulations of students. Much of the research affirming the value of the SAT and ACT has been conducted by the testing organizations. One such study, a synthesis of recent test score validity studies (Mattern and Patterson, 2014), states that the SAT provides incremental validity above and beyond HSGPA in the prediction of cumulative GPA, retention and graduation. Their conclusion: the combination of HSGPA and testing will produce the most accurate predictions of college success. Another recent release, a just-published volume of essays, Measuring Success: Testing, Grades and the Future of College Admissions (Buckley, Letukas, and Wildavsky, 2018) is principally a response by the College Board and ACT to the rapid growth of TOPs.

#### Testing is a horrible metric for academic achievement – studies conclude that tests value privilege over merit.

Syverson et al. 18 [Steven T. Syverson, Valerie W. Franks, William C. Hiss , Spring 2018, " DEFINING ACCESS: How Test-Optional Works ," National Association for College Admission Counseling , https://www.nacacnet.org/globalassets/documents/publications/research/defining-access-report-2018.pdf, accessed 8-9-2019] LHSBC

The 2014 research revealed that—when given the option at one of those 33 TOP institutions —roughly a third of enrolled students chose to apply without standardized test scores (Non-Submitters). These Non-Submitters went on to graduate at virtually the same rates (a 0.6% difference) and with nearly the same college GPA (0.05 of a Cum GPA point) as the Submitters whose test scores were considered in the admission process. Their research also concluded that Non-Submitters were more likely to be first-generation-to-college, underrepresented minority students, women, Pell Grant recipients, and students with Learning Differences. And, using large volumes of HSGPA data, their findings underscored the sturdiness of the HSGPA as a predictor of college performance.

This research highlighted an interesting intersection between the testing agencies and that of the counter views. A meta-analysis of studies of “discrepant performance” revealed that “a quarter to a third of tested students exhibit some degree of mismatch between their grades and their test scores.” Within this group, approximately half of them have high school grades that are higher than what the tests would predict. Across the studies cited, the range appears to be between 11% and 18% of the sample population (Sanchez & Mattern [Making the Case for Standardized Testing] in Buckley, 2018).

Another related study identified the students most likely to have strong HSGPAs and low testing: women, FirstGeneration to college, low income students, and students who speak a second language at home. Furthermore, those most likely to be discordant with weaker HSGPAs and stronger testing are males, whites, and those of higher income (Sanchez and Edmunds, 2015).

## AT Test Optional

#### Test optional is still racist. Even if admissions has equaliez, aid distribution, the key factor for many under privileged students, has not.

Syverson et al. 18 [Steven T. Syverson, Valerie W. Franks, William C. Hiss , Spring 2018, " DEFINING ACCESS: How Test-Optional Works ," National Association for College Admission Counseling , https://www.nacacnet.org/globalassets/documents/publications/research/defining-access-report-2018.pdf, accessed 8-9-2019] LHSBC

A financial analysis, though inconclusive, suggested that some degree of financial investment was required to support the success of a TOP policy. While the proportion of students with need did not necessarily increase after policy adoption, average demonstrated need and gift aid per capita did. Non-Submitters were generally needier than Submitters. They also, however, included a sizable proportion of No-Need students, only modestly lower than that of Submitters. We noted that well over half of all No-Need students were offered some gift aid, but No-Need NonSubmitters were less likely than Submitters to receive gift awards, in spite of the fact that these two groups were shown to graduate at comparable rates.

#### Test optional sucks – it’s selectively applied, abused for ranking spots, and used for applicant gain

Stier 13 [Debbie Stier, Debbie Stier is the author of the forthcoming book, The Perfect Score Project: Uncovering the Secrets of the SAT., 10-31-2013, "SAT-Optional Schools Not Such a Great Option After All," TIME, http://ideas.time.com/2013/10/31/sat-optional-schools-not-such-a-great-idea-after-all/, accessed 8-9-2019] LHSBC

Critics argue that test-optional colleges are simply gaming the system to gain status in the rankings, most notably the U.S. News & World Report rankings, which have created a frenzy of colleges vying to move up in prestige. A test-optional policy means more applicants, which means more applicants to reject, which means appearing more “selective” as far as the rankings go. Also, a test-optional school’s SAT average will be artificially inflated because applicants who do submit scores [have higher scores](http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ856358.pdf) — 100 to 150 points better, on average — than applicants who don’t.

There’s also the fact that “test optional” means different things to different schools. Students with low SAT scores may be hoping for the chance to be considered as a whole person rather than a test score, but it’s not always that simple. There are policy nuances, as when colleges are test-optional for students with a certain GPA or state schools are test-optional for in-state applicants but not for applicants from out of state or abroad.

On the flip side, there’s a chance for some students with high test scores to work the system to their advantage because the applicant pool at test-optional schools is presumably filled with score-free applications. At a test-optional college, high scores might even mitigate the consequences of a low GPA.

There is no doubt that one test should not determine an applicant’s chances, but in 2009, the College Board began offering “Score Choice,” which allows students to decide whether to send SAT scores from a certain test day or, if they had a particularly bad morning, omit the scores for that day. And yes, there are definitely other limitations to the SAT’s ability to capture a whole person and certainly inequalities whereby those who can afford expensive test prep and multiple testings can gain an advantage. But for most students, “test optional” winds up complicating their choices rather than expanding them.

#### Test optional only benefits colleges, not students.

Buckley et al. 18 [Jack Buckley, Lynn Letukas, Ben Wildavsky, 2018, "Measuring Success testing, grades, and the future of college admissions ,” Johns Hopkins University Press , <https://b-ok.org/book/3425926/69156b>, accessed 8-9-2019] LHSBC

There are other motivations behind the test-optional movement, of course. Lucido notes that test-optional policies are attractive to enrollment managers: they can boost the number of applicants to a college and increase selectivity while raising average SAT scores, because lower-scoring students are less likely to submit scores. Dropping testing requirements can also generate positive publicity. Yet the students who are the intended beneficiaries of test-optional policies may suffer, Lucido suggests; on some campuses they are admitted at lower rates by admissions officers who have less information on which to base their decisions.

## Test Optional

#### Test optional solves racially biased admissions. Prefer the best data – we survey almost 1 million records

Syverson et al. 18 [Steven T. Syverson, Valerie W. Franks, William C. Hiss , Spring 2018, " DEFINING ACCESS: How Test-Optional Works ," National Association for College Admission Counseling , https://www.nacacnet.org/globalassets/documents/publications/research/defining-access-report-2018.pdf, accessed 8-9-2019] LHSBC

In this study, we collected student-record level data from 28 institutions that illustrate the variety among institutions that have adopted a TOP. They ranged in undergraduate enrollments from 1,500 to 20,000 and 15%-90% in admission selectivity, and included long-time users of TOP as well as recent adopters of the policy. In most instances we received four cohorts of student data, in total representing a dataset of 955,774 individual applicant records. We focused on interpreting the data using practical significance rather than experimental statistical techniques. A TOP was described by many of the admission deans of the participating institutions as a tool they employed in the hope of increasing applications from a more diverse range of students, so this report focuses great attention on traditionally under-represented populations in American higher education. To do so, we used our record-level data to identify the intersectionality of these underserved populations: First-Generation College Bound, students from lower SES backgrounds (Pell recipients as proxy), and students from racial and ethnic groups that have traditionally been underrepresented in college populations (URM). We identified students associated with any of these three groups and designated them as a single category of “Expanded Diversity,” and when possible, used it in our explorations. The experiences of institutions in this study provide evidence that the adoption of a well-executed test-optional admission policy can lead to an increase in overall applications as well as an increase in the representation of URM students (both numeric and proportionate) in the applicant pool and the freshman class. Roughly two-thirds of our TOP institutions experienced URM growth above that of a matched test-requiring peer institution. A similar but smaller magnitude increase was seen among Pell recipients. Approximately one quarter of the students in this study did not submit standardized test scores with their college application (henceforth to be referred to as “Non-Submitters”). As noted in earlier studies, URM, First-Generation-to- “This Commission wishes to emphasize at the outset that a “one-size-fits-all” approach for the use of standardized tests in undergraduate admission does not reflect the realities facing our nation’s many and varied colleges and universities. These institutions differ greatly in size, selectivity and mission. At some, standardized tests are important predictors of students’ academic success, while at others, they add little compared to high school grades.” College, and Pell recipients were more strongly represented among Non-Submitters. For instance, 35% of Black or African-American students chose to be Non-Submitters (12 percentage points higher than the overall non-submitting rate), as compared to 18% of white students. Similarly, women chose to be Non-Submitters at higher rates than men. We also found that Non-Submitters were often admitted at lower rates than Submitters, but, on average, enrolled (yielded) at substantially higher rates. Their HSGPAs were modestly lower than the Submitters, and, upon entering college, their First Year GPAs and Cumulative GPAs were comparably lower. However, they ultimately graduated at rates equivalent to, or marginally higher than, Submitters, the ultimate proof of success.

## Ses

#### Counterplan text: In the United States, colleges and universities ought to implement socio-economic status (SES) based admissions.

Young and Johnson 04 [John W. Young and Paul M. Johnson, \*Rutgers University and \*\*Department of Educational Psychology, Rutgers University, 11-1-2004, "The Impact Of An Ses-Based Model On A College'S Undergraduate Admissions Outcomes," Research In Higher Education Vol. 45, No. 7, Pp. 777-797 (21 Pages), https://www.jstor.org/stable/40197393?seq=1#metadata\_info\_tab\_contents, accessed 8-11-2019] LHSBC

In Grutter vs. Bollinger, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the use of race as one factor, among many in admissions decisions is constitutional. It is not known, however, whether future legal opinions will continue to uphold the use of affirmative action policies. Some have argued that class-based preferences can achieve many of the same goals as in affirmative action while being more likely to withstand legal challenges. To date, no empirical studies have been conducted on the potential impact of a class-based admissions policy if implemented at an undergraduate institution. This paper reports on a study at a selective public college and compares a number of outcomes under three admissions models: the original admissions decisions, a purely academic model, and an socio-economic status (SES)-based model. The findings showed that use of the SES-based model would have led to a more academically qualified class than in the original admitted class while maintaining substantially greater student diversity that was found under the academic model. An admissions policy based on preferences for socio-economically disadvantaged applicants appears to hold promise for other colleges and universities with similar institutional and applicant characteristics. The ideas and research design reported in this paper are based on the doctoral dissertation study of the second author, "Undergraduate Admissions Models Incorporating Socioeconomic Factors" (Johnson, 2000).

#### Our study is the only and the best – national studies confound and produce inaccurate models

Young and Johnson 04 [John W. Young and Paul M. Johnson, \*Rutgers University and \*\*Department of Educational Psychology, Rutgers University, 11-1-2004, "The Impact Of An Ses-Based Model On A College'S Undergraduate Admissions Outcomes," Research In Higher Education Vol. 45, No. 7, Pp. 777-797 (21 Pages), https://www.jstor.org/stable/40197393?seq=1#metadata\_info\_tab\_contents, accessed 8-11-2019] LHSBC

To date, no studies have been published that examines the possible effects of considering SES on the undergraduate admissions process at a selective institution of higher education. This paper reports on the potential effects of using SES in admissions decisions on the racial and ethnic distribution of three entering cohorts of students at an academically competitive liberal arts college within a public university, and is the first investigation that provides evidence on the outcomes at a single institution if such a policy were to be implemented. Using data on applicants to a single college is the best method to determine how using SES in admissions decisions might shape the racial and ethnic composition of the resulting cohorts of accepted students since admissions policies and practices operate at an institutional level, not at a national level. The internal validity of the research design for this study is greater than for studies using national data since confounding factors due to institutional differences have been eliminated. By focusing on a single institution, we can determine if the findings from studies using national data hold for the more realistic context of the admissions process as conducted within an institution. Furthermore, one would expect that the results from this study would generalize to other institutions of a similar mission and size, with likely dozens of institutions nationally that fit this description. Before any institution chooses to incorporate SES into its admission decisions, it would be useful to have an empirical basis for understanding the possible impacts on the racial composition of entering cohorts of students that result from use of a class-based policy. In this study, the racial composition of the students as admitted under the college's current admissions system was compared to that of the students if admitted under two other models: (1) based only on admissions test scores and high school grades, referred to in this paper as the academic model, and (2) based on test scores, high school grades, and four SES measures, referred to as the SES-based model.

#### The Counterplan solves for discrimination and avoids politics.

Young and Johnson 04 [John W. Young and Paul M. Johnson, \*Rutgers University and \*\*Department of Educational Psychology, Rutgers University, 11-1-2004, "The Impact Of An Ses-Based Model On A College'S Undergraduate Admissions Outcomes," Research In Higher Education Vol. 45, No. 7, Pp. 777-797 (21 Pages), https://www.jstor.org/stable/40197393?seq=1#metadata\_info\_tab\_contents, accessed 8-11-2019] LHSBC

Kahlenberg (1996) presented a series of cogent arguments for the use of preferences on the basis of class, a policy he calls class-based affirmative action. The thesis of Kahlenberg's book is that current affirmative action policies that are based on racial preferences, although well intentioned, are flawed and should be revamped in favor of class-based policies. In theory, because members of racial minority groups are disproportion- ately disadvantaged economically, the benefits from class-based policies would flow mainly to these groups. Kahlenberg argues that class-based policies are a remedy to the moral and political problems resulting from affirmative action, and provide ways to achieve the goals that racial preferences seek to achieve while avoiding the associated problems caused by affirmative action programs. He further claims that class- based policies have the potential to create equal opportunities in education and employment for all individuals. Kahlenberg presented three aspects to the argument in favor of class-based preferences: (1) policies based on these preferences can fulfill the promise of genuine equal opportunity. (2) class-based policies will indirectly compensate for past discrimination, and can provide a mechanism for achieving a color-blind society. (3) class-based affirmative action should survive the legal and political attacks that may eventually lead to the elimination of race- and gender.

#### The Counterplan also dodges court politics.

Young and Johnson 04 [John W. Young and Paul M. Johnson, \*Rutgers University and \*\*Department of Educational Psychology, Rutgers University, 11-1-2004, "The Impact Of An Ses-Based Model On A College'S Undergraduate Admissions Outcomes," Research In Higher Education Vol. 45, No. 7, Pp. 777-797 (21 Pages), https://www.jstor.org/stable/40197393?seq=1#metadata\_info\_tab\_contents, accessed 8-11-2019] LHSBC

Another possible solution that has been widely discussed is to consider the class or socio-economic status (SES) of a student in the admissions process. The use of a student's background characteristic such as their SES may achieve the multiple goals of increased educational opportunities, greater student diversity, and be legally defensible. Programs that award preferences to applicants from families with lower SESs would likely be viewed by the courts as being less objectionable than race-based affirmative action programs. Violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution was the basis on which affirmative action programs were challenged. Presently, the Supreme Court uses a three-tiered approach to analysis under the Equal Protection Clause. Suspect classifications such as race, national origin, or religion are subjected to the closest (or strict) scrutiny since the classifi- cation must be shown to serve a compelling state interest. A quasi-suspect classification such as gender is subjected to a lower degree of (or middle- tier) scrutiny. All other classifications, including by SES, are subjected to minimum (or rational basis) scrutiny (Galloway, 1989; Jeffrey, 1999). Although there is no guarantee that admissions preferences based on SES would not be ruled as unconstitutional, the legal standard for such a ruling would be much higher than for race-based affirmative action programs.

## Nebel

#### The terms “colleges, universities, standardized tests, and undergraduate admissions decisions” are all bare plurals that are generic generalizations

Nebel 8/12 [Jake Nebel, Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs., 8-12-2019, "Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution," Briefly, https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/, accessed 8-14-2019] LHSBC

1 Bare Plurals

“Colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions” are bare plural noun phrases. A [bare plural](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bare_nouns#English_Bare_Plurals) is a noun phrase that lacks an overt determiner. [Determiners](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Determiner) include articles like the, possessives like my, demonstratives like these, and quantifiers like some. “Colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions” are plural, and they lack determiners, so they are bare plurals. (“Colleges” and “universities” are also bare plurals, but it doesn’t matter for our purposes whether we consider them separately or just consider the conjunctive noun phrase.)

Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. Generic generalizations include sentences like, “Dogs bark,” “Bees sting,” and “Birds fly.” It is helpful to understand generic generalizations by contrasting them with two other kinds of generalizations.

#### Generics means no specification and no PICs

Nebel 8/12 [Jake Nebel, Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs., 8-12-2019, "Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution," Briefly, https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/, accessed 8-14-2019] LHSBC

Generic generalizations are neither existential nor universal.

Generics are distinct from existential statements because they cannot be affirmed by particular instances. For example, “Birds swim” is a generic. It’s false even though there are some birds that do swim: namely, penguins. You can’t affirm that birds swim by observing that penguins swim.

Generics are distinct from universal statements because they can tolerate exceptions. For example, “Birds fly” is a generic. It’s true even though there are some birds that don’t fly: namely, penguins. You can’t negate that birds fly by observing that penguins don’t.

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions.

#### Colleges and Universities is a bare plural – logic, upward-entailment, adverbs, and framer’s intent.

Nebel 8/12 [Jake Nebel, Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs., 8-12-2019, "Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution," Briefly, https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/, accessed 8-14-2019] LHSBC

First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural.

Second, “colleges and universities” fails the [upward-entailment test](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#IsolGeneInte) for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals.

Third, “colleges and universities” fails the [adverb of quantification test](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#IsolGeneInte) for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally(“Colleges and universities generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever(“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution.

Fourth, it is extremely unlikely that the topic committee would have written the resolution with the existential interpretation of “colleges and universities” in mind. If they intended the existential interpretation, they would have added explicit existential quantifiers like “some.” No such addition would be necessary or expected for the generic interpretation since generics lack explicit quantifiers by default. The topic committee’s likely intentions are not decisive, but they strongly suggest that the generic interpretation is correct, since it’s prima facie unlikely that a committee charged with writing a sentence to be debated would be so badly mistaken about what their sentence means (which they would be if they intended the existential interpretation). The committee, moreover, does not write resolutions for the 0.1 percent of debaters who debate on the national circuit; they write resolutions, at least in large part, to be debated by the vast majority of students on the vast majority of circuits, who would take the resolution to be (pretty obviously, I’d imagine) generic with respect to “colleges and universities,” given its face-value meaning and standard expectations about what LD resolutions tend to mean.

## Limits

#### Pragmatically, there are too many to colleges and universities prepare – they’re not unified making prep exponentially harder

Selingo 13 [Jeffrey J. Selingo, Selingo is the author of There Is Life After College, about how today’s graduates launch into their careers. He is former editor of the Chronicle of Higher Education, a professor of practice at Arizona State University, a trustee of Ithaca College and a visiting scholar at Georgia Tech's Center for 21st Century Universities., 5-20-2013, "How many colleges and universities do we really need?," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2015/07/20/how-many-colleges-and-universities-do-we-really-need/, accessed 8-14-2019] LHSBC

Today, there are some 5,300 colleges and universities in the United States, everything from beauty schools to Harvard. Though we often refer to them collectively as “the American higher-education system,” it’s far from an organized system. In essence, they operate as 5,300 little fiefdoms.

#### There are over 52 standardized tests that are directly considered by colleges

Collegexpress [Collegexpress, No Date, "College Admission Tests: Everything You Need to Know," No Publication, https://www.collegexpress.com/articles-and-advice/test-prep/articles/test-taking-tips/standardized-test-glossary/, accessed 8-14-2019] LHSBC

What you should worry about is when, where, how, and why to take these tests. Here we give you a glimpse at general tests and terms—but there is a lot more to them! Fortunately, you have tons of free resources available to you, whether through your library or guidance counselor or your own online research. Be sure to refer to the testing agencies’ websites, as well as the Test Prep section of our sister site, CollegeXpress.com! This is just an introduction to common testing language. For a more nitty-gritty look, we recommend the [ETS Glossary of Standardized Testing Terms](http://ets.org/understanding_testing/glossary).

ACT

The ACT was designed to test concepts learned in school rather than the less tangible analytical skills. It comprises four required sections: English, Mathematics, Reading, and Science. The Writing portion of the ACT is optional, though some colleges and universities may require it as part of their application for admission.

Students can take the exam six times throughout the year, with [test dates](http://www.act.org/content/act/en/products-and-services/the-act/registration.html) in September, October, December, February, April, and June. (Check to make sure the Writing portion is offered on your preferred test date should you be interested in taking it.) The total testing period, including breaks, lasts about five hours with Writing or about four hours and 15 minutes without.

The ACT is often taken in the spring of students’ junior year or fall of senior year. It is scored on a scale of 1–36. Your composite score is the average of your scores in the four main sections rounded to the nearest whole number.

Its baseline fee is $42.50 for 2017, or $58.50 with the Writing component; test takers may also incur additional fees (see “Fees”). For more information regarding the ACT, visit [act.org](http://act.org/).

AP exams

There are more than 30 AP subjects to choose from across the following areas: arts, English, history and social science, math and computer science, sciences, and world languages and cultures.

High school AP classes are guided by course descriptions designed by the same people behind the corresponding exams. These classes and tests are meant to measure students’ abilities with college-level work, and students can earn college credit should they achieve adequate scores. However, college and university guidelines for accepting AP credit vary wildly; some may accept a score of 3 or higher, while others require a 4 or 5. Also, a college or university’s course catalog may not correspond with AP credit in the same way as another school. Students may receive credit and/or place out of introductory courses.

AP tests are administered each year throughout the month of May and cost $93 each (additional fees may vary). Students may take multiple AP exams should they wish. Comparable to SAT Subject Tests, they should be taken at the culmination of the corresponding class.

Most AP tests last two to three hours and include multiple-choice and free-response sections. Additionally, language tests have a speaking portion, and those taking the Studio Art test submit portfolios, amongst other differences.

For more information regarding AP tests, visit [collegeboard.org](http://www.collegeboard.org/).

Calculators

Most math problems found on standardized tests can be completed without a calculator, but they are generally permitted, though their use will likely be restricted to only the math portion of the given test (i.e., you can’t have your calculator out during a writing section). Permitted calculators vary from test to test; for example, the SAT allows graphing calculators but the ACT does not. Be sure to confirm and review the rules dictating calculator use for any standardized test you plan to take. And make sure the calculator's batteries are charged on test day!

Fees

Test fees vary greatly by test and are paid at the time of registration. Students may also encounter additional fees for sending their test scores to more than a set number of institutions or for choosing to send scores after the opportunity to designate schools has passed. The SAT, for example, includes four score sends with test registration; that means any students who register and take the test can send their results to four colleges/universities of their choice for free. Sending results to five or more schools usually incurs additional costs.

There are also several other possible fees, such as for late registration and changing your test date. However, students who can demonstrate their family’s financial need may qualify for test fee waivers. You can usually find more information on official test websites, but be sure to ask your high school guidance counselor for help if you need it. The important thing is to investigate any test you plan on taking and make sure you know how much it will cost before signing up.

Identification

You may be required to show an original form of ID (not a photocopy) when you take your standardized test(s). This is generally used as a precaution against cheating or other fraudulent activity, and without such an ID, you may be turned away from your testing center. Acceptable forms of student identification include passports, driver’s licenses, and student IDs. If you don’t have an acceptable form of ID, you and your parents may be able to fill out supplementary paperwork before—and we’re talking well before—taking the test; this form will likely need to be prepared in conjunction with your school and/or a notary. Check with the organization responsible for your test(s) to confirm what ID, if any, is necessary on test day.

SAT

Like the ACT, the SAT evaluates students’ readiness for college work. A new version of the test was rolled out in March 2016. Some of the updates involved adding questions more closely related to high school course work, more “real world” vocabulary and math, no penalties for wrong answers, and a return to an optional Writing section. Scoring is also back to the 1600-point scale. The [SAT is made up of four parts](https://www.princetonreview.com/college/sat-sections): Reading, Writing and Language, Math, and the optional essay.

The test lasts three hours and 50 minutes with the essay and three hours without it. The baseline fee for the current and new version of the SAT is $54.50 with the essay and $43 without. Test takers may also incur additional fees (see “Fees”). The SAT is administered by the College Board several times throughout the year. It’s often taken in the spring of students’ junior year or fall of senior year. For more information regarding the SAT, visit [collegeboard.org](http://www.collegeboard.org/).

SAT Subject Tests

Once known as the SAT II, these 20 tests, though similar to their SAT namesake, cover a single subject each, such as physics, US history, math, French, and more. Each lasts an hour.

Some colleges and universities, particularly the most selective schools, require SAT Subject Test scores (usually up to three), while other schools will simply consider the scores if applicants choose to send them.

## Impact

#### Fighting racism in college matters – ethnic diversity improves future behavior.

Carrell et al. 16 [Scott E. Carrell, Mark Hoekstra, and James E. West, \*Scott Carrell is a Professor of Economics, the Co-Faculty Director of the California Education Laboratory and the Faculty Athletics Representative at the University of California, Davis. He received his BA from the U.S. Air Force Academy in 1995, an M.A. in Economics and an M.S. in Management from the University of Florida in 2002, and a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Florida in 2003. He previously taught at Dartmouth College and the U.S. Air Force Academy and served as the Senior Economist for Public Finance and Labor Economics on the staff of the President's Council of Economic Advisers during the summer of 2004. Professor Carrell is a Research Associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research, a Research Fellow at Institute for the Study of Labor, and a Co-Editor for the Journal of Human Resources. He spent ten years as an active duty officer in the U.S. Air Force and retired from the U.S. Air Force Reserve as a Lieutenant Colonel in 2015. His primary area of research is in the economics of education \*\* Professor of Economics at Texas A&M, Ph.D. Economics, University of Florida, \*\*\*PHD - Economics, Univ Michigan Ann Arbor, 2016 "The Impact Of College Diversity On Behavior Toward Minorities," American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/pol.20170069&amp;&amp;from=f, accessed 8-15-2019] LHSBC

This study provides an empirical test of whether increased diversity on a college campus influences the subsequent behavior of the majority toward the minority. Specifically, we examine whether white males are affected by either the number or type of black peers to whom they are exposed. To do so, we use data from the U.S. Air Force Academy (USAFA) in which students are randomly assigned to peer groups in their freshman year and subsequently reassigned into different peer groups in their sophomore year. Results indicate that white males exposed to higher ability black peers in their freshman year were significantly more likely to pair with a black roommate in their sophomore year. That is, exposure to higher ability black peers leads white students to decide to share a significant amount of personal space and time with a different black peer the following year. In addition, we also find some suggestive evidence that exposure to additional black peers leads to increases in the likelihood of pairing with a black roommate the following year, with effects concentrated primarily among whites from states with relatively few blacks. These results provide several important takeaways. First, in addition to complementing the existing literature on the impact of exposure to more members of the minority group, we also document that the type of members from that group affects racial attitudes. This highlights the importance of the type of individual with whom one interacts, which is consistent with models in which individuals update prior attitudes regarding other groups. In addition, the importance of the type of individuals with whom one interacts also speaks directly to the potential costs and benefits of increasing diversity in higher education. That is, the benefits of increased exposure may be partially offset if increased enrollment of underrepresented minorities is accomplished by lowering an admission threshold. We show that exposure to additional black peers from the middle and especially the top third of the high school performance distribution has a large, positive effect on the probability of pairing with a black roommate the following year. However, we also show that exposure to an additional marginal black peer who ranks in the bottom third of high school performance has no effect – positive or negative – on subsequent racial relations. This suggests that at least in this context, any positive effect of increased exposure is roughly cancelled out by the negative effect of exposure to a black peer of lower academic ability. We note, however, that it is an open question as to whether the net impact of these two effects is similar for marginal applicants in other contexts. In addition, we emphasize that understanding this tradeoff is one of potentially many considerations in evaluating whether race-conscious admissions policies are socially desirable. Finally, our results demonstrate that exposure to more and higher aptitude black peers can lead to significant changes in subsequent behavior. Importantly, these changes in behavior are toward a new and different set of black peers. This provides evidence that increased diversity does more than change self-reported attitudes; it also leads to meaningful changes in future behavior

## Race aff

#### It is impossible to detach the legacy of racism from the SAT – empirics prove that discrimination continues today.

Binnie 3/26 [Neil Binnie, 3-26-2019, "OPINION: The racist roots of the SAT render it ineffective," Daily Trojan, http://dailytrojan.com/2019/03/26/opinion-the-racist-roots-of-the-sat-render-it-ineffective/, accessed 8-15-2019] LHSBC

Last week, Interim President Wanda Austin announced USC’s lowest acceptance rate in history — 11 percent. As admission to USC grows more competitive, the USC community must address systemic inequalities present in standardized college entrance exams. Children from affluent backgrounds simply have more advantages when they take such tests — advantages that are prominent in their test scores.

Standardized testing was founded on racism and class inequality. College Board, the organization that administers the SAT, created their tests based on ones used for the United States Army, according to PBS Frontline. These tests were initially developed to determine those who could be considered “mentally inferior” and unfit for military service.

“During World War I, standardized tests helped place 1.5 million soldiers in units segregated by race and by test scores,” the National Education Association said. The tests were scientific, yet they remained deeply biased.

A study published in 1923 by Carl Brigham, one of the men who created one of the original tests, wrote that the so-called “American Intelligence” would not develop further “owing to the presence of the negro.”

Now the test, more commonly known as the SAT, is used as a metric for admission by most colleges.

While Brigham’s boilerplate racism is one of the past, students of color continue to be discriminated against, even in the creation of test questions. Education Weekly writer Catherine Gewertz studied SAT results in 2017 to look at trends among students of different races taking the test.

“Hispanic and African-American students score significantly below [the average composite score],” Gewertz found.

The National Center for Fair & Open Testing, commonly known as FairTest, also reported that students of color score lower on standardized testing used in college admissions. Lower scores impact their ability to secure merit-based scholarships, contributing to the racial gap in college enrollments and completion, according to the NEA. Consistent low scores for minority groups create not only a systemic cycle of racial gaps, but also a psychological one — the NEA reports that the use of high-stakes testing affects test takers’ emotional and psychological states, causing poor performance and a dismal academic outlook.

SAT tutoring also perpetuates economic inequity in testing. While very few students paid exorbitant amounts of money to cheat on these tests, many affluent students have access to expensive test prep that drastically improves their scores. Elite Test Prep near Arcadia High School, the high school that sends the highest number of students to USC, offers a morning SAT prep course that costs $2,740. While seeking out tutoring for academic achievement is not inherently wrong, doing so places lower income students who cannot afford such test prep at a noticeable disadvantage.

This economic inequality is represented in the student population of USC. A recent study by The Equality of Opportunity Project found that USC was falling behind its California peers in enrolling students whose family incomes were in the lowest 20 percent.  Because the SAT is unfairly biased against minority students and those of lower socioeconomic classes, the University must champion students from lower income households, especially those from communities around USC.

The SAT cannot truly measure student aptitude due to its deep historical roots in racism and its present-day propensity to disadvantage minorities and those of lower socioeconomic classes.

On the USC Admission Center website, the University claims to review every application comprehensively and holistically. As USC admission becomes more competitive, the University must recognize the racial and economic barriers some of its prospective students face. While a standardized test score is not the only consideration in assessing an applicant, maybe it should not even be considered at all.

#### Reject standardized tests – they’re a horrible metric for determining college success and they privilege rich white males

Fairtest 7 [Fairtest, 8-20-2007, "The ACT: Biased, Inaccurate, and Misused," No Publication, https://www.fairtest.org/act-biased-inaccurate-and-misused, accessed 8-15-2019] LHSBC

What is the ACT

More than a million high school students take the ACT (formerly known as the American College Testing Program Assessment) each year. Like the SAT, the ACT is a standardized multiple-choice test meant to predict first-year college grades. While the SAT predominates on the East and West Coasts, the ACT is more common in the Midwest, Southwest, and Deep South.

The ACT consists of four individual tests: English, Math, Reading, and Science Reasoning. The score report for the "Enhanced ACT Assessment" includes a composite ranging from 1-36, a score for each individual test, and sub scores. There is also an optional "writing" test.

The ACT was developed as an alternative to the SAT, but is just a different test, not a better one. Like the SAT, the ACT has long-standing problems of bias, inaccuracy, coachability, and misuse. Because of these flaws, no test - neither the ACT nor SAT - should be required in the college admissions process.

How is the ACT biased?

Race, class and gender biases give White, affluent, and male test-takers an unfair edge.
ACT scores are directly related to family income: the richer students' parents are, the higher are average scores. But score gaps between groups on the ACT cannot be explained away solely by differences in educational opportunity linked to social class. According to ACT research, when all factors are equal, such as course work, grades and family income, Whites still outscore all other groups. If the ACT were not biased, Asian Americans, who take more academic courses than any other group, would likely score even higher. Moreover, boys score slightly higher than girls across all races, despite boys' lower grades in high school and college when matched for identical courses.

ACT has performed few studies of score differences in its test, making it difficult to pinpoint the sources of the score gaps. Here are a few likely candidates:

Biased format: Research shows that a fast-paced, multiple-choice format favors males over females. Guessing, a risk males are more likely to take, is rewarded. Since multiple-choice items do not allow for shades of meaning they work against the most typical female thinking style.

Biased language: Idiomatic terms such as "ball and chain" (to indicate a married partner) and "straight from the horse's mouth" may not be familiar to many test-takers, particularly those whose first language isn't English, causing them to choose wrong answers.

How accurate is the ACT?

ACT scores do not predict college performance effectively
Even the test-maker admits that high school grades predict first-year college grades better than ACT scores do. In fact, adding the ACT to the high school record does not significantly improve predictions.

One study at Chicago State University confirmed this trend. For the vast majority of the university's graduates who scored in the middle range of the test as high school students, the ACT explained only 3.6% of the differences in cumulative college GPA. In fact, the exam over-predicted the performance of the class graduating in 1992, which had the highest average ACT score among the classes in the research study yet the poorest academic performance over four years at the university.

The ACT regularly underestimates the abilities of females, who earn higher grades than males in college, despite lower ACT scores. Recognizing the problem, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology routinely admits females with lower math scores because they find the women still perform as well as men.

The ACT also does a poor job of predicting the college performance for students of color. One study conducted at a medium-sized regional university in the Southeast showed that the ACT explained only 6.8% of the differences in first-semester college grades for African Americans, while for Whites the ACT predicted approximately 28% of the differences. High school grades predicted equally well for both groups, demonstrating that other measures of achievement are not as subject to differences across racial groups as are test scores.

ACT scores are imprecise
The individual tests have large margins of error, according to data from ACT. The margin of error - the inconsistency in ACT scores inherent in the testing process - on each subject's 1-36 point scale is 1.55 points in English, 1.43 in Mathematics, 2.20 in Reading, and 1.75 in Science Reasoning. In other words, if a student were to retake the exam, there would be about a two-thirds chance that her score would be 1.55 points higher or lower on the English test than on a previous administration of the test. There is also a one-third chance the score difference would be even larger. The margins of error, while appearing to be small at 1.43 - 2.20, can actually have significant consequences for applicants when admissions offices or financial aid programs require minimum (or "cut-off") scores.

Is the ACT coachable?

ACT itself sells coaching products. ACT insists that "for students who have not studied the content or grasped it... short term review is not likely to be of much benefit." While ACT acknowledges that familiarity and test-taking skills can affect a score, it also maintains that the descriptions and sample items included in the registration packet address them. If that claim is true, why is ACT selling coaching guides and software? Many commercial firms promote extensive lines of ACT test preparation materials, ranging from workbooks to classroom and on-line courses.

How is the ACT misused?

Cut-off scores on the ACT unfairly deny education and scholarships.
The ACT's flaws have serious consequences. Despite its inaccuracies, biases, and coachability, ACT cut-off scores are often used to determine entrance into schools and allocate scholarships. A single point can decide whether a student is admitted or receives needed funds. Though these misuses violate ACT guidelines for proper test use, the test-maker has done nothing to stop them. ACT has the responsibility and the power to protect students from testing abuse by refusing to send scores to colleges, scholarship agencies, and educational systems which misuse their product.

Education denied
In Mississippi, ACT test scores have long been used as a tool of segregation in state colleges and universities. In 1962 Mississippi's higher education board instituted a minimum ACT requirement for admission that was eight points above the average Black student's score in the state. According to a federal court, this was done "soon after the court ordered admission of James Meredith to the University of Mississippi because it deterred black enrollment." The U.S. Supreme Court agreed, specifically citing the role of the ACT cut-off as a key factor in denying African Americans access to the state's major universities. Nonetheless, the state still relies on ACT cut-offs to determine eligibility for admissions and lucrative scholarships.

Scholarships denied
In Louisiana, high achieving students can have their tuition and fees waived for up to four years at state colleges and universities if they score above an ACT cut-off of 20. This minimum score is close to the average for White students in Louisiana, but more than three points above the African American average. Several other state scholarship programs also employ cut scores, including Florida's "Bright Futures" and South Carolina's "Palmetto Fellows" programs.

#### Only abolishing solves – tests are constantly remodified to exclude minorities perpetuating exclusion

Singer 4/6 [Steven Singer, Steven Singer is a husband, father, teacher, blogger and education advocate. He often writes at his own blog, 4-6-2019, "Standardized Testing is a Tool of White Supremacy," Common Dreams, https://www.commondreams.org/views/2019/04/06/standardized-testing-tool-white-supremacy, accessed 8-15-2019] LHSBC

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](https://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/lawreview/vol43/iss1/3/), 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.

Some might argue that this isn’t racist because race was not explicitly used to determine which questions would be included. Yet the results are exactly the same as if it were.

Others want to reduce the entire enterprise to one of social class. It’s not students of color that are disadvantaged—it’s students living in poverty. And there is overlap here.

[Standardized testing doesn’t show academic success so much as the circumstances that caused that success or failure](https://www.alternet.org/2015/05/how-standardized-testing-reveals-stark-inequalities-between-rich-and-poor/). Lack of proper nutrition, food insecurity, lack of prenatal care, early childcare, fewer books in the home, exposure to violence—all of these and more combine to result in lower academic outcomes.

But this isn’t an either/or situation. It’s both. [Standardized testing has always been about BOTH race and class](https://gadflyonthewallblog.com/2016/01/17/high-stakes-testing-doesnt-protect-civil-rights-it-violates-them/). They are inextricably entwined.

#### The race achievement gap exists – this is explicit evidence from college board themselves

Reeves and Halikias 17 [Richard V. Reeves and Dimitrios Halikias, \*John C. and Nancy D. Whitehead Chair Senior Fellow - Economic Studies Director - Future of the Middle Class Initiative Co-director - Center on Children and Families \*\* Research Assistant - Center on Children and Families , 2-1-2017, "Race gaps in SAT scores highlight inequality and hinder upward mobility," Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/research/race-gaps-in-sat-scores-highlight-inequality-and-hinder-upward-mobility/, accessed 8-15-2019] LHSBC

Taking the SAT is an American rite of passage. Along with the increasingly popular ACT, the SAT is critical in identifying student readiness for college and as an important gateway to higher education. Yet despite efforts to equalize academic opportunity, large racial gaps in SAT scores persist.

THE GREAT SCORE DIVIDE

The SAT provides a measure of academic inequality at the end of secondary schooling. Moreover, insofar as [SAT scores predict student success](http://research.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/publications/2015/6/research-report-sat-validity-primer.pdf) in college, inequalities in the SAT score distribution reflect and reinforce racial inequalities across generations.

In this paper, we analyze racial differences in the math section of the general SAT test, using publicly available College Board population data for all of the nearly 1.7 million college-bound seniors in 2015 who took the SAT. (We do not use the newest data released for the class of 2016, because the SAT transitioned mid-year to a new test format, and data has so far only been released for students who took the older test.) Our analysis uses both the [College Board’s descriptive statistics](https://secure-media.collegeboard.org/digitalServices/pdf/sat/total-group-2015.pdf) for the entire test-taking class, as well as [percentile ranks](https://secure-media.collegeboard.org/digitalServices/pdf/sat/sat-percentile-ranks-gender-ethnicity-2015.pdf) by gender and race. (The College Board has separate categories for “Mexican or Mexican American” and “Other Hispanic, Latino, or Latin American.” We have combined them under the term Latino.)

The mean score on the math section of the SAT for all test-takers is 511 out of 800, the average scores for blacks (428) and Latinos (457) are significantly below those of whites (534) and Asians (598). The scores of black and Latino students are clustered towards the bottom of the distribution, while white scores are relatively normally distributed, and Asians are clustered at the top:

Race gaps on the SATs are especially pronounced at the tails of the distribution. In a perfectly equal distribution, the racial breakdown of scores at every point in the distribution would mirror the composition of test-takers as whole i.e. 51 percent white, 21 percent Latino, 14 percent black, and 14 percent Asian. But in fact, among top scorers—those scoring between a 750 and 800—60 percent are Asian and 33 percent are white, compared to 5 percent Latino and 2 percent black. Meanwhile, among those scoring between 300 and 350, 37 percent are Latino, 35 percent are black, 21 percent are white, and 6 percent are Asian:

The College Board’s publicly available data provides data on racial composition at 50-point score intervals. We estimate that in the entire country last year at most 2,200 black and 4,900 Latino test-takers scored above a 700. In comparison, roughly 48,000 whites and 52,800 Asians scored that high. The same absolute disparity persists among the highest scorers: 16,000 whites and 29,570 Asians scored above a 750, compared to only at most 1,000 blacks and 2,400 Latinos. (These estimates—which rely on conservative assumptions that maximize the number of high-scoring black students, are consistent with an older estimate from a [2005 paper](http://www.jbhe.com/features/49_college_admissions-test.html) in the Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, which found that only 244 black students scored above a 750 on the math section of the SAT.)

A STUBBORN BLACK-WHITE GAP

Disappointingly, the black-white achievement gap in SAT math scores has remained virtually unchanged over the last fifteen years. Between 1996 and 2015, the average gap between the mean black score and the mean white score has been .92 standard deviations. In 1996 it was .9 standard deviations and in 2015 it was .88 standard deviations. This means that over the last fifteen years, roughly 64 percent of all test-takers scored between the average black and average white score.

These gaps have a significant impact on life chances, and therefore on the transmission of inequality across generations. As the economist [Bhashkar Mazumder has documented](https://www.chicagofed.org/publications/economic-perspectives/2014/1q-mazumder), adolescent cognitive outcomes (in this case, measured by the AFQT) statistically [account for most of the race gap](https://www.chicagofed.org/publications/working-papers/2011/wp-10) in intergenerational social mobility.

COULD THE GAP BE EVEN WIDER?

There are some limitations to the data which may mean that, if anything, the race gap is being understated. The ceiling on the SAT score may, for example, understate Asian achievement. If the exam was redesigned to increase score variance (add harder and easier questions than it currently has), the achievement gap across racial groups [could be even more pronounced](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/ccf_20160811_jacob_evidence_speaks1.pdf). In other words, if the math section was scored between 0 and 1000, we might see more complete tails on both the right and the left. More Asians score between 750 and 800 than score between 700 and 750, suggesting that many Asians could be scoring above 800 if the test allowed them to.

A standardized test with a wider range of scores, the LSAT, offers some evidence on this front. [An analysis](http://www.lsac.org/docs/default-source/research-%28lsac-resources%29/tr-14-02.pdf) of the 2013-2014 LSAT finds an average black score of 142 compared to an average white score of 153. This amounts to a black-white achievement gap of 1.06 standard deviations, even higher than that on the SAT. This is of course a deeply imperfect comparison, as the underlying population of test-takers for the LSAT (those applying to law school) is very different from that of the SAT. Nonetheless the LSAT distribution provides yet another example of the striking academic achievement gaps across race:

Another important qualification is that the SAT is no longer the nationally dominant college-entrance exam. In recent years, the ACT has surpassed the SAT in popularity. If the distributions of students taking the two exams are significantly different, focusing on one test alone won’t give a complete picture of the racial achievement gap. A cursory look at the evidence, however, suggests that race gaps on the [2016 ACT](http://www.act.org/content/dam/act/unsecured/documents/P_99_999999_N_S_N00_ACT-GCPR_National.pdf) are comparable to those we observe for the SAT. In terms of composition, ACT test-takers were 54 percent white, 16 percent Latino, 13 percent black, and 4 percent Asian. Except for the substantially reduced share of Asian test-takers, this is reasonably close to the SAT’s demographic breakdown. Moreover, racial achievement gaps across the two tests were fairly similar. The black-white achievement gap for the math section of the 2015 SAT was roughly .88 standard deviations. For the 2016 ACT it was .87 standard deviations. Likewise, the Latino-white achievement gap for the math section of the 2015 SAT was roughly .65 standard deviations; for the 2016 ACT it was .54 standard deviations.

OR COULD THE GAP BE NARROWER THAN IT LOOKS?

On the other hand, there is a possibility that the [SAT is racially biased](https://bearcenter.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/Wilson%20%2322.pdf), in which case the observed racial gap in test scores may overstate the underlying academic achievement gap. But most of the concerns about bias relate to the verbal section of the SAT, and our analysis focuses exclusively on the math section.

Finally, this data is limited in that it doesn’t allow us to disentangle race and class as drivers of achievement gaps. It is likely that at least some of these racial inequalities can be explained by different income levels across race. Unfortunately, publicly available College Board data on class and SAT scores is limited. The average SAT score for students who identify as having parents making between $0 and $20,000 a year is 455, a score that is actually .2 standard deviations above the average score for black students (428). These numbers are fairly unreliable because of the low rates of student response; some 40 percent of test-takers do not list their household income. In comparison, only 4 percent of test-takers fail to provide their racial identification.

However, a [2015 research paper](http://www.cshe.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/shared/publications/docs/ROPS.CSHE_.10.15.Geiser.RaceSAT.10.26.2015.pdf) from the Center for Studies in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley shows that between 1994 and 2011, race has grown more important than class in predicting SAT scores for UC applicants. While it is difficult to extrapolate from such findings to the broader population of SAT test-takers, it is unlikely that the racial achievement gap can be explained away by class differences across race.

DOWN WITH STANDARDIZED TESTS?

Given the reliance of colleges on test scores for admissions, the gaps in SAT math performance documented here will continue to reproduce patterns of inequality in American society. It seems likely, however, that colleges [rely too heavily on such tests](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2014/02/21/a-telling-study-about-act-sat-scores/?utm_term=.134785980295). [Research from William Bowen, Matthew Chingos, and Michael McPherson](http://press.princeton.edu/TOCs/c8971.html) suggests that high school grades may have more incremental predictive power of college grades and graduation rates. The SAT may not be a good measure of student potential.

Even to the extent that SAT scores do predict college success, it is far from clear that universities are justified in basing admissions so strongly on the exam. After all, a wide range of other morally relevant considerations—questions of distributive justice, for example—may well need to be weighed alongside considerations of academic preparation.

#### Counterplan text: The United States federal government ought to

#### Increase cash transfers to disadvantaged parents with young children

#### Improve access to quality pre-school programs

#### Pursue paid leave policies

#### Teach the skills needed to effectively raise their children

Reeves and Halikias 17 [Richard V. Reeves and Dimitrios Halikias, \*John C. and Nancy D. Whitehead Chair Senior Fellow - Economic Studies Director - Future of the Middle Class Initiative Co-director - Center on Children and Families \*\* Research Assistant - Center on Children and Families , 2-1-2017, "Race gaps in SAT scores highlight inequality and hinder upward mobility," Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/research/race-gaps-in-sat-scores-highlight-inequality-and-hinder-upward-mobility/, accessed 8-15-2019] LHSBC

Significant racial and class inequalities much earlier in life explain persistent obstacles to upward mobility and opportunity. The extensive racial gaps in academic achievement and college preparation across high school seniors are symptomatic of those deeper drivers of inequality. Accordingly, policy efforts may be more effective if they target underlying sources of these achievement gaps. That means experimenting with earlier childhood interventions of the sort we have [described elsewhere](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/social-mobility-memos/2016/08/25/four-ways-to-close-the-early-years-learning-gap/): increasing [cash transfers to disadvantaged parents with young children](https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/this-policy-would-help-poor-kids-more-than-universal-pre-k-does/), improving [access to quality preschool programs](https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/does-pre-k-work-or-not/), pursuing [paid leave policies](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/social-mobility-memos/2016/12/13/what-could-really-help-the-working-class-paid-leave/) to allow for more quality parent investment during the first years of life, [teaching parents the skills they need](https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-parenting-gap/) to effectively raise their children, and so on.

#### The anxiety of tests furthers discrimination.

Green and Griffore 80 [Robert L. Green and Robert J. Griffore , Summer 1980, " The Impact of Standardized Testing on Minority Students ," The Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 49, No. 3, Critical Issues in Testing and Achievement of Black Americans (Summer, 1980), pp. 238-252 , https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2295083.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aaae005e87f8dd810c094fe93de263c77, accessed 8-15-2019] LHSBC

It has long been known that test anxiety may accompany the taking of aptitude tests. An Educational Testing Service survey conducted in 1961 found that more than 80 percent of students taking the SAT experienced a degree of test anxiety. Debilitating test anxiety is typically used as a measure of fear of failure in motivational research. Thus, to the extent anxiety acts as a debili- tating factor, test performance is motivated by fear of failure, which might result in lower test performance. 34 Indeed, performance on the SAT has been found to be very susceptible to examinees' anxiety. To a substantial extent, SAT scores may indicate more about examinees' state of debilitating test anxiety than about their ability to perform in college. 35 Since the SAT and other aptitude tests may measure anxiety, there is content bias inherent in these tests. This is a problem because test anxiety appears to be inversely related to social class and also more prevalent among minority examinees.36 One would, therefore, expect the performance of minority examinees on aptitude tests to be unfairly and disproportionately affected by test anxiety. This undue influence is serious enough on its own merits, but it is further complicated by the fact that academic performance is not necessarily influenced by anxiety to the extent standardized test scores are influenced. After all, the SAT constitutes a rather unique experience for most examinees. It is one which produces a threat, because it has a more far-reaching effect on one's life than, say, a quiz or midterm exam. Moreover, in motivational theory, there is another motive which can counteract fear of failure: motive to succeed. This tendency does not interfere with action; rather, it is positively related to academic performance. Since test- taking motivation may be different from that which produces performance in the classroom, it is not clear that tests like the SAT or the ACT are relevant indicators.

#### Counterplan text: The United States federal government ought to

####  Establish a National Bureau of Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests and Testing

#### Allocate funds for conducting independent validation and reliability studies on widely used educational and psychological instruments

#### Involve minority professionals in developing, revising, and reviewing standardized achievement tests

#### Mandate that corporations combat standardized test misuse

#### Partner tests admins with school systems, educators, and measurement specialists to seek ways in which instruments can be designed to enhance the educational status of all children

#### Mandate that educators in public school systems and universities must acknowledge the social, political and economic ramifica- tions of testing.

#### Mandate that testing companies allocate money to research on test unfairness and bias and to the development of viable alternatives

#### give instruction and practice to test naïve students to enable them better to compete with children who have already developed test-taking strategies.

#### Inform test producers and test users of what standardized achievement tests can and cannot do

#### Not support companies that that refuse to examine seriously all aspects of test bias, that refuse to broaden their standardization sample to include a range of racial and class groups when gathering normative data, that refuse to include black, Hispanic, and Native American professionals in the construction and full assessment of their instruments

#### Solves the aff – It’s the best of both worlds. No standardized tests makes the decision more subjective.

Green and Griffore 80 [Robert L. Green and Robert J. Griffore , Summer 1980, " The Impact of Standardized Testing on Minority Students ," The Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 49, No. 3, Critical Issues in Testing and Achievement of Black Americans (Summer, 1980), pp. 238-252 , https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2295083.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aaae005e87f8dd810c094fe93de263c77, accessed 8-15-2019] LHSBC

We have suggested that the use of tests can be unfair under certain conditions, and that tests themselves may have several sources of inherent bias. It is not our intention to suggest that all tests should be abandoned. Indeed, in the absence of standardized tests, selection and placement decisions might become wholly subjective and even more unfair. However, it is extremely important that standardized testing practices involve less unfairness, and that the tests themselves have less inherent bias. It is in response to these needs that we offer the following recommendations:

1. A National Bureau of Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests and Testing should be established. Such a review agency is necessary in a society which has come to rely on testing as a primary standard for selection, classification and placement decisions in many aspects of citizens' lives.

2. The National Institute of Education should allocate funds for conducting independent validation and reliability studies on widely used educational and psychological instruments.

3. There should be full involvement of minority professionals in developing, revising, and reviewing standardized achievement tests.

4. Corporations which produce standardized tests should take an active approach toward limiting test misuse. The assumption of a neutral position is not realistic.

5. Test producers should join with school systems, educa- tors, and measurement specialists to seek ways in which instruments can be designed to enhance the educational status of all children through improvement of instruction.

6. Educators in public school systems and universities must acknowledge the social, political and economic ramifica- tions of testing. Tests and their uses do make a difference in children's lives.

7. Testing companies should be urged to allocate a specified portion of their economic resources to research on test unfairness and bias and to the development of viable alternatives. The alternative to such internal efforts might be other external monitoring procedures such as the cur- rent "Truth-in-Testing" bills.

8. Students who are test naive should be given instruction and practice to enable them better to compete with children who have already developed test-taking strategies.

9. Test producers and test users should become informed and aware of what standardized achievement tests can and cannot do. Such an awareness would provide support for the movement toward truth-in-testing.

10. Companies that refuse to examine seriously all aspects of test bias, that refuse to broaden their standardization sample to include a range of racial and class groups when gathering normative data, that refuse to include black, Hispanic, and Native American professionals in the con- struction and full assessment of their instruments should not be supported in their marketing efforts by public school activities, nor by institutions of higher education.

## Case turn

#### No tests makes the decision more subjective

Green and Griffore 80 [Robert L. Green and Robert J. Griffore , Summer 1980, " The Impact of Standardized Testing on Minority Students ," The Journal of Negro Education, Vol. 49, No. 3, Critical Issues in Testing and Achievement of Black Americans (Summer, 1980), pp. 238-252 , https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2295083.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aaae005e87f8dd810c094fe93de263c77, accessed 8-15-2019] LHSBC

We have suggested that the use of tests can be unfair under certain conditions, and that tests themselves may have several sources of inherent bias. It is not our intention to suggest that all tests should be abandoned. Indeed, in the absence of standardized tests, selection and placement decisions might become wholly subjective and even more unfair. However, it is extremely important that standardized testing practices involve less unfairness, and that the tests themselves have less inherent bias. It is in response to these needs that we offer the following recommendations:

## Race aff

#### Testing privileges wealth over merit and the entire person.

England 5/1 [Jason England, Jason England is a former admissions dean and an assistant professor of creative writing at Carnegie Mellon University., 5-1-2019, "The mess that is elite college admissions, explained by a former dean," Vox, https://www.vox.com/the-highlight/2019/5/1/18311548/college-admissions-secrets-myths, accessed 8-15-2019] LHSBC

3) Standardized testing is just as problematic as the vague concept of “preparedness” and as contingent on wealth

How should you define a prospective student’s value? Is there a magical chemistry between applicant and university? Should a student reflect a university’s ideals? Should admissions officers primarily value self-motivation, independent thinking, creativity? Demonstrated service to the community?

In theory, our office valued a mix of all the above. But in practice, standardized test scores, class rank, and private schooling (interchangeable with “preparedness”) ruled the day. Elite universities, no matter how high-minded, have corporate souls and bottom lines. Despite being nonprofits, elite universities are competing businesses in an ever-evolving marketplace. And more often than not, professed ideals will take a back seat to whatever drives the market. If your competitors boast an SAT median of 1450 and 60 percent of their incoming class ranks in the top 10 percent of their high schools, you need to at least match that.

Although standardized tests predict little aside from first-year college academic success and retention, some people still point to a correlation between SAT scores and future earnings. But using the SAT to predict income is a chicken-and-egg riddle because family income and education level so reliably predict SAT scores and class movement in America is so stagnant. None of my personal or professional experience has legitimized the notion that an applicant with a 1440 is going to be a better classroom student or more worthwhile citizen than an applicant with a 1250.

My final year in admissions, the way we treated an applicant broke my heart. I interviewed her in my office and was struck by her depth, self-effacing humor, drive, maturity, and critical thinking. She had two working-class parents without advanced degrees and grew up in an economically depressed region of western Massachusetts. She had the grades and the extracurricular activities, but her scores were 70 points below our median.

During our committee session, I gave an impassioned speech on her behalf, which might account for the four votes I got in her favor. I’d never advocated so desperately and enthusiastically for a student. She was precisely the sort of person who would reach our campus, take full advantage of the resources she’d been lacking throughout her life, and contribute both socially and academically. Unfortunately, five colleagues still voted against her. Her case helped see me out the door.

## TOEFL Colonization

#### The TOEFL furthers colonialization and decks VTL

Magtoto 5/16 [Maxine Magtoto, 5-16-2019, "Standardized Testing: Systemic Racism and the Disparity of International Education," ROOSTERGNN, https://rgnn.org/2019/05/16/standardized-testing-systemic-racism-disparity-international-education/, accessed 8-15-2019] LHSBC

F[rom its conception in 1962](https://www.manhattanreview.com/toefl-history/), passing the Test of English as a Foreign Language, or the TOEFL, has become standard procedure for those looking to pursue higher education in English-speaking countries. But what exactly does passing this test entail? Contrary to what one may think, it’s not English proficiency – it’s conformity to elitism.

Structurally, the TOEFL is a test segmented into four sections: reading, listening, writing, and speaking. The former two are in multiple-choice format and assessed by machines. The writing and speaking are based on prompts and judged according to a rubric. Because these tests measure for the skills one acquires through schooling, they prove to highlight the differences posed by educational discrimination. Standardized testing mainly advertises itself as the outcome of a seemingly-objective, meritocratic system, designed to award those who put in the most effort; however, this is not the case.

Optimal performance comes through good test-taking skills specific to the test being taken, not actual levels of academic prowess. Unfortunately, the means for building these skills are biased towards those born into the educational systems of native English-speaking countries that have access to these resources. This is ironic, because these are the same countries that require international applicants to break through quantitative measures of English ability to be considered for admission.

The TOEFL is only one of many mechanisms that funnel into the multi-billion dollar standardized testing industry. Test companies are, first and foremost, for-profit corporations. The TOEFL exam costs [over $200 USD](https://www.ets.org/toefl/ibt/about/fees/) to take once, the score being valid for two years. However, the products companies offer consist not only the test but also the additional program supplements meant to help students do well. Additionally, bear in mind that international students are meant to take the TOEFL in addition to other tests required of regular applicants, such as the SAT and ACT. Testing companies take advantage of the desperation of the international applicant to make money.

One would only need to look at standardized testing results as a whole to see how the test plays into inequality. According to a [2014 study](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2014/03/05/these-four-charts-show-how-the-sat-favors-the-rich-educated-families/?utm_term=.520155427f33) by The Washington Post, students of higher-income families have been proven to outrank their peers by around 200 points on the reading and writing section of the SAT. This has been a [recurring trend throughout the years](https://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/08/27/sat-scores-and-family-income/?_r=0). Suspiciously enough, the College Board has failed to release SAT scores by income statistics for 2017 and 2018, hinting that they may be trying to suppress this information. This only goes to prove that standardized tests not only favor those of high socioeconomic status, but also enable those privileged enough to have been born in these countries to have an easier time getting into tertiary educational institutions.

Some may argue that international students are victimizing themselves and could avoid the issue by making use of local opportunities available to them. But that only avoids the problem and doesn’t address the underlying issue of elitism. The unsurpassable number opportunities available in the Western world simply cannot be dismissed. American universities, for instance, have come to be renowned as the best worldwide. With top-notch facilities, high-quality instructors, and curriculum flexibility, entrance to these educational institutions has become indicative of one’s success. As such, they have come to attract global prospects from a myriad cultural backgrounds. The U.S. has the largest number of international students in tertiary programs of any country, with around 1.1 million students. [However, international students only comprise around 5%](https://www.internationalstudent.com/study_usa/) of its entire student pool. The four other nations whose universities require proof of English proficiency – Australia, Ireland, the United Kingdom, and New Zealand – share in this high regard.

This makes the high-stakes aspect of these tests all the more absurd – those that most need to score well are the ones least equipped to get it. The fact that standardized tests are needed in the first place, in fact, only goes to show an attachment to a racist past.

After all, standardized tests were first founded by xenophobes. Lewis Terman, an American psychologist, was one of the key figures in standardized test development. He had drawn inspiration from Frenchman Alfred Binet’s Intelligence Quotient (IQ) test, and altered it to fit American protocols, creating the [Stanford-Binet IQ test in 1916](https://www.hmhco.com/~/media/sites/home/hmh-assessments/clinical/stanford-binet/pdf/sb5_asb_1.pdf?la=en). This was during a point in history when the eugenics movement was flourishing in America, Terman being one of many professionals in the field of the ideology that [IQ was linked to genetics rather than social status](http://aapf.org/standardized-testing). It is difficult to detach from the test’s problematic history when aspects such as class divide, segregation, and genetics still factor into taking it.

Further exacerbating this, this is what [admissions at the University of Chicago](https://internationalaffairs.uchicago.edu/page/english-language-requirements) states regarding qualifying conditions in which English proficiency requirements are waived for international applicants:

“Students who are natives of or who have studied English in other countries (for example, India, Pakistan, the Philippines, Hong Kong, Singapore, etc.) are not exempt from the English language requirement.”

Institutions are going out of their way to call out nations that have proven relatively-high levels of English proficiency – all of which, uncoincidentally, are former colonies of a native English-speaking nation. This reduces the humanity of foreign parties who may have been English speakers their whole lives to: first, a generalization based on their race; and second, a quantifiable statistic that says virtually nothing about their knowledge. English proficiency is, as a result, defined not by individuals, but by nationality. They further demean the nations they single out as those who had once been underneath their rule. The Western standard of English is a means to control these countries and keep them in line. They must be reminded that they are less than; that their different education system is not only of no comparison, but that they, as a result, are less educated and must prove themselves, regardless of their education system or whether English is the language of instruction at their school.

It has reinforced the colonial mentality that had disparaged foreign education in the past, upholding the belief that Western powers would be justified in subjecting foreigners to their standard of English proficiency, drawing parallels to [Kipling-esque colonial sentiments](http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5478/) held by imperialist powers that felt the need to occupy foreign lands because of an apparently-inherent superiority.

The bottom line is that if English proficiency was so important to these institutions, they would certainly ask it of all prospective applicants, regardless of their citizenship. But this isn’t the case. Despite what they advocate for, the TOEFL does not value diversity- it only crystallizes the systemically-racist mentality that pressures non-native English speakers to strive in order to be as viable a candidate for higher education as their native counterparts.

It wouldn’t be much of a stretch to say that the TOEFL is not about education. Rather, it is a matter of immigration, residence, and status that goes to affirm the privilege of those not on the receiving end. The TOEFL is not universal. It is a tool of compartmentalization.

Standardized testing has created a paradoxical hierarchy where even the highest international scorers must conform to the standards of the ultimate presiding power – their former colonizers. With the way things stand, the TOEFL – and standardized tests like it – only perpetuates the racist ideology of colonial apologists.

## Race aff

#### Standardized tests are racial profiling where scores are used to deem black, brown, and immigrant groups as failing.

Malsbary 15 [Christine Brigid Malsbary, Christine Brigid Malsbary is a postdoctoral fellow with the National Academy of Education/Spencer Foundation. Her research examines how teachers and students are impacted by education policy reform. She currently teaches at Vassar College as a Visiting Assistant Professor., 10-26-2015, "Standardized Tests are a Form of Racial Profiling," Living in Dialogue, http://www.livingindialogue.com/standardized-tests-are-a-form-of-racial-profiling/, accessed 8-16-2019] LHSBC

The power elite is preserved because in a time of shrinking opportunities, a filter that eliminates large numbers of English learners from the mix gives white students an advantage. Let us be clear: the promises of the civil rights era have not come true. Both the workforce and schools remain segregated with a significant white power elite that is both about class and about race. Today, Blacks make up less than 4% of practicing physicians, and Latinos about 5%– [similar percentages to 1960](http://consumer.healthday.com/general-health-information-16/doctor-news-206/too-few-blacks-hispanics-are-becoming-doctors-study-702572.html). Schools are not desegregated, and maintain the same rates of segregation since landmark Brown v. Board policy in 1954. Today, Black and Latino students tend to be in schools with a substantial majority of poor children, [while white and Asian students typically attend middle class schools](http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/news/press-releases/2014-press-releases/ucla-report-finds-changing-u.s.-demographics-transform-school-segregation-landscape-60-years-after-brown-v-board-of-education).

I think we should “call a spade a spade”: standardized tests are a function of white supremacy and a method of racial profiling in schools.

Racial profiling is understood as the act of targeting particular groups of people because of their race. We usually think of the targeting as done by law enforcement, and racial profiling is usually thought of as traffic and pedestrian stops, raids on immigrant communities, and the ejection of Muslim Americans and South Asians on airlines and at airports.

Tests are a form of racial profiling because they provide a way for school districts and education reformers to frame black, brown and immigrant youth as “failing” and target the education services that these youth then receive. When a child’s knowledge, worth and assets are reduced to a test score, assumptions can be made about that child’s intelligence (and by extension the intelligence of the child’s racial group). The low-intelligence of people of color and immigrants is a regular trope in this country. The assumed superiority of the white brain means that we norm all “standards” (aka tests) to bizarre and out of touch expectations that only youth with an array of special services can pass.

Let’s talk about those special services. Once youth of color get low scores on bad tests, they are framed as “failing” and targeted to receive an array of expensive for-profit services that are put into place at the expense of recess and social studies and fun and joy. Effectively, their educational opportunities are reduced to passing math and English. In fact, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), part of the U.S. Department of Education, [released the findings](http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2012014) of the first nationwide arts survey reporting [an “equity gap”](http://blog.ed.gov/2012/04/ed-releases-new-report-on-arts-education-in-u-s-public-schools/)between the availability of arts instruction as well as the richness of course offerings for students in low-poverty schools compared to those in high-poverty schools, leading students who are economically disadvantaged to not get the enrichment experiences of affluent students.

Frame and target. Frame and target. This is at the center of racial profiling.

Standardized tests create test scores which are then used to target students of color by limiting the creative depth, intellectual wealth, and variety of their education. Producing test scores is an act of racial profiling. The alternative, here, is to opt young people out of tests, which means opting children out of this particular form of racial profiling. If they (the district, the power elite, the mayor, the education corporate reformers) do not have a young person’s test score, then they cannot assign value or worth to that particular young person. Test refusal is refusing racial profiling and saying yes to dignity and anti-racist, humanizing schooling.

#### Standardized tests are a vicious cycle of colorblind eugenics where knowledge is identified and axed for not “conforming” to problematic standards of intelligence.

Au 18 [Wayne Au, Wayne Au is a professor in the School of Educational Studies and interim dean of diversity and equity and chief diversity officer at the University of Washington Bothell. He is also a longtime editor of the social-justice teaching magazine, Rethinking Schools., 4-14-2018, "The Socialist Case Against the SAT," No Publication, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2018/04/against-the-sat-testing-meritocracy-race-class, accessed 8-16-2019] LHSBC

It also turns out that the process of SAT test-question selection is flawed in racially biased ways. When the SAT tries out new questions, unbeknownst to students, they put these questions in a special trial section of the test. If a test-taker gets the trial test question correct and goes on to score high on the SAT overall, then the question is deemed a valid and good question and gets included in a future test — all because it is the kind of question that a high SAT test-scorer gets correct. This means that the SAT is populated by questions that high-scoring SAT takers answer correctly.

The problem is that this process creates a self-reinforcing cycle of race and class inequality. A 2003 study by Kidder and Rosner published in the Santa Clara Law Review found racist outcomes in the SAT test-question selection: there were trial SAT questions where blacks got the right answer more often than whites, and where Latinos got the right answer more often than whites. However, these questions, where the typical racial outcomes of the SAT were inverted, were deemed invalid as real questions for use of future tests. Why? Their pattern of correct responses didn’t match the overall patterns among individual SAT test-takers. The black and Latino students who got those trial questions right more often than the white students, didn’t outscore the white students overall. Writing in the Nation, [Rosner explained](https://www.thenation.com/article/white-preferences/):

Each individual SAT question ETS chooses is required to parallel outcomes of the test overall. So, if high-scoring test-takers — who are more likely to be white — tend to answer the question correctly in [experimental] pretesting, it’s a worthy SAT question; if not, it’s thrown out. Race and ethnicity are not considered explicitly, but racially disparate scores drive question selection, which in turn reproduces racially disparate test results in an internally reinforcing cycle.

In this sense the SAT is a textbook example of what race scholar Eduardo Bonilla-Silva calls colorblind racism. Officially it is race neutral, but empirically it produces and reproduces racialized outcomes.

In this context it is important to remember that the SAT is designed to sort and stratify human populations. The SAT is a norm-referenced test. This means its primary purpose is to sort and rank students in comparison to each other — establishing a “norm” for performance and demarcating who is above and below this norm. Consequently, the SAT is designed to produce a “bell curve” of test scores, where some score high, a bunch land in the middle, and some score low. The bell-curve assumption built into the SAT extends directly from the eugenics movement: It presumes that intelligence is naturally distributed across human populations unequally. Within this frame a good test not only requires that a portion of students to fail, it also mirrors this presumed “natural” distribution of human intelligence. In this way, the SAT is required to produce inequality, not equality. In a racist, capitalist system, that the SAT unequally stratifies human populations by race and class should come as no surprise.

#### Eliminating the black-white score gap the best option to reduce status quo inequality.

Jencks and Phillips 98 [Christopher Jencks and Meredith Phillips, 3-1-1998, "The Black-White Test Score Gap: Why It Persists and What Can Be Done," Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-black-white-test-score-gap-why-it-persists-and-what-can-be-done/, accessed 8-15-2019] LHSBC

African Americans score lower than European Americans on vocabulary, reading, and math tests, as well as on tests that claim to measure scholastic aptitude and intelligence. The gap appears before children enter kindergarten and it persists into adulthood. It has narrowed since 1970, but the typical American black still scores below 75 percent of American whites on almost every standardized test. This statistic does not imply, of course, that all blacks score below all whites. There is a lot of overlap between the two groups. Nonetheless, the test score gap is large enough to have significant social and economic consequences.

Closing the black-white test score gap would probably do more to promote racial equality in the United States than any other strategy now under serious discussion. Judging by the currently available statistical evidence, eliminating the test score gap would sharply increase black college graduation rates, making them nearly equal to white rates. Such a change would also allow selective colleges to phase out racial preferences in admission, which have long been a flashpoint for racial conflict. Eliminating the test score gap would also reduce racial disparities in men’s earnings and would probably eliminate the racial disparities in women’s earnings.

#### Independently, our diversity impact exceeds their hedonic calculus – there are other forms of well-being that aren’t simply dopamine or pleasure.

Bowman et al. 11 [Nicholas A. Bowman, Jay W. Brandenberger, Patrick L. Hill, and Daniel K. Lapsley , 2011, " The Long-Term Effects of College Diversity Experiences: Well-Being and Social Concerns 13 Years After Graduation ," University of Notre Dame, https://www3.nd.edu/~dlapsle1/Lab/Articles\_&amp;\_Chapters\_files/Bowman%20et%20al%20Long%20term%20effects%20of%20college%20diversity%20JCSD.pdf, accessed 8-15-2019] LHSBC

Ancient Greek philosophers and modern-day psychologists alike have distinguished between two types of well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2001; Ryff, 1989; Waterman, 1993). Subjective or hedonic well-being describes the experience of pleasure and the avoidance of (psychological) pain. This form of well-being is typically defined as having positive emotions, being satisfied with one’s life, and/or having a lack of negative emotions. In contrast, eudaimonic or psychological well-being describes the degree to which people are living their lives to the fullest; this multidimensional construct includes having a purpose in life, experiencing personal growth, maintaining meaningful interpersonal relationships, and exerting control over one’s environment. Although these two forms of well-being are correlated (Keyes, Shmotkin, & Ryff, 2002; Waterman, 1993), they represent theoretically distinct and important aspects of human flourishing.

It seems plausible that substantive interactions with diversity may help students from all backgrounds feel comfortable in relatively heterogeneous college environments (thus promoting subjective well-being). Diversity experiences, which are relatively novel and can be challenging, might also provide the opportunity for personal, social, and intellectual development (promoting psychological well-being). Indeed, the available research supports these assumptions. Interactions with peers from different racial/ethnic backgrounds are positively associated with a sense of belonging to one’s college (Locks, Hurtado, Bowman, & Oseguera, 2008) and satisfaction with the college experience (Astin, 1993; Chang, 1999). Moreover, taking multiple diversity courses and having positive interactions with diverse students each contribute to increased psychological well-being (Bowman, in press). The effects of diversity experiences on well-being—particularly psychological or eudaimonic well-being—may be at least partially explained by their impact on students’ awareness of social issues and concern for improving society. Psychological well-being is characterized by identifying a sense of purpose in life and undergoing personal growth in one or more domains (Ryff, 1989), and college diversity experiences can provide an important basis for establishing this purpose and growth. For instance, Astin (1993) examined the relationships between several diversity experiences and self-reported gains on 82 college outcomes. Regardless of the type of experience, diversity interactions are most strongly related to students’ cultural awareness, commitment to promoting racial understanding, and participation in campus demonstrations. Other studies show that diversity experiences are associated with increased importance placed on social action and engaged citizenship (Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Hurtado, 2005; Nelson Laird, Engberg, & Hurtado, 2005) and reductions in racist attitudes, stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination (for a meta-analytic review, see Denson, 2009). In sum, diversity experiences can play a key role in students’ development of certain aspects of purpose (i.e., improving racial understanding specifically and society more generally) and personal growth (i.e., fostering cultural awareness and diminishing prejudice).

This overall emphasis on social action engagement and improving society can be described as a prosocial orientation (Van Lange, 1999; Van Lange, De Bruin, Otten, & Joireman, 1997). Such an orientation may bolster well-being either directly or indirectly through promoting prosocial behaviors that enhance well-being. Bowman and colleagues (Bowman, Brandenberger, Hill, Lapsley, & Quaranto, in press) find that prosocial orientation at the end of the senior year predicts increases in volunteer work among graduates in their mid-30s and that adult volunteering is positively associated with adult psychological well-being. Other research observes a direct link between college prosocial orientation and well-being in adulthood (Hill, Burrow, Lapsley, & Brandenberger, in press), but this analysis did not control for previous wellbeing or other factors.

#### Diversity experiences matter ­– they impact people for years into the future.

Bowman et al. 11 [Nicholas A. Bowman, Jay W. Brandenberger, Patrick L. Hill, and Daniel K. Lapsley , 2011, " The Long-Term Effects of College Diversity Experiences: Well-Being and Social Concerns 13 Years After Graduation ," University of Notre Dame, https://www3.nd.edu/~dlapsle1/Lab/Articles\_&amp;\_Chapters\_files/Bowman%20et%20al%20Long%20term%20effects%20of%20college%20diversity%20JCSD.pdf, accessed 8-15-2019] LHSBC

In sum, curricular and co-curricular diversity experiences are positively related to personal growth, purpose in life, recognition of racism, and volunteering behavior among college graduates in their mid-30s. These long-lasting effects are consistent with the importance of the undergraduate years in fostering long-lasting attitudes, values, and behaviors (e.g., Newcomb, Koenig, Flacks, & Warwick, 1967; Parks, 2000). Perhaps the most surprising finding was the consistency of racial/cultural awareness workshops in predicting subsequent outcomes. Given that a two-hour workshop may have such a lasting impression, some might argue that these activities should become a mandatory part of the college experience. Generally speaking, people’s behaviors often shape their subsequent attitudes and beliefs (e.g., Eagly & Chaiken, 1993); in this instance, students who decide to attend a cultural awareness workshop might come to see themselves as the sort of person who cares about these issues, which leads to further commitment toward a prosocial orientation. However, psychologists have long established that a person must freely choose to engage in a behavior in order for that behavior to shape one’s attitudes and identity (e.g., Bem, 1972; Festinger, 1954). Attending a voluntary workshop may lead students to draw inferences about their relevant attributes, but students who attend a required workshop may think that they went simply because they had no choice. Therefore, colleges and universities might encourage students to attend these workshops by providing a number of sessions at convenient times and locations, and through a variety of campus organizations. Further research on how the effects of diversity-related activities may vary depending on student choice (e.g., comparing outcomes from required versus “voluntary” diversity courses) is clearly needed. Despite the voluminous literature on how college affects student growth and development, there is a dearth of evidence about whether and to what degree these effects continue after graduation (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). This study provides evidence for a small piece of this puzzle, namely, the sustained impact of interactions with diversity. These findings strongly support the need for college administrators, practitioners, and faculty to facilitate meaningful diversity experiences on campus. In fact, higher education institutions can promote long-term diversity learning outcomes in a relatively simple manner, since the forms of engagement that most strongly affect students’ future well-being and social concerns can be incorporated effectively into the curriculum and co-curriculum.

## Heg

#### Diversity is important to military innovation, military readiness, and junior officer retention

Granville 15 [Anna Granville, 4-13-2015, "4 Reasons I Am Resigning My Commission As A Naval Officer," Task &amp; Purpose, https://taskandpurpose.com/4-reasons-i-am-resigning-my-commission-as-a-naval-officer, accessed 8-17-2019] LHSBC

3. The military is a homogeneous, anti-intellectual organization.

Finally, the factor that I found most frustrating is the toxicity of a perpetually anti-intellectual, change-resistant organization. My given reasons for resigning are extremely common among junior officers — both men and women — and have been recently quantified by the [2014 Navy Retention Study](http://www.dodretention.org/). Yet many senior leaders would look at my reasons for resigning and find a way to discredit them because they do not like what they say, possibly because they feel these motives question their own career choices.

When I was a week into my first deployment, I was preparing my slides for a watch turnover brief as the assistant chiefs of staff all filed in. A fellow junior officer, whose watch station was adjacent to mine, muttered, “Man, the Navy has a never-ending supply of middle-aged white men.”

And she was absolutely right. The majority of senior military leaders are white, Christian, conservative men with engineering degrees from a service academy, masters’ degrees from a war college, who grew up middle-class or privileged and whose wives do not have a career outside the home. There is nothing wrong with any of this — indeed, this is probably the profile of most executives in America. But this also means there’s a lack of diversity of ideas, a resistance to alternative ways of thinking, and the lethality of group think.

Unfortunately, this is also the profile of the same kind of individual who will wax on about how the military should not be a vehicle of social change — something that is very easy for someone in a position of privilege to say. Yet the American milit8ary has been a vehicle of social change since its inception; that is something to be proud of.

In order to succeed as an organization that is in the business of outsmarting and out-maneuvering an adversary who wants to kill us and our allies, shouldn’t we encourage diversity of thought in the force, and strive to recruit and retain leaders who think differently, rather than writing them off as disruptive?

#### Diversity is key to military recruitment and innovation.

Forsling 15 [Carl Forsling, 4-28-2015, "Why The Military Needs Diversity," Task &amp; Purpose, https://taskandpurpose.com/why-the-military-needs-diversity, accessed 8-17-2019] LHSBC

For whatever scoffing the overused term “diversity” engenders, it has significant payoffs. All else being equal, a team with more than one represented demographic [will tend to perform better](http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-diversity-makes-us-smarter/), especially when it comes to producing innovation, which becomes more important to the military with each passing day. Groups with members of varied backgrounds generate more ideas and encourage individuals to “up their games.

In the military, we sometimes add tactical necessity to the mix — the [Marine Lioness](http://americanveteranmagazine.blogspot.com/2010/03/women-in-service-marine-corps-lioness.html) program is an example. It allowed female Marines in units to conduct searches and collect actionable intelligence among local women in Iraq. Additionally, in a military operating in far-flung reaches of the world, having diverse backgrounds often leads to units having individuals conversant in the [culture](https://books.google.com/books?id=PFp8AgAAQBAJ&pg=PT10&dq=military+looks+for+language+proficiency+diversity&source=gbs_toc_r&cad=3#v=onepage&q=military%20looks%20for%20language%20proficiency%20diversity&f=false) or [language](https://books.google.com/books?id=gGrAflAL8cEC&pg=PA1&lpg=PA1&dq=military+looks+for+language+proficiency+diversity&source=bl&ots=H0gUBzDydU&sig=9fHr_tK3epWuCsLN5WYIN2LCvVg&hl=en&sa=X&ei=j9w6Vdy3F4HutQWVs4DoDw&ved=0CDwQ6AEwBg#v=onepage&q=military%20looks%20for%20language%20proficiency%20diversity&f=false) of an area of operations.

Additionally, the corporate world already widely recognizes diversity as a necessity for [recruitment and retention](http://www.entrepreneur.com/article/240550) and the military should as well. Having minorities and women in a workplace helps to recruit and retain them — seeing people like you makes a difference. White men have benefited from this principle for generations — they just never consciously think about it.

It’s not a choice between diversity and high standards. They aren’t mutually exclusive. With the right approach diversity can actually increase the military’s standards.

Let’s start by saying that there’s nothing wrong with being a white Christian male. I’m one myself. I know that senior military leaders of that persuasion worked hard to get to their positions, but only the most naive would not admit that some others of different backgrounds might have to exercise more initiative or work a little harder to reach the same level.

A major issue here is that from adolescence on, white males stare military service in the face as a primary option. It’s not uncommon for them to have an unbroken male lineage of military service going back to their grandfathers and sometimes beyond. Their families and communities wholeheartedly endorse them joining. [That doesn’t occur nearly as often for those from other demographics](http://wiisglobal.org/2014/02/03/diversity-and-inclusion-imperative-for-the-u-s-militarys-future-success/). For many women and some minorities, joining the military, especially as an officer, is not as obvious an option as it is for a typical white male.

This is where an opportunity to encourage diversity without compromising standards comes in. Diversity doesn’t have to be some plan by which a thumb has to be put on the scale favoring the minority or the woman in any selection; like the type of affirmative action where a racial or gender-based golf handicap gets figured into the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery score for enlisted service members, SAT scores for officer programs, or some other standard.

By just making a bigger effort to broaden the pool of applicants we select from, we have the ability to increase, not decrease, quality. If there’s a large pool of potential applicants who are ignoring the option of joining the military for whatever reason, then by taking steps to encourage more of them to apply, quality goes up, not down. To use a simplified example, if you need to pick 10 people for a job, are you more likely to get higher quality recruits from a group of 50 applicants or 100?

## Race

#### Diversity makes us smarter – decades of research proves

Phillips 14 [Katherine W. Phillips, Katherine W. Phillips is Paul Calello Professor of Leadership and Ethics and senior vice dean at Columbia Business School., 10-1-2014, "How Diversity Makes Us Smarter," Scientific American, https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-diversity-makes-us-smarter/, accessed 8-17-2019] LHSBC

Decades of research by organizational scientists, psychologists, sociologists, economists and demographers show that socially diverse groups (that is, those with a diversity of race, ethnicity, gender and sexual orientation) are more innovative than homogeneous groups.

It seems obvious that a group of people with diverse individual expertise would be better than a homogeneous group at solving complex, nonroutine problems. It is less obvious that social diversity should work in the same way—yet the science shows that it does.

This is not only because people with different backgrounds bring new information. Simply interacting with individuals who are different forces group members to prepare better, to anticipate alternative viewpoints and to expect that reaching consensus will take effort.

#### High stakes tests forward stereotype threat – being afraid of perpetuating negative stereotypes causes scores to drop

Steele and Aronson 95 [Claude M. Steele and Joshua Aronson,\* Claude M. Steele is the twenty-first Provost of Columbia University, as well as a Professor of Psychology. He was educated at Hiram College and at Ohio State University, where he received his Ph.D. in psychology in 1971. He has received honorary degrees from the University of Michigan, the University of Chicago, Yale University, Princeton University, and from the University of Maryland, Baltimore County. \*\* Joshua Michael Aronson is an American social psychologist and Associate Professor of Applied Psychology at New York University's Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development. , 1995, "Stereotype Threat And The Intellectual Test Performance Of African Americans," Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 69(5), 797-811., https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1996-12938-001, accessed 8-17-2019] LHSBC

General Discussion The existence of a negative stereotype about a group to which one belongs, we have argued, means that in situations where the stereotype is applicable, one is at risk of confirming it as a self characterization, both to one's self and to others who know the stereotype. This is what is meant by stereotype threat. And when the stereotype involved demeans something as important as intellectual ability, this threat can be disruptive enough, we hypothesize, to impair intellectual performance. In support of this reasoning, the present experiments show that making African American participants vulnerable to judgment by negative stereotypes about their group's intellectual ability depressed their standardized test performance relative to White participants, while conditions designed to alleviate this threat, improved their performance, equating the two groups once their differences in SATs were controlled. Studies 1 and 2 produced this pattern by varying whether or not the test was represented as diagnostic of intellectual ability—a procedure that varied stereotype threat by varying the relevance of the stereotype about Blacks' ability to their performance. Study 3 provided direct evidence that this manipulation aroused stereotype threat in Black participants by showing that it activated the racial stereotype and stereotype-related self-doubts in their thinking, that it led them to distance themselves from African American stereotypes. Study 4 showed that merely recording their race—presumably by making the stereotype salient—was enough to impair Black participants' performance even when the test was not diagnostic of ability. Taken together these experiments show that stereotype threat—established by quite subtle instructional differences—can impair the intellectual test performance of Black students, and that lifting it can dramatically improve that performance. Mediation: How Stereotype Threat Impairs Performance Study 3 offers clear evidence of what being stereotype threatened is like—as well as demonstrating that the mere prospect of a difficult, ability-diagnostic test was enough to do this to our sample of African American participants. But how precisely did this state of self-threat impair performance, through what mechanism or set of mechanisms did the impairment occur?

There are a number of possibilities: distraction, narrowed attention, anxiety, self-consciousness, withdrawal of effort, overeffort, and so on (e.g., Baumeister, 1984). In fact, several such mechanisms may be involved simultaneously, or different mechanisms may be involved under different conditions. For example, if the test were long enough to solidly engender low performance expectations, then withdrawal of effort might play a bigger mediational role than, say, anxiety, which might be more important with a shorter test. Such complexities notwithstanding, our findings offer some insight into how the present effects were mediated. Our best assessment is that stereotype threat caused an inefficiency of processing much like that caused by other evaluative pressures. Stereotype-threatened participants spent more time doing fewer items more inaccurately—probably as a result of alternating their attention between trying to answer the items and trying to assess the self-significance of their frustration. This form of debilitation—reduced speed and accuracy—has been shown as a reaction to evaluation apprehension (e.g., Geen, 1985); test anxiety (e.g., Wine, 1971; Sarason, 1972); the presence of an audience (e.g., Bond, 1982); and competition (Baumeister, 1984). Several findings, by suggesting that stereotype-threatened participants were both motivated and inefficient, point in this direction. They reported expending as much effort as other participants. In those studies that included the requisite measures—Study 2 and the replication study reported with Study 4—they actually spent more time per item. They did not guess more than non-stereotype-threatened participants, and, as Black participants did generally, they reported rereading the items more. Also, as noted, these participants were strong students, and almost certainly identified with the material on the test. They may even have been more anxious. Stereotype threat increased Black participants' anxiety in the replication study, although not significantly in Study 2. Together then, these findings suggest that stereotype threat led participants to try hard but with impaired efficiency. Still, we note that lower expectations may have also been involved, especially in real-life occurrences of stereotype threat. As performance falters under stereotype threat, and as the stereotype frames that faltering as a sign of a group-based inferiority, the individual's expectations about his or her ability and performance may drop—presumably faster than they would if the stereotype were not there to credit the inability interpretation. And lower expectations, as the literature has long emphasized (e.g., Bandura, 1977, 1986; Carver, Blaney, & Scheier, 1979; Pyszczynski & Greenberg, 1983) can further undermine performance by undermining motivation and effort. It is precisely a process of stereotype threat fostering low expectations in a domain that we suggest leads eventually to disidentification with the domain. We assume that this process did not get very far in the present research because the tests were short, and because our participants, as highly identified students, were unlikely to give up on these tests—as their self-reports tell us. But we do assume that lower expectations can play a role in mediating stereotype threat effects. There is, however, strong evidence against one kind of expectancy mediation. This is the idea that lowered performance or selfefficacy expectations alone mediated the effects of stereotype threat. Conceivably, the stereotype threat treatments got Black participants to expect that they would perform poorly on the test—presumably by getting them to accept the image of themselves inherent in the racial stereotype. The stereotype threat condition did activate participants' self-doubts. This lower expectation, then, outside of any experience these participants may have had with the test itself, and outside of any apprehension they may have had about self-confirming the stereotype, may have directly weakened their motivation and performance. Of course it would be important to show that stereotype threat effects are mediated in African American students by expectations implicit in the stereotype, expectations powerful enough to more or less automatically cause their underperformance. But there are several reasons to doubt this view. For one thing, it isn't clear that our stereotype threat manipulations led Black participants to accept lower expectations and then to follow them unrevisedly to lower performance. For example, they resisted the self-applicability of the stereotype. But most important, as noted, it is almost certain that any expectation formed prior to the test would be superseded by the participants' actual experience with the test items; rising with success and falling with frustration. In fact, another experiment in our lab offered direct evidence of this by showing that expectations manipulated before the test had no effect on performance. Its procedure followed, in all conditions, that of the standard diagnostic condition used in Studies 1 and 2—with the exception that it directly manipulated efficacy and performance expectations before participants took the test. After being told that the test was ability diagnostic, and just before taking the test, the experimenter (an Asian woman) asked participants what their SAT scores were. After hearing the score, in the positive expectation condition, she commented that the participant should have little trouble with the test. In the negative expectation condition, this comment indicated that the participant would have trouble with the test, and nothing was said in a no-expectation condition. Both White and Black participants were run in all three expectation conditions. While the experiment replicated the standard effect of Whites outperforming Blacks under these stereotype threat conditions (participants' SATs were again used as a covariate) F( 1, 32) = 5.12, p < .03, this personalized expectation manipulation had no effect on the performance of either group. For Blacks, the means were 4.32, 6.38, and 6.55, for the positive, negative and no-expectations conditions, respectively, and for Whites, for the same conditions, they were 8.24, 9.25, and 11.23, respectively. Thus in an experiment that was sensitive enough to replicate the standard stereotype threat effect, expectations explicitly manipulated before the test had no effect on performance. They are unlikely, then, to have been the medium through which stereotype threat affected performance in this research. Finally, participants in all conditions of these experiments were given low performance expectations by telling them that they should expect to get few items correct due to the difficulty of the test. Importantly, this instruction did not depress the performance of participants in the non-stereotype-threat conditions. Thus it is not likely that a low performance expectation, implied by the stereotype, would have been powerful enough, by itself, to lower performance among these participants when a direct manipulation of the expectation could not.

#### The inherent nature of the SAT as a diagnostic test reinforces racism – people subconsciously internalize stereotypes and underperform due to hindered cognitive function.

Steele and Aronson 95 [Claude M. Steele and Joshua Aronson,\* Claude M. Steele is the twenty-first Provost of Columbia University, as well as a Professor of Psychology. He was educated at Hiram College and at Ohio State University, where he received his Ph.D. in psychology in 1971. He has received honorary degrees from the University of Michigan, the University of Chicago, Yale University, Princeton University, and from the University of Maryland, Baltimore County. \*\* Joshua Michael Aronson is an American social psychologist and Associate Professor of Applied Psychology at New York University's Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development. , 1995, "Stereotype Threat And The Intellectual Test Performance Of African Americans," Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 69(5), 797-811., https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1996-12938-001, accessed 8-17-2019] LHSBC

Results and Discussion The ANCOVA performed on the number of items correctly solved yielded a significant main effect of race, F(\, 35) =10.04, p < .01, qualified by a significant Race X Test Description interaction, F( 1, 35) = 8.07, p < .01. The mean SAT score for Black participants was 603 and for White participants 655. The adjusted means are presented in Figure 2. Planned contrasts on the adjusted scores revealed that, as predicted, Blacks in the diagnostic condition performed significantly worse than Blacks in the nondiagnostic condition /(35) = 2.38, p < .02, than Whites in the diagnostic condition t(35) = 3.75, p < .001, and than Whites in the nondiagnostic condition Z(35) = 2.34, /?< .05. But the planned contrasts of the Black diagnostic condition against the other conditions did not reach conventional significance, although its contrasts with the Black nondiagnostic and White diagnostic conditions were marginally significant, with ps of .06 and .09 respectively. Blacks completed fewer items than Whites, ^(1,35) = 9.35, p < .01, and participants in the diagnostic conditions tended to complete fewer items than those in the nondiagnostic conditions, F(\, 35) = 3.69, p < .07. The overall interaction did not reach significance. But planned contrasts revealed that Black participants in the diagnostic condition finished fewer items (M = 12.38) than Blacks in the nondiagnostic condition (M = 18.53), ?(35) = 2.50, p < .02; than Whites in the diagnostic condition (M= 20.93), /(35) = 339,p< .01; and than Whites in the nondiagnostic condition (M = 21.45), t(35) = 3.60,p < 0.1

These results establish the reliability of the diagnosticity-byrace interaction for test performance that was marginally significant in Study 1. They also reveal another dimension of the effect of stereotype threat. Black participants in the diagnostic condition completed fewer test items than participants in the other conditions. Test diagnosticity impaired the rate, as well as the accuracy of their work. This is precisely the impairment caused by evaluative pressures such as evaluation apprehension, test anxiety, and competitive pressure (e.g., Baumeister, 1984). But one might ask why this did not happen in the nearidentical Study 1. Several factors may be relevant. First, the most involved test items—reading comprehension items that took several steps to answer—came first in the test. And second, the test lasted 25 min in the present experiment whereas it lasted 30 min in the first experiment. Assuming, then, that stereotype threat slowed the pace of Black participants in the diagnostic conditions of both experiments, this 5-min difference in test period may have made it harder for these participants in the present experiment to get past the early, involved items and onto the more quickly answered items at the end of the test, a possibility that may also explain the generally lower scores in this experiment. This view is reinforced by the ANCOVA (with SATs as a covariate) on the average time spent on each of the first five test items—the minimum number of items that all participants in all conditions answered. A marginal effect of test presentation emerged, F{ 1, 35) = 3.52, p < .07, but planned comparisons showed that Black participants in the diagnostic condition tended to be slower than participants in the other conditions. On average they spent 94 s answering each of these items in contrast to 71 for Black participants in the nondiagnostic condition, ((35) = 2.39, p < .05; 73 s for Whites in the diagnostic condition, f(35) = 2.12, p < .05, and 71 s for Whites in the nondiagnostic condition, Z(35) = 2.37, p < .05. Like other forms of evaluative pressure, stereotype threat causes an impairment of both accuracy and speed of performance. No differences were found on any of the remaining measures, including self-reported effort, cognitive interference, or anxiety. These measures may have been insensitive, or too delayed. Nonetheless, we lack an important kind of evidence. We have not shown that test diagnosticity causes in Black participants a specific apprehension about fulfilling the negative group stereotype about their ability—the apprehension that we argue disrupts their test performance. To examine this issue we conducted a third experiment.

#### Tests aren’t a predictor of future success – especially true for minorities.

Smith and Garrison 05 [Daryl G Smith and Gwen Garrison, 2005, “The Impending Loss of Talent: An Exploratory Study Challenging Assumptions About Testing and Merit,” TCRecord, accessed 8-14-19] LHSBC

This study, while exploratory in nature, has attempted to look at academic success retrospectively using a variety of indicators of success—graduation rates, grades, and passage of the bar exam. Five data sets, all but one of which focused on the SAT, provided an opportunity to investigate the role of standardized tests in student success. The data obtained for this study, while having limitations, provide an important perspective on the relationship between tests and success. A key limitation is the use of existing data with different variables provided in each.

Overall, one can see that there would be significant loss of talent if tests emerged as an overriding consideration in admissions. While we might have expected some threshold point to be obtained for the data, we did not find this, except in the case of the highly selective science school. In virtually all the data, there was a demarcation between those whose test scores were at the lowest levels and those whose scores were above. The advisability of admitting students from the lowest testing group would depend on institutional views about risk, intervention, and success. Even so, for students in this group, a high percentage were still represented in the success categories. One can only wonder what improved institutional practices would do to improve success. For all the data, successful students were as likely to come from the middle groups as from the top tier. These results demonstrate the care that must be used in relying on tests to determine merit in facing the many policy and legal challenges that emerge from admissions decisions. We should note that the important findings of this study would have been masked in traditional validity studies.

Moreover, when looking at the distributions by race and ethnicity, one would want to use extreme caution when attributing significance to tests, given the lack of consistency shown in these data. Indeed, contrary to the views of many, it is clear that if there are differentials in performance, they may not be a function of test scores. While further exploration with larger samples of underrepresented students is needed, the current data underscore the need for caution in linking test scores and success. Indeed, the lack of consistency among underrepresented students is one of the most consistent findings from this analysis.

In some policy and legal studies, we are led to believe that when we look at student success we are only seeing students with higher test scores, and conversely when we look at failure, we are looking at students with lower scores. This is particularly true when students come from an underrepresented group. These data suggest quite a different picture. The analysis, though not definitive and certainly limited, underscores the drawbacks of relying too heavily on tests in admissions decisions. It debunks the myth that performance in school is directly related to test scores. Finally, the study supports the power of using retrospective approaches to evaluate both policy and institutional efforts. The view of the relationship between tests and success described in the initial conceptual hypothesis is not sustainable.

Each of the recent challenges to affirmative action in admissions, whether through state propositions or legal action, rests on the argument that students are being admitted with “less merit” and that this approach works against student who have earned “merit.” The results of this study suggest that if merit is defined by those who succeed, standardized tests as preadmissions indicators of merit are quite inadequate overall and especially inadequate for underrepresented students of color. In the absence of reliable indicators, holistic admissions and human judgment are likely to be the best approach. This is especially true in the context of highly competitive admissions in elite institutions. In such contexts, there are many more people who are superbly qualified for admissions than there are places available. Reducing the complex calculus of admissions to only one or two numerical indicators is likely to be misleading. Moreover, in the case of using standardized tests as the major criterion, this calculus will work against historically underrepresented students—the groups for whom affirmative action was initially created. Finally, it is clear that educators, policymakers, and lawyers must examine critically any argument that rests primarily on tests as indicators of merit.

#### These are the topical tests

International Student [International Student, No Date, "Standardized Tests Overview," https://www.internationalstudent.com/study\_usa/application-process/standardized-tests/overview/, accessed 8-18-2019] LHSBC

Types of Standardized Tests

Most undergraduate and graduate programs will require the TOEFL exam for all international students to ensure that they have adequate proficiency in English to succeed in U.S. colleges. All standardized tests listed here are given in English.

For undergraduate admissions, required standardized tests usually include:

1. Scholastic Assessment Test [(SAT)](https://www.internationalstudent.com/test-prep/sat/)

2. Test of English as a Foreign Language [(TOEFL)](https://www.internationalstudent.com/test-prep/toefl/)

3. American College Testing [(ACT)](https://www.internationalstudent.com/test-prep/act/)

#### College diversity is bad – more diversity leads to more exclusive groups

Byrd 15 [W. Carson Byrd, Summer 2015, "college diversity is (but doesn't have to be) for whites on JSTOR," Contexts

Vol. 14, No. 3, Moving Through Time And Space Pp. 74-75 (2 Pages), https://www.jstor.org/stable/24710378?Search=yes&amp;resultItemClick=true&amp;searchText=college&amp;searchText=diversity&amp;searchText=%22benefit%22&amp;searchUri=%2Faction%2FdoBasicSearch%3FQuery%3Dcollege%2Bdiversity%2B%2522benefit%2522&amp;ab\_segments=0%2Fbasic\_SYC-4341%2Fcontrol&amp;refreqid=search%3A6273033d19cacc369a787fad79e6149c&amp;seq=1#metadata\_info\_tab\_contents, accessed 8-18-2019] LHSBC

As the racial and ethnic diversity on college campuses since the 1960s has increased, students have seen addi tional opportunities to interact with peers of different races and ethnicities. However, whether a majority of colleges and universities are truly "diverse" is up for debate. Many remain overwhelm ingly white in student body and faculty composition. And, even if a university is diverse, that doesn't mean that stu dents interact across group lines. A 2012 study by Angela Bahns, Kate Pickett, and Christian Crandall found growing diversity coupled with growing student bodies at colleges and universities results in fewer personal relationships with people who are dissimilar from one's self. Here, the larger, diverse campus affords more opportunity to select friends that are similar and allows students to possibly avoid difficult conversations regarding social issues such as inequality.

## PTX DA

#### Don’t Read - Trump wins 2020 if he stays socially and economically conservative – the resounding call of “down with Socialism” means wins the election

Linker 2/12 [Damon Linker, 2-12-2019, "How Trump wins in 2020," The Week, https://theweek.com/articles/823170/how-trump-wins-2020, accessed 9-11-2019] LHSBC

If you want to know how President Trump can win re-election in 2020, you need only look at the headlines emanating from the Democrats over the past couple of weeks.

It's not just one headline. It's the cumulative effect of them all.

It's also not as simple as saying that the Democrats are "moving too far to the left." There is ample polling evidence to suggest there is room for the party to shift in a more progressive direction on some issues, especially those touching on the economic struggles of ordinary Americans. Higher taxes for the richest Americans. Single-payer health care. Aggressive environmental policies to combat climate change. Free college tuition. Child care for all. The list of possible initiatives is long, and combining higher taxes with any one or two of them could make a powerful and popular agenda for a Democrat hoping to unseat the president, in part by stealing his populist thunder and exposing the plutocratic agenda that he and his party stand for.

But that's not the message Democrats have been sending.

The Green New Deal that several of the leading presidential candidates have co-sponsored is a far-left wish list — the progressive equivalent of Ted Cruz's 2016 proposal to institute a flat tax and abolish four Cabinet-level departments of the executive branch — combined with the risible suggestion that the trillions of dollars of resulting spending can be paid for simply by running gargantuan deficits on top of the massive debt the Obama and Trump administrations have already piled up. And if that weren't enough, the FAQ page about the Green New Deal that Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez's office[briefly released](https://theweek.com/speedreads/822509/eliminating-cows-4-more-bold-promises-alexandria-ocasiocortezs-green-new-deal) and then withdrew added on what sounded like material from a Monty Python skit devised to ridicule environmentalists. End air travel! Kill all the cows to save us from the scourge of bovine flatulence!

But even that isn't sufficient to give Trump a solid path to victory in 2020. It's still very early. There's plenty of time for candidates to distance themselves from the most utopian and absurd elements of the Green New Deal — and to use some of its details as a foil for their own comparatively modest plans. (Thanks to Ocasio-Cortez, Medicare-for-all already looks considerably more sober and responsible than it did a week ago.)

Yes, Trump will denounce anything the Democrats propose as "socialism." But if the Democratic message resonates with the widespread conviction, shared by many Trump voters, that the economy is rigged by and for the wealthy, the charge will feel [hollow, desperate, and self-serving](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/trumps-war-on-socialism-will-fail/2019/02/10/b6fe3a6a-2be4-11e9-b2fc-721718903bfc_story.html?utm_term=.dfeef1b42f88).

Unless, that is, Trump uses the epithet to mean more than a drive to rein in the economic inequality and [injustice](https://theweek.com/articles/817500/injustice-driving-populist-revolution) that permeates American life.

To get a sense of how Trump could deploy a more expansive definition of the term "socialism" to do maximal electoral damage to the Democrats, I suggest close and regular reading of the blog of Rod Dreher at The American Conservative. [Last week](https://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/socialism-2020-trump/) Dreher [announced](https://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/our-socialist-democratic-party/) that he's [planning](https://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/italy-left-bolshevism-gender-ideology/) a [new book](https://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/socialism-and-social-conservatism/), timed for the fall of 2020, about the threat that socialism poses to the United States in general and to conservative Christians and other traditionalist religious believers in particular. In Dreher's view, the threat goes far beyond the worry that pious Americans who happen to be well off will face higher taxes. The danger that socialism supposedly poses to the kind of people who read Dreher's blog has much more to do with what might be described as cultural totalitarianism.

Those who follow the world of conservative ideas will recognize the argument as one associated with the Polish writer and former anti-Communist dissident Ryszard Legutko. In a book published in this country in 2016, [The Demon in Democracy: Totalitarian Temptations in Free Societies](https://www.amazon.com/Demon-Democracy-Totalitarian-Temptations-Societies/dp/1594038635/ref%3Dsr_1_1?crid=QUXYVFMEYLU5&keywords=legutko&qid=1549911488&s=books&sprefix=Legutko%2Cstripbooks%2C143&sr=1-1?tag=thwe0f5-20), Legutko claimed that the secular liberalism that has come to dominate Central and Eastern Europe in the years since the end of the Cold War is less different from the communist totalitarianism it replaced than is typically acknowledged. Both systems are holistic ideologies that despise genuine pluralism. Both seek to drive out competing visions of humanity and the world. And both are fundamentally intolerant of dissent.

Dreher is proposing to adapt and apply this argument to the United States, describing a country confronting what he calls the "[Woke Menace](https://www.theamericanconservative.com/dreher/woke-menace-identity-politics-is-cultural-socialism/)" of a newly radicalized and emboldened left that aims to centralize power and stamp out all dissent. Those who believe in the sanctity of traditional marriage, who think that the free exercise of religion goes beyond worshipping in church and private homes, who therefore believe that devout Christians (and Jews and Muslims) should be free (in some instances) to discriminate against homosexuals and the transgendered, who consider abortion to be murder and abortion in the third trimester to be infanticide — Americans who hold these and similar views find themselves confronting the prospect of a party gaining power that considers every one of these positions not just erroneous but fundamentally illegitimate, beyond the moral pale, rooted in irrational animus and bigotry, and worthy of being excommunicated from public life.

Social conservatives have known for a long time that many progressives view them that way — as ignorant bigots whose benighted prejudices should be excluded from power whenever and wherever possible. Until recently, these conservatives have consoled themselves with two presumptions. First, they've assumed that however influential such progressives might be in the media, on college campuses, and on the Supreme Court, they were somewhat hemmed in by an electorate that preferred Democrats who talked about making abortion "safe, legal, and rare" and at least paid lip service to the importance of the traditional family. Second, they've hoped and believed that this underlying conservatism of the electorate would ultimately deliver them sufficient political power to reverse the country's long-term political and cultural drift in a progressive direction.

Events of the past decade have disabused social conservatives of both presumptions. Democrats are more culturally left-wing than ever, and the hourly outrages of the Trump presidency have emboldened them to abandon the restraints that once bound them. At the same time, Trump's very immorality — his embodiment of so many of our ailing culture's sins — along with the narrowness of his win in 2016 have convinced these social conservatives that their every victory is precarious, a mere hair's breadth away from a reversal that will usher in the final triumph of absolute moral degradation in America and an end to their own freedom to live and worship as they wish.

This is what Dreher means by "socialism" — the attempt by the left to seize total control and use every power at its disposal (political, economic, cultural, technological) to smash its moral opponents, once and for all.

Imagine a general election campaign in which the Republican Party and the Trump campaign supplemented the president's Twitter-based rabble-rousing and inevitable personal attacks on the Democratic nominee with a resolutely anti-socialist message — with socialism understood in this broad, comprehensive sense. The point wouldn't be just to raise fears of higher taxes and bigger government but to fold that anxiety into the culture war, where Trump's political skills are most formidable.

"It's me or progressive totalitarianism" — that's how Trump wins in 2020.

#### Trump needs the black vote to win 2020 – he doesn’t need a majority but just enough the edge the margins

Wegmann 6/7 [Philip Wegmann, RCP Staff, 6-7-2019, "Trump Bets on More Black Support in 2020. (He Might Need It.)," Real Clear Politics, https://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2019/06/07/trump\_bets\_on\_more\_black\_support\_in\_2020\_he\_might\_need\_it.html, accessed 9-11-2019] LHSBC

Behind and, by most accounts, a bit desperate in August of 2016, Donald Trump made a wager.

The bet was with the black electorate, but the candidate made it in front of a mostly white crowd in a predominantly white suburb of Lansing, Michigan. His opponent, he said, didn’t care about black people. She only saw black communities as reliable political reservoirs and their citizens as blindly loyal Democratic voters who get little in return.

Why not do something different? Trump asked on stage, reading carefully from twin teleprompters and directing his remarks to “every single African American citizen” who wanted to see a better future.

“What do you have to lose by trying something new like Trump?” he said. And then, after watching the crowd erupt, he went off script and doubled down: “You're living in poverty, your schools are no good, you have no jobs, 58% of your youth is unemployed — what the hell do you have to lose?”

Hillary Clinton would later call that pitch “so ignorant it’s staggering.” But Trump made it a stump speech staple and, three months later, went on to win Michigan, win over more black voters than either of the last two Republican presidential nominees, and win the White House.

With another election around the corner, the Trump campaign has returned to the question, albeit with a slight adjustment: What do black voters have to lose by voting against the incumbent?

According to Republicans, a lot.

Kamilah Prince, who directs African American engagement for the Republican National Committee, rattled off a list of Trump accomplishments, from near-record-low unemployment numbers for black workers and a healthy business environment for black entrepreneurs to support for historically black colleges and criminal justice reform.

The black voter calculus will boil down, Prince told RealClearPolitics, to either “four more years of record-setting growth and opportunities or a return to Democrat policies that have failed the black community in the past.”

It is a convenient dichotomy that Trump will soon present in one iteration or another on the campaign trail. Whether it will work, and to what degree, remains to be seen, of course. But the president certainly cannot expect, as he promised at that 2016 rally in Michigan, to win 95% of the black vote. According to data analysis by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, the party of Lincoln hasn’t won more than 40% of the black vote since 1956. A hugely popular war hero, Dwight Eisenhower, set that high mark in his reelection race, and no other GOP candidate has come close.

All the same, Trump managed 8% black support in 2016. And despite the GOP’s unpromising history, his campaign manager thinks the president can more than quadruple that number next year.

This time around the Trump wager has more weight behind it, as his camp is hyping criminal justice reform as its hallmark achievement. After black voters learn about that accomplishment, 2020 Campaign Manager Brad Parscale told RCP, “we notice a significant uptick in support.”

Specifically, the Trump team recorded support for the president in the “low double digits” while knocking on the doors of 1,200 black households. When those same households were told about criminal justice reform, things changed. According to Parscale, support jumped to nearly 38%.

The campaign knows that gaining majority support is impossible. They don’t need it, though. To win a second term, the president must do one of two things. Either improve on his 2016 record slightly or ensure the opponent, whoever it may be, does not rally black turnout in 2020.

This means winning at the margins, explained Ken Blackwell, a former Republican mayor of Cincinnati and Ohio secretary of state, because “it is a mistake to think there will be a seismic shift in black voter behavior.”

“At the end of the day, Democrats know this is the one voter base they cannot afford to have fractionalized,” Blackwell told RCP. “We know they have to get a 93%-7% split, but a win for us, a technical knockout for us, would be something like 88%-12%.”

#### The counterplan sticks and makes him win. Education is a key issue in 2020 – 8 warrants

Harris 6/3 [Douglas N. Harris, Nonresident Senior Fellow - Governance Studies, Brown Center on Education Policy, 6-3-2019, "8 reasons why education may be pivotal in the 2020 election (and beyond)," Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/brown-center-chalkboard/2019/06/03/8-reasons-why-education-may-be-pivotal-in-the-2020-election-and-beyond/, accessed 9-11-2019] LHSBC

It is worth starting with a brief recap of the recent federal role in K-12 education. President George W. Bush’s No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law in 2001 represented an unprecedented increase in the federal role in K-12 education at the time. President Barack Obama increased the federal role even more—introducing [$100 billion](http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/campaign-k-12/2019/02/stimulus-education-race-to-the-top-sig-education-funding.html) in federal education spending (prompted by the financial crisis) and leveraging NCLB to make deals with states that allowed the U.S. Department of Education, through a waiver process, to pressure states to adopt the Obama administration’s preferred accountability-driven policies without getting congressional approval. Indirectly, this gave the federal government a hand in academic standards, which had been previously left to the states, and in teacher evaluation, which few governments, at any level, had ever really tried to touch.

Republicans saw this as executive overreach and Democrats became more disenchanted with the policies themselves, especially their focus on high-stakes testing. This led to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which pulled federal law back to something closer to, and a bit less aggressive than, the original NCLB (but still more active than the pre-NCLB era). Many long-term members of Congress even recanted their original support for NCLB and their support for ESSA was meant to send just that message.

Given the NCLB-ESSA story, one might think the federal role would fade as a political issue in presidential elections, but this has not happened. In fact, I argue that education might be more important than ever in the 2020 election and for years to come:

1. EDUCATION IS BECOMING MORE IMPORTANT IN DAILY LIFE

In perception and reality, education is becoming [more and more important](https://www.clevelandfed.org/newsroom-and-events/publications/economic-commentary/economic-commentary-archives/2012-economic-commentaries/ec-201210-the-college-wage-premium.aspx) to parents and the long-term life success of their children. It is also a key cog in the macroeconomy, with [over $1 trillion](https://www.usgovernmentspending.com/breakdown) in spending annually (mostly from [public sources](https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=66&utm_source=twitterfeed&utm_medium=twitter)). These are the underlying forces that led to NCLB and the importance of education has only continued to grow. The sector has simply become too important for politicians at any level to ignore.

2. EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Education has increasingly become a pocketbook issue as the share of women in the workforce has increased. Working parents need someone to care for their children, and given what we know about social and cognitive growth in the early years, publicly-funded early childhood education has many potential advantages. Meanwhile, federal policy has been remarkably stagnant, still rooted in LBJ-era policies like Head Start and federal tax credits. The issue is ripe for policy change and offers yet another reason for voters and presidential candidates to pay attention to education. Support for early childhood is [very high in polls](https://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/early_years/2017/06/national_poll_finds_bipartisan_support_for_making_early_childhood_education_affordable.html), with bipartisan appeal.

3. HIGHER EDUCATION

The federal government has long played a significant, though quiet, role in funding colleges and universities with Pell Grants, student loans, and regulations. However, as student loan debt has skyrocketed, the federal government is a natural place to look for solutions. While more contentious than early childhood, many of these ideas also [poll well](https://morningconsult.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/170911_crosstabs_Politico_LIM_v1_AP-1.pdf) across the political spectrum.

4. TIGHT STATE BUDGETS

Education—especially any new programs addressing early childhood education and college affordability—requires resources, something in short supply at the state and local levels. Health care and pension benefits are taking on a larger and [larger share](https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/data-visualizations/2014/fiscal-50#ind7) of state spending. States have also shown a strong inclination to cut higher education first when budgets are tight. The federal government, with its borrowing power, almost has to be involved in any major spending effort.

5. INEQUALITY PROBLEMS

Inequality is real and fast-rising issue, and one of the key concerns among Democrats. Income inequality is partly caused by unequal educational opportunity (though [not as much](https://www.epi.org/blog/higher-returns-on-education-cant-explain-growing-wage-inequality/) as some education advocates would have it). Early childhood education is also a factor in gender-based income inequality since child care and early education are central to allowing women—still the primary caregivers—to have equal access to opportunities in the labor market.

6. POLITICAL PRACTICALITY

More so than other issues, because most people interact with public education in some way, education positions can be used to attract support from very specific constituencies. Want to attract younger voters? Promise more money for higher education, like free college and loan forgiveness. Want to attract African-Americans? Support for historically black colleges and universities. Want to attract rural voters? Create a rural education proposal. Want to attract women? Focus on early childhood education. Education is the Swiss army knife of policy and politics.

7. DIPLOMA AND GENDER DIVIDES

In the early 2000s, voters with more formal education voted fairly equally for Democrats and Republicans. [Not anymore](https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/education-not-income-predicted-who-would-vote-for-trump/)—53% of college-educated white voters [went for Democrats](https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2018/11/education-gap-explains-american-politics/575113/) in 2018 compared with 37% of non-college-educated whites (I could not find the same numbers for people of color or the whole population). It stands to reason that voters with more formal education are especially likely to see education as an important policy issue. Education is also more of a pocketbook issue for women, [who also vote](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/11/08/the-2018-midterm-vote-divisions-by-race-gender-education/) disproportionately for Democrats.

8. BETSY DEVOS

DeVos is one of the [more reviled figures](https://www.politico.com/story/2017/09/27/playbook-donald-trump-cabinet-popularity-243191) in what is, for Democrats, a highly reviled Trump administration. Her lack of experience in education (especially public schools), early glaring missteps (“guns and bears”?), and strong support for vouchers and online schooling, generally opposed by Democrats, make her [an easy target](https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2018/09/27/betsy-devos-an-attractive-boogeyman-for-political.html) for generic political attacks. (Not that it matters for purposes here, but her ideas also [lack research support](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/25/opinion/betsy-devos-and-the-wrong-way-to-fix-schools.html) to recommend them.)

#### Trump reelection ruins efforts to combat climate change, causes a new global arms race, and cedes control of the Supreme Court.

Starr, 19 [Paul, professor of sociology and public affairs at Princeton and a winner of the Pulitzer Prize for General Nonfiction, May 2019, “Trump’s Second Term,” <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2019/05/trump-2020-second-term/585994/>, BP]

This is one of those moments. After four years as president, Trump will have made at least two Supreme Court appointments, signed into law tax cuts, and rolled back federal regulation of the environment and the economy. Whatever you think of these actions, many of them can probably be offset or entirely undone in the future. The effects of a full eight years of Trump will be much more difficult, **if not impossible, to undo.** Three areas—climate change, the risk of a renewed global arms race, and control of the Supreme Court—illustrate the historic significance of the 2020 election. The first two problems will become much harder to address as time goes on. The third one stands to remake our constitutional democracy and undermine the capacity for future change. In short, the biggest difference between electing Trump in 2016 and reelecting Trump in 2020 would be **irreversibility**. Climate policy is now the most obvious example. For a long time, even many of the people who acknowledged the reality of climate change thought of it as a slow process that did not demand immediate action. But today, amid extreme weather events and worsening scientific forecasts, **the costs of our delay are clearly mounting, as are the associated dangers**. To have a chance at [keeping global warming below 1.5 degrees Celsius](https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/sites/2/2018/07/SR15_SPM_version_stand_alone_LR.pdf)—the objective of the Paris climate agreement—the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says that by 2030, CO2 emissions must drop some 45 percent from 2010 levels. Instead of declining, however, **they are rising.** In his first term, Trump has announced plans to cancel existing climate reforms, such as higher fuel-efficiency standards and limits on emissions from new coal-fired power plants, and he has pledged to pull the United States out of the Paris Agreement. His reelection would put off a national commitment to decarbonization until **at least the second half of the 2020s**, while encouraging other countries to do nothing as well. And change that is delayed becomes more economically and politically difficult. According to the Global Carbon Project, if decarbonization had begun globally in 2000, an emissions reduction of about 2 percent a year would have been sufficient to stay below 2 degrees Celsius of warming. Now it will need to be approximately 5 percent a year. If we wait another decade, it will be about 9 percent. In the United States, the economic disruption and popular resistance sure to arise from such an abrupt transition **may be more than our political system can bear**. No one knows, moreover, when the world might hit **irreversible tipping points** such as the collapse of the West Antarctic Ice Sheet, which would likely **doom us to a catastrophic sea-level rise.**

#### Climate change causes extinction --- latest studies.

Sprat and Dunlop 19 (David Spratt and Ian Dunlop, \*Research Director for Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration and co-author of *Climate Code Red: The case for emergency action*; \*\*member of the Club of Rome AND formerly an international oil, gas and coal industry executive, chairman of the Australian Coal Association, chief executive of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, and chair of the Australian Greenhouse Office Experts Group on Emissions Trading, "Existential climate-related security risk: A scenario approach," Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, 5-30-2019, https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/148cb0\_90dc2a2637f348edae45943a88da04d4.pdf, Date Accessed: 7-5-2019, SB)

2050: By 2050, there is broad scientific acceptance that system tipping-points for the West Antarctic Ice Sheet and a sea-ice-free Arctic summer were passed well before 1.5°C of warming, for the Greenland Ice Sheet well before 2°C, and for widespread permafrost loss and large-scale Amazon drought and dieback by 2.5°C. The “hothouse Earth” scenario has been realised, and Earth is headed for another degree or more of warming, especially since human greenhouse emissions are still significant. While sea levels have risen 0.5 metres by 2050, the increase may be 2–3 metres by 2100, and it is understood from historical analogues that seas may eventually rise by more than 25 metres. Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and 55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of lethal heat conditions, beyond the threshold of human survivability. The destabilisation of the Jet Stream has very significantly affected the intensity and geographical distribution of the Asian and West African monsoons and, together with the further slowing of the Gulf Stream, is impinging on life support systems in Europe. North America suffers from devastating weather extremes including wildfires, heatwaves, drought and inundation. The summer monsoons in China have failed, and water flows into the great rivers of Asia are severely reduced by the loss of more than one-third of the Himalayan ice sheet. Glacial loss reaches 70 percent in the Andes, and rainfall in Mexico and central America falls by half. Semi-permanent El Nino conditions prevail. Aridification emerges over more than 30 percent of the world’s land surface. Desertification is severe in southern Africa, the southern Mediterranean, west Asia, the Middle East, inland Australia and across the south-western United States. Impacts: A number of ecosystems collapse, including coral reef systems, the Amazon rainforest and in the Arctic. Some poorer nations and regions, which lack capacity to provide artificially-cooled environments for their populations, become unviable. Deadly heat conditions persist for more than 100 days per year in West Africa, tropical South America, the Middle East and South-East Asia, which together with land degradation and rising sea levels contributes to 21 perhaps a billion people being displaced. Water availability decreases sharply in the most affected regions at lower latitudes (dry tropics and subtropics), affecting about two billion people worldwide. Agriculture becomes nonviable in the dry subtropics. Most regions in the world see a significant drop in food production and increasing numbers of extreme weather events, including heat waves, floods and storms. Food production is inadequate to feed the global population and food prices skyrocket, as a consequence of a one-fifth decline in crop yields, a decline in the nutrition content of food crops, a catastrophic decline in insect populations, desertification, monsoon failure and chronic water shortages, and conditions too hot for human habitation in significant food-growing regions. The lower reaches of the agriculturally-important river deltas such as the Mekong, Ganges and Nile are inundated, and significant sectors of some of the world’s most populous cities — including Chennai, Mumbai, Jakarta, Guangzhou, Tianjin, Hong Kong, Ho Chi Minh City, Shanghai, Lagos, Bangkok and Manila — are abandoned. Some small islands become uninhabitable. Ten percent of Bangladesh is inundated, displacing 15 million people. According to the Global Challenges Foundation’s Global Catastrophic Risks 2018 report, even for 2°C of warming, more than a billion people may need to be relocated due to sea-level rise, and In high-end scenarios “the scale of destruction is beyond our capacity to model, with a high likelihood of human civilisation coming to an end”. 22

### Case turns

#### Colleges need to sift through quickly so GPA and Class rank are the alternatives – that still produces racially disparate admissions.

Wooldridge 14 [Adrian Wooldridge, the Management Editor for the economist and formerly Washington Bureau Chief for the Economisy, 9-4-2014, "A True Test: In Defense of the SAT ," New Republic, https://newrepublic.com/article/119322/defense-standardized-tests-sat, accessed 9-14-2019] LHSBC

Because of these manifold problems, the critics of the SAT are being forced to resort, for practical purposes, to more mundane measures of promise, such as class ranking and GPA. Yet there is little reason to think that these devices will do anything to improve the fortunes of racial minorities. In 1995, almost twice as many white students as black ranked in the top tenth of their class, according to the College Entrance Examination Board. Only eight percent of black students had an "A" average compared with 21 percent of whites and 27 percent of Asians.

Indeed, when the University of California looked into the implications of abolishing the SAT, it found that the impact on the racial composition of the university would be mixed: The number of Latinos eligible for places would rise by five percent, but the number of blacks eligible would decline by 18 percent. Fourteen percent more whites would qualify for places, while the number of eligible Asians would fall.

These alternatives are also less reliable than the SAT. A recent study by the Educational Testing Service found that SATs are better than high school GPAs in predicting freshman grades in nearly all subjects. By the same token, the Law School Admissions Test—the LSAT—seems to be a substantially better predictor of first-year performance in law school than undergraduate GPA.

GPAs have always been unreliable indicators because different schools use different grading systems. And, even within schools, different teachers grade according to different standards. A 1994 study by the Department of Education, for example, found that students receiving an "A minus" in schools in impoverished areas might well have received a "C" or "D" in schools in more affluent areas. GPAs are getting steadily less reliable, too, because of the impact of grade inflation. The percentage of college-bound seniors reporting an "A" average increased from 28 percent in 1987 to 37 percent a decade later, and this inflation is only likely to get worse if universities start giving more weight to school grades. Judging students by their GPAs will inevitably involve admission officers in judging the reliability of schools as much as the promise of their graduates, a process that is unlikely to redound to the advantage of the inner cities.