**AFF**

In today’s debate we look at both sides of the topic of whether or not the right to strike ought to be unconditional. For today’s round I will represent the AFF and the PROS of allowing this right to be unconditional.

I start off the debate by stating my framework or what should be the deciding factor in the debate today:

In today’s debate I value **Societal Good**

Which is defined by Investopedia dot com as: something that benefits the largest number of people in the largest possible way, such as clean air, clean water, healthcare, and literacy. Also known as "common good,"

To achieve this value it is best that we use the value criterion of **Utilitarianism:**

Which is defined by Marium Webster as: a theory that the aim of action should be the largest possible balance of pleasure over pain or the greatest happiness of the greatest number

Interpretation- This means that the debater who provides the most universal net benefit on their side ought to win the debate today.

#### **Current quality of education is sharply decreasing through teacher shortages**

**Boyce 19** Paul Boyce, 9-17-2019, "The Teacher Shortage Is Real and about to Get Much Worse. Here's Why," No Publication, https://fee.org/articles/the-teacher-shortage-is-real-and-about-to-get-much-worse-heres-why/

Teacher Shortage According to research by the Economic Policy Institute (EPI), the teacher shortage could reach 200,000 by 2025, up from 110,000 in 2018. This shortage of workers is due to a number of factors. Among them are pay, working conditions, lack of support, lack of autonomy, and the changing curriculum. The shortage of teachers will inevitably cause a decline in educational standards. The shortage is crucially important to educational outcomes. Class sizes are rising, causing a detrimental effect on these outcomes. As the number of available teachers declines, class sizes have to increase to compensate. Having more kids in a class can also affect teacher performance—more books to mark, more children to monitor, more children's behavior that needs managing. The pressure on teachers to obtain high test scores amps up stress further. It creates a vicious cycle, and it is starting to snowball. The shortage is only set to increase unless something changes. Impact on Quality The shortage of teachers will inevitably cause a decline in educational standards. Principals face a shortage of highly qualified teachers. The natural response for them is to hire less qualified teachers, hire teachers trained in another field or grade, or make use of unqualified substitute teachers. This means students are being taught by teachers who lack sufficient skills and knowledge. According to the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future: Studies discover again and again that teacher expertise is one of the most important factors in determining student achievement, followed by the smaller but generally positive influences of small schools and small class sizes. That is, teachers who know a lot about teaching and learning who work in environments that allow them to know students well are the critical elements of successful learning. Teachers matter more to student achievement than any other factor. In fact, research by Chlotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor states that teacher qualifications predict more of the difference in educational gains than race and parent education combined.

#### **Status Quo policies make the opportunity cost for teacher strikes too high**

**Casey 20** Leo Casey, 12-2-2020, "The Teacher Strike: Conditions for Success," Dissent Magazine, <https://www.dissentmagazine.org/online_articles/the-teacher-strike-conditions-for-success>

The most essential organizational task is winning and keeping the allegiance of teachers to the strike. Teachers are knowledgeable and discerning political actors. They understand full well that strikes are a high-intensity and high-risk tactic, with the potential both to deliver advances and victories that could not be otherwise obtained and to end in major setbacks and defeats. The risk side of this equation is particularly acute in the three-quarters of all states where teacher strikes are illegal; in these states, striking becomes an act of civil disobedience and can result in severe penalties to teachers and their unions. To be willing to go on strike and stay out until a settlement is won, therefore, teachers need to be convinced on a number of different counts: first, that they are fighting for important, worthwhile objectives; second, that those objectives cannot be achieved through other means that are not as high-intensity and high-risk as a strike; third, that the strike has reasonable prospects of success; fourth, that the strike objectives have strong support in the community; and fifth, that the solidarity among teachers, which is essential to a strike’s success, is strong and will hold. In significant measure, the last of these points is dependent not simply on the organization and mobilization of the strike, but also on the four antecedent conditions. If teachers become doubtful on any of these points, it will become difficult to mount or sustain a successful strike.

#### **That causes teachers uproot and quitting through unsatisfaction**

**Carpenter 21** Jennifer Carpenter., 05-17-21, "Opinion: Protect local control for schools," Burlington Free Press, https://www.burlingtonfreepress.com/story/opinion/my-turn/2017/05/17/opinion-protect-local-control-schools/101726614/

The most crucial part of the proposal put forward by House Speaker Mitzi Johnson and President Pro Tem Tim Ashe is that it protects local control of schools. Statewide health insurance negotiations for teachers is the first step towards a statewide teachers’ contract, kneecapping school boards and paving the way towards a single, statewide school district. That is unacceptable, but it is the hill Gov. Scott and his Republican allies have decided to make their stand on. It is telling that Sen. Degree, one of Gov. Scott’s strongest supporters, included in his proposed amendment a clause that would have removed teachers’ right to strike. That shows their true intentions. When teachers’ needs are not met, students’ needs will not be met, and we will be unable to retain and attract a workforce of young families which is critical to the revitalization of our state’s economy. There will be no incentive for the teaching profession to attract and retain new teachers to the field if our state government teaches our community that teachers have no say over their working conditions and therefore are not valued. Schools need teachers and we need enrollment of students. Teachers and families of school age children will simply uproot and go elsewhere to have their needs met, jeopardizing our educational system, our school-age population and workforce. A “one-size-fits-all” approach from our state government cannot possibly work across the board for every school. Having worked in four different school districts in the state, I have been exposed to potential consequences of centralized control. I recall an emergency meeting at one of those districts in 2016 between administration and teachers where there were very tense discussions on what the initial proposal of Act 46 per-pupil spending cap would have meant for the school. Had the administration and teachers not pulled together to discuss and demand more for their programs and allowed a reckless centralized decision to go forth, to paraphrase one of the teachers present at this meeting, the initial Act 46 proposal would have destroyed the institution, as it would have meant dismantling most aspects of the curriculum that would render the students to be competitive for college and in the workforce, as the cuts were too severe of an impact on the school programs to justify sending anyone there. As a result, several teachers said they would have been prepared to pull their own children from the school and move out of the area. This is only one example of how allowing the state to have centralized control, which has proved to be an approach lacking in carefully frontloaded research and detailed examination of impact on programs and teachers, would have devastating consequences on local communities.

#### **Strikes empower unions and are successful achieving bargaining power, which keeps them in education.**

**LawInfo 20** [Peter Serdyukov, National University, La Jolla, California. 05/18/20, Teachers Unions & Collective Bargaining. <https://www.lawinfo.com/resources/labor-law/teachers-unions-collective-bargaining.html>] // SC SD

A **teachers' union** is a special type of labor union designed to fight for the rights of educators. With roots dating back more than 150 years in the U.S., these organizations **play critical roles not only in securing benefits for teachers but also shaping the way education works. For instance, thanks to lobbying by the National Education Association, or NEA, in the late 1860s, Congress created the Department of Education.**

What Teachers' Unions Bargain For

**Like other types of**[**trade unions**](https://www.lawinfo.com/resources/employment-law-employee/unions/)**, teachers' unions use collective bargaining agreements, or CBAs, to protect their members. Over the years, collective bargaining has helped educators gain many rights, such as:**

**Fair working conditions, compensation, and pay equality**

**Tenure mechanisms that prevented qualified educators from being punished for their personal biases, political beliefs, or other unfair reasons**

**Access to various benefits**

When it comes to education policy, teachers' unions also work to ensure that educators can fulfill their job duties in the face of tough odds. For instance, the NEA played a critical role in shifting the focus from federal policies like the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which included 2001's No Child Left Behind Act, towards alternatives like the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015. At the same time, education policy is a very politicized issue, and not every lawmaker is onboard with the kinds of changes that teachers seek. These differences of opinion mean that individual educators may be subject to a variety of laws depending on where they are in their careers.

State Laws and the NLRA

**Some states prohibit certain types of collective bargaining for certain workers. For teachers, such restrictions usually come into effect in public schools, where educators are classified as public employees.**

**In Texas, Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, and South Carolina, collective bargaining was entirely prohibited for public employees as of 2014. Only 11 states explicitly give teachers the right to do things like going on strike, and many states make it completely illegal for public employees to strike. In some right-to-work states, these employees may be allowed to strike, but the power of unions to compel them to join is often significantly limited**. As major walkouts and strikes over low pay have shown, these rules aren't always successful at stopping collective action, and public opinion may be evolving about educators' rights as employees.

How are states allowed to prohibit teachers from doing something that many workers view as a fundamental freedom? **The right to form unions, strike, bargain collectively, and take other actions are laid out in the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, or NLRA. This federal legislation also prohibits actions like unions trying to force people to join and stops employers from retaliating against workers who exercise their union rights. Although the NLRA can take precedence over many state laws, its protections exclude employees in the public sector, such as teachers.**

Teachers' Unions and the U.S. Constitution

Labor unions aren't mentioned anywhere in the U.S. Constitution. At the same time, however, **Article I of the Constitution grants Congress the power to regulate various forms of commerce among the states. The Constitution also protects people's right to assemble and speak freely, both of which are critical to common union activities, such as meeting, discussing employment conditions, promoting union membership, and collective bargaining.**

Bargaining Units

Bargaining units are groups of workers who are represented by a common labor union when it comes to collective bargaining and negotiation. Employers or official bodies, such as the Indiana Education Employment Relations Board, recognize bargaining unit groups as being represented by labor unions. **States that allow teachers to participate in collective bargaining may also mandate that schools clearly specify to which bargaining units they belong so that employees can take advantage of their rights.**

**Bargaining unit positions are jobs that receive labor union representation. Although all employees can hold these jobs regardless of their union membership status, only those who hold bargaining unit jobs gain the full benefits of being in unions.**

Being in a bargaining unit position generally makes it easier to file complaints and appeals because unions outline specific grievance procedures. At the same time, all teachers can exercise non-union complaint rights and appeals. For example, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission protects current employees and would-be workers from discrimination based on certain protected classes, such as race, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, national origin, or religion.

Teachers' Unions and Charter Schools

As in many other labor fields, unions sometimes clash with employers, such as schools. Notably, these disputes have come into the public eye as certain states move towards voucher and charter school education models.

One key distinction in such battles is the fact that although charter schools receive funds from the government, they're often treated and operated as independent entities. According to the Emory Law Journal, charter school efforts to secure funding while retaining their independence has led to significant uncertainty. For instance, almost half of all states exempt charter schools from the collective bargaining agreements that public schools in the same districts must follow, and only around an eighth of charter schools have labor unions. Some charter schools have even argued that as “political subdivisions,” they don't count as employers under the NLRA.

Other Teachers’ Union Benefits

**Joining a union might give certain teachers more control over their futures. Since the benefits they receive go above and beyond what many school districts would provide of their own accord, these teachers may enjoy heightened access to vital resources that make it easier to focus on their career development**. Union members may receive:

Prescription medication benefits

Consumer discounts

Dental and vision health benefits

Pension plans

For teachers, the decision whether to join a union is a personal matter. Those who want to keep their options open, however, may benefit from learning about what kinds of allowances they enjoy in different states and distinct employment positions.

#### **Only strikes have proven successful in raising wages.**

**Richards 19**, [[Erin Richards](https://www.usatoday.com/staff/2647805001/erin-richards/), 6-18-19, “Strikes, pay raises & charter protests: America's teachers' exhausting, exhilarating year” <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/education/2019/06/18/teacher-pay-raises-strike-last-day-of-school-summer/1437210001/>] // SC SD

"Oh, the places you'll go!" the popular Dr. Seuss book promises to new graduates.

And, this past year, to their teachers.

America's educators have survived a rollicking year in the public spotlight — and no slowdown is in sight.

In the last 18 months, we've seen **teachers striking for higher pay**, teachers running for political office, teachers protesting charter schools, teachers organizing insurgent groups within their unions and teachers broadcasting the state of their under-resourced classrooms.

USA TODAY tracked the pressures on America's teachers with a school-year-long series of stories, capped by a [nationwide analysis of teacher pay and housing costs](https://www.usatoday.com/in-depth/news/education/2019/06/05/teachers-pay-cost-of-living-teaching-jobs/3449428002/).

Here's what happened.

**It's working: Teachers are pushing policy changes**

Starting last summer, it was front-line teachers rather than policymakers driving the national discussion over how best to educate children and compensate educators.

**How the movement started:** [‘Any talks of striking?’ A West Virginia teacher’s Facebook post started a national wave](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/education/2019/02/20/teacher-strike-west-virginia-school-closings-education-bill/2848476002/)

Their actions are helping to change the narrative. Red-state governors who cracked down on teachers unions a decade ago and trimmed education budgets are now adding money to education efforts. In Texas, state Gov. Greg Abbott, a Republican, just signed into law [a $5 billion school finance package](https://bit.ly/2Y3pFuk), with much of the money slated for teacher raises.

In Oklahoma, home to [one of the first statewide teacher strikes](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2018/04/02/teacher-strikes-shut-down-schools-across-oklahoma-kentucky/478102002/) in 2018, Republicans passed a budget that offers about $200 million in new education spending, partly to fund teacher raises.

On the Democratic side, presidential candidates Kamala Harris, a senator from California, and Joe Biden, former vice president, have both made pay raises for teachers part of their platforms.

In general, the public has backed the idea.

In a national poll from USA TODAY and Ipsos Public Affairs, a majority of people said teachers [had the right to strike](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2018/09/12/teachers-union-strike-pay/1227089002/), a view held even by the parents whose lives were most disrupted when teachers walked off the job.

#### **Teacher strikes affect politics at the national level - increases educational focus.**

Will 10/27 (Madeline, citing working study by two Brown professors, 10-27-2021, "When Teachers Strike, Education Becomes More Prevalent in Political Campaigns, Study Finds," Education Week, https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/when-teachers-strike-education-becomes-more-prevalent-in-political-campaigns-study-finds/2021/10)

Teacher strikes have a profound and often unrecognized role in national politics, a new working paper suggests: They put education front and center in Congressional campaigns and advertisements. Holding a strike more than doubles the likelihood that a Congressional candidate will air an education ad in the area where the labor action occurred, write the authors of the paper, which has not yet been peer reviewed. The upshot is that despite the risky nature of shutting down schools, strikes may elevate the importance of education issues, and ultimately could give teachers’ unions more power in the national arena. “We were really interested in some of these broader political effects of teacher strikes,” said Melissa Arnold Lyon, a co-author of the study and a postdoctoral research associate at the Annenberg Institute at Brown University. “Teachers’ unions have increasing prominence as national actors in education politics.” Teacher strikes are generally rare, but in 2018, a surge of activism—deemed the #RedforEd movement—led to teachers across entire states walking out of their classrooms to call for higher wages and more school funding. There were statewide strikes or walkouts that year in West Virginia, Oklahoma, and Arizona, as well as large-scale protests that shut down schools in North Carolina, Kentucky, and Colorado. That level of activism helped boost support for raising teacher salaries and triggered sympathetic media attention to the plight of teachers. Still, the working paper found that the statewide strikes were not necessarily driving the overall findings—even individual strikes increase the probability of education-focused advertisements being aired. Lyon and Brown professor Matthew Kraft created a dataset of all U.S. teacher strikes between July 2007 and November 2018—totaling 540 district strikes, many of which were part of coordinated efforts in a single state—and analyzed that alongside databases of TV political ads for U.S. House of Representatives elections. The researchers compared election ads in media markets where strikes occurred and in markets that didn’t experience strikes. The researchers focused on ads from House of Representatives campaigns to show how the effects of teacher strikes reverberate beyond local or state politics. Also, campaign ads are expensive and represent a significant investment from a candidate—and past research has shown that political ads can affect voter preferences, election turnout, and future legislative agendas. The researchers found that most of the ads were positive: They promoted a candidate (instead of attacking them) and had uplifting music. Although teacher strikes have negative consequences on parents and students in the form of lost instruction time and child care, few ads disparaged teachers’ unions or called for stricter laws against striking, Lyon said. That effect holds true for both political parties. “Republicans just as much as Democrats are talking about education more as a result of teacher strikes, and they’re doing so in largely positive ways,” she said. The study also found that the effects of strikes on political ads are strongest in political battleground areas, where candidates are appealing to swing voters. “These findings highlight how candidates with the greatest concern for their election prospects are the most reactive to strikes,” the researchers wrote. “This implies that strikes lead political elites to believe that they have something to gain from discussing education issues.” Teacher strikes often have the public’s support The statewide strikes and those that happened in big cities in 2018 and 2019 were notable for going beyond the bread-and-butter issues typical in labor disputes. While teachers were fighting for salary increases, they framed the strikes as efforts to do what’s best for their students. They pointed to sparsely resourced classrooms, shoddy school infrastructure, and gaps in available student supports. That framing—that teachers were on the picket lines, sometimes risking their jobs, in order to provide what’s best for their students—helped galvanize public support.

#### **The teacher activism movement is a nation-wide force for social change. It’s successfully deconstructing privatization, inequality, and charter schools.**

Will 19 (Madeline, 3-5-2019, "How Teacher Strikes Are Changing," Education Week, <https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/how-teacher-strikes-are-changing/2019/03>) AG

But this time, teachers’ demands were different, a reflection of the changing flavor of strikes nationwide. While last year’s teacher walkouts were focused primarily on stagnant wages and crumbling classrooms, the strike demands now are more far-reaching. Teachers are pushing back against education reform policies such as charter schools and performance-based pay. They’re also fighting for social-justice initiatives like sanctuary protections for undocumented students. Although some experts say there’s a risk of losing public support as teachers become more political in their demands, the strikes so far have retained community involvement and have all been relatively successful. Even as the protests move from red states to blue cities, there is still a coherent narrative in place: Teachers are underpaid, asked to do more with less, and fed up. These strikes are not independent and isolated efforts, said Rebecca Tarlau, an assistant professor of education and labor and employment relations at Pennsylvania State University’s College of Education. “It’s a wave of different activists who are in conversation and connection and trying to transform their unions in really interesting and important ways,” she said. So far this year, teachers in Los Angeles went on a six-day strike that ended with a host of union victories, including smaller class sizes, more support staff, and other socially minded initiatives, like legal support for immigrant students. Teachers in Denver went on a three-day strike last month over the district’s performance-based compensation model. Then, West Virginia teachers walked out in protest of a bill that would have established charter schools in the state, along with up to 1,000 education savings accounts that allow certain parents to use public money to pay for private school. Teachers in Oakland, Calif., went on strike for two weeks in February over pay, class sizes, and the cash-strapped district’s proposal to close schools. As the teacher-activism movement spreads, it emphasizes the “point that teachers’ concerns are national and not simply a product of big-city unions,” said Jeffrey Henig, the director of the politics and education program at Teachers College, Columbia University. Now, he said, “we’re seeing that played back in places like West Virginia, where the local actors without the strong historical unions ... are now breathing the fumes of national issues like privatization and school choice and are broadening their scope as a result.” In some ways, the strike in Oakland embodied what the movement has become, experts say. At the center of the contract dispute was the union’s demand for a 12 percent pay raise. But Oakland Education Association President Keith Brown framed the strike as a “fight for the soul of public education” in the city. In addition to pushing for student supports, teachers are fighting against the proposed closures of up to 24 regular public schools and the growth of charter schools. “No one thinks of the Oakland strike as a strike that’s about salary,” Tarlau said. “It is part of the big picture: What is the future of our schools? What is the future of public education?”

#### **Educational innovation solves extinction.**

**Serdyukov 17** Peter Serdyukov, National University, La Jolla, California. 03/27/2017. “Innovation in Education: What Works, What Doesn’t, and What to Do about It?” Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 4–33.

Introduction Education, being a social institution serving the needs of society, is indispensable for society to survive and thrive. It should be not only comprehensive, sustainable, and superb, but must continuously evolve to meet the challenges of the fast-changing and unpredictable globalized world. This evolution must be systemic, consistent, and scalable; therefore, school teachers, college professors, administrators, researchers, and policy makers are expected to innovate the theory and practice of teaching and learning, as well as all other aspects of this complex organization to ensure quality preparation of all students to life and work. Here we present a systemic discussion of educational innovations, identify the barriers to innovation, and outline potential directions for effective innovations. We discuss the current status of innovations in US education, what educational innovation is, how innovations are being integrated in schools and colleges, why innovations do not always produce the desired effect, and what should be done to increase the scale and rate of innovation-based transformations in our education system. We then offer recommendations for the growth of educational innovations. As examples of innovations in education, we will highlight online learning and time efficiency of learning using accelerated and intensive approaches. Innovations in US education For an individual, a nation, and humankind to survive and progress, innovation and evolution are essential. Innovations in education are of particular importance because education plays a crucial role in creating a sustainable future. “Innovation resembles mutation, the biological process that keeps species evolving so they can better compete for survival” (Hoffman and Holzhuter, 2012, p. 3). Innovation, therefore, is to be regarded as an instrument of necessary and positive change. Any human activity (e.g. industrial, business, or educational) needs constant innovation to remain sustainable. The need for educational innovations has become acute. “It is widely believed that countries’ social and economic well-being will depend to an ever greater extent on the quality of their citizens’ education: the emergence of the so-called ‘knowledge society’, the transformation of information and the media, and increasing specialization on the part of organizations all call for high skill profiles and levels of knowledge. Today’s education systems are required to be both effective and efficient, or in other words, to reach the goals set for them while making the best use of available resources” (Cornali, 2012, p. 255). According to an Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) report, “the pressure to increase equity and improve educational outcomes for students is growing around the world” (Vieluf et al., 2012, p. 3). In the USA, underlying pressure to innovate comes from political, economic, demographic, and technological forces from both inside and outside the nation. Many in the USA seem to recognize that education at all levels critically needs renewal: “Higher education has to change. It needs more innovation” (Wildavsky et al., 2012, p. 1). This message, however, is not new – in the foreword to the 1964 book entitled Innovation in Education, Arthur Foshay, Executive Officer of The Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation, wrote, “It has become platitudinous to speak of the winds of change in education, to remind those interested in the educational enterprise that a revolution is in progress. Trite or not, however, it is true to say that changes appear wherever one turns in education” (Matthew, 1964, p.

### **Growth adv**

#### **The pandemic slowed growth, but it’s not irreversible – education improvement can turn the tide.**

Hanushek and Woessmann 20 (Eric, award-winning economist and PhD Economics @ MIT, and Ludger, Prof. Economics @ Ludwig Maximillian University of Munich, September 2021, "The Economic Impact of Learning Losses,” https://www.oecd.org/education/The-economic-impacts-of-coronavirus-covid-19-learning-losses.pdf) AG

As a result of the schools being closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic, classes were almost universally disrupted for months in the first half of 2020. As pupils gradually return to school, the high costs of not learning should be taken into account. The future impact of past and future learning losses need to be considered when it comes to the design of mixed in-person and home learning and when classes are potentially cancelled again locally or regionally due to newly occurring infections. Roughly speaking, research in the economics of education shows that each additional year of schooling increases life income by an average of 7.5-10%. In other words, a loss of one third of a school year’s worth of learning would reduce the subsequent earned income of the pupils concerned by about 3%. Beyond crudely measured school attainment, the loss in cognitive skills resulting from school closures and the untested ways of re-opening is the larger issue. The different ways of estimating the economic costs of the pandemic for current students provide consistent estimates of today’s learning challenges. The costs of school closure and the associated learning losses go beyond the lower incomes that this cohort of students can expect. A less skilled work force also implies lower rates of national economic growth. A loss of one-third of a year in effective learning for just the students affected by the closures of early 2020 The Economic Impacts of Learning Losses | © OECD 2020 13 will, by historical data, lower a country’s GDP by an average of 1.5% over the remainder of the century. If the re-opened schools (which also involve new students) are not up to the same standard as before the pandemic, the impacts on future economic well-being will be proportionately larger. In addition to the economic effects of the cognitive skill losses emphasised here, there are other potentially important costs due to losses in social-emotional development of children, although neither the magnitude nor the economic impact of these are currently known. There is considerable anecdotal evidence that children from disadvantaged backgrounds and pupils with learning difficulties have a particularly difficult time coping with the home-learning phase. Due to the very different pressures, school closures threaten to become a major burden on the equality of educational opportunities and lead to increased inequality in society. Immediate concrete measures need to be taken to provide effective learning for all age groups, albeit in an adapted format – from improving distance learning to developing constructive ways to re-open schools to all children and adolescents. Because school attendance will likely remain disrupted for some time to come, the serious costs of not learning must be considered and comprehensive measures must be taken to ensure that learning takes place everywhere again. Indeed, as described, it is possible and important to build upon the new organisation of schools to ensure that the schools are actually superior to the pre-COVID schools. Unless schools get better, the current students will be significantly harmed. Moreover, the harm will disproportionately fall on disadvantaged students. Substantial learning differences across countries, closely related to institutional structures of their school systems, indicate that improvements are possible (Hanushek and Woessmann, 2011[12]; Woessmann, 2016[11]). Therefore, permanent learning losses are not inevitable if countries improve the learning gains of their students in the future.

#### **COVID put education funding on the brink. Kills growth and democracy.**

Goczek et al 21 (Lukasz, Professor of Macroeconomics @ University of Warsaw, Ewa Witkowska, and Bartosz Witkowski, 6/5/21, "How Does Education Quality Affect Economic Growth?" <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/11/6437>) AG

It is common knowledge that education is important, and there is overwhelming evidence that better education gives great returns to individuals. Oreopoulos and Salvanes [53] suggest that better education might lead individuals to make better decisions about health, marriage, and parenting style. It is also believed that schooling improves patience, making individuals more goal-oriented and less likely to engage in risky behavior. Yet, at the macroeconomic level, there is little empirical evidence that better education in a given country translates into better economic results. This can be mostly attributed to the quantitative, not qualitative, data on education available across countries. While Hanushek and Woessmann [6] published evidence of the importance of education quality as a factor of GDP growth, their results might cause some doubts, mostly because they investigated the contemporaneous relationship between the two—or, to be more accurate, the correlation between the 1960–2010 GDP growth and the available PISA scores (from the beginning of the current century). As a result, their research confirms the existence of the relation itself; however, its direction is most likely opposite to the claim of the authors—or at least it is difficult to identify the direction of the relation. A possible solution would be to use properly lagged PISA results and include them in the GDP growth regression. An obvious problem is the lack of the lagged PISA results given that the tests started at the beginning of the current century. As a partial solution to this problem, we suggested estimating a model that explains the results of PISA as a function of educational expenditures. The model would then been used to provide backward predictions of PISA scores, and the final model of GDP growth could be estimated with the use of adequately lagged PISA scores in the role of input. The resulting model seems to be rational from the economic and the educational point of view. Although the results are in line with earlier claims by the cited authors, it provides stronger evidence for the relevance of the quality of education as it is statistically more robust, and the properties of the applied estimator are generally better. As a result, applying the alternative technique should be viewed as an important value-add of this research. Justifying the value of a good education is of double importance. In practical Sustainability 2021, 13, 6437 18 of 22 terms, it is an important voice in the discussion and provides an additional argument for directing a stream of investment in education, which is particularly important while governments might start searching for savings if global markets fall into the recession phase of the economic cycle. One might wonder why the different types of skills have such a similar influence on the performance of the economies. Certainly, a few reasons could be given. Firstly, each of them should be viewed as a proxy for the general quality of education in a given school, district, or even country—probably more than the indicator of the level of teaching of a particular class. Secondly, the final PISA scores in different areas are in some cases constructed with the use of their values (or actually, their components) in various areas. As a result, the distributions of different PISA scores are not fully independent, which can be partly reflected in the above-described similarities between the three different models presented in Table 2. In any case, it can be believed that the methodology discussed here should be viewed as a formal confirmation that expenditures on education, which result in higher education quality, just pay back. The return is not immediate, but some years after the graduates enter the labor market, the quality of the education that they attained at the age of 15 begins to matter. Several elements are crucial for the properly constructed model and for trustworthy conclusions. An important question is how long after graduation the employees have the greatest impact on the total productivity in the economy and contribute the most to the GDP growth. While answering this question would suggest the adequate lag length for the models analyzed in the study, it is not simple to do so. It seems rational to assume that the employees of crucial significance should obtain better remuneration. This process, however, exhibits little stability: while in 1975 they were the 29-year-olds who had the highest average wages, recently, the peak is observed in the cohort of 40-year-olds. That could be attributed to the increasing professionalization and an increasing role of knowledge and experience in the labor market, which suggests that the significance of the quality of education has increased and might be expected to further increase in the future. However, such a result makes it more challenging to properly lag the regressors in the model equations. Still, the robustness analysis partly described in this paper and delivered by Witkowska and Witkowski [54] leaves no doubts: while the results are observed most clearly with lags of 15 years, which means considering the education quality of today’s 30-year-olds, the figures are very similar for the 25- as well as the 40-year-olds. The transmission channel in the analyzed phenomenon is interesting. While in the theoretical model we concentrated on the economic aspects of education quality, those are not limited to these. Authors in [4,55] have pointed out that, on the individual level, expenditures on education as well health will develop adequate competencies and improve the state of health so that the productivity and income of that person will increase in the future. These two factors, education and health, have an impact on human productivity, which has an impact on production, and with an increase in production, economic growth will also increase. Therefore, education and health, which are important components of human capital, have an impact on economic growth. A study on economic growth in Korea and Japan by Han and Lee [56] provides empirical arguments that there is strong cointegration between health services and education in improving the quality of human resources and economic growth. Yet another transmission channel to be taken into consideration is the democracy– education nexus. While most of the highest-developed countries in the world are adult democracies, there is a clear relationship between education and democracy across countries [57,58]; however, the reason for this remains unclear. In their study [59], they proposed the explanation hinging on the connection between education and the costs and benefits of political engagement. Schools not only educate but also socialize young people, and political involvement is a form of the latter. There is numerous evidence showing a positive connection between education and civic engagement. Ref. [59] models education as raising the benefits of political action when individuals choose to support a more or less democratic Sustainability 2021, 13, 6437 19 of 22 regime. In this model, democratic regimes offer weak incentives to a wide base of potential supporters, whereas dictatorships offer strong incentives to a narrower base. Education increases the society-wide support for democracy because democracy relies on people with high participation benefits for its support. The authors showed that better-educated nations are more likely both to protect democracy and to undertake effective efforts to prevent coups. The performed analysis additionally raised two broader questions. First, whereas the model itself focused on the effects of education on participation, the analysis applied to 32 all social glues that encourage collective action; so, perhaps the analysis suggests a solution to Olson’s free-rider problem in all organizations, and not just in political regimes—namely, human capital or other kinds of social glue as a motivation to participate. Secondly, the results shed a light on the problem of why some dictators invest in education that might be a threat to them. One of the possible answers is that many dictators face an external threat and, therefore, must grow their economies and their armies (including investing in human capital) to counter these threats even if this raises the risk of democratization. A second answer is that, even with a lack of external threats, dictators might benefit from economic growth, and, therefore, they might promote education to become richer. A third idea is that all dictators face significant ouster risks and that it is much better for the dictator’s life for him to be replaced by democracy in an educated country than by another dictator in an uneducated one. Fortunato & Panizza [57] in their study on the interaction between democracy and education and its impact on the quality of government, draw three important conclusions. Firstly, the interaction between democracy and education is always positively and significantly correlated with the quality of government. Secondly, the correlation between democracy and quality of government is statistically significant only in countries with high levels of education. Thirdly, the marginal effect of education is positive and statistically significant in countries with high levels of democracy. In their model [57], they synthesized, in one framework, the stance emphasizing the importance of political institutions as a fundamental factor explaining cross-country differences in income per capita with the stance that institutional improvements and development is driven by social and human capital. The most important empirical finding from this work is the conclusion that democratic institutions and education complement each other, but they argue that democracy leads to the election of better candidates only in the situation where the level of education is above a certain threshold. Simultaneously, amelioration of education can affect the quality of the elected officials but only if the cost of entry into politics is not prohibitive. The authors ran a set of Monte Carlo simulations to show that these results were not driven by reverse causality. By looking explicitly at the interaction between democracy and education, they demonstrated how these two variables complement each other in the selection of high-quality policymakers, which guarantees good governance. In addition, we should bear in mind that economic growth is an important facet, but just one of many, of country development. We can expect societies with higher education quality to be more democratic and politically stable, to exhibit less violence, poverty and inequality, and to enjoy a higher quality of governance. All of these additional factors associated clearly with higher education quality can have a noteworthy positive impact on both economic growth and society’s welfare, going far beyond simple economic calculation. The development of a knowledgeable population does not only contribute to economic growth itself but also might contribute to such aspects of national well-being as welfare and poverty reduction [3]. The authors in [58] also agree that the development of economic growth analysis provides a basis for the role of human capital as an important part of increasing economic growth. Wensley and Evans [60] are convincing that the higher the quality of human capital, the higher its effect on economic growth, and there are numerous studies stating that education is of particular importance for growth in developing countries [2,61–63]. Sustainability 2021, 13, 6437 20 of 22 The above results seem to be an important confirmation of the role of education not just for the well-being of individuals but also for the well-being of entire societies. Of course, the milestone study [6] and the earlier analysis of Hanushek and Woessmann suggested the existence of such a relation. However, we believe that this study is the first to confirm them with the use of modern econometric tools that include not just the dynamic panel data models but also the BMA approach. Its strength consists in the elimination of a vast amount of subjectivity that accompanies the construction of a single model. Instead, a number of models were analyzed and averaged, confirming the validity of the results. They seem vital, especially in the pandemic era when numerous governments will be looking for various areas in which the costs can be cut to compensate for the recent excessive expenditures on healthcare and lockdown support. The decision of where to cut costs will be challenging; however, the conclusions of this study are clear: saving on the quality of education in the middle and long time horizon will not pay off in terms of economic growth and should not be considered as a profitable solution. On the other hand, our study has natural limitations. The crucial one is the limited number of lagged PISA scores due to the relatively short history of this tool. Secondly, although the number of countries that participate is quite large today, initially, it was notably lower. These shortcomings simply require more time. Secondly, while we believe that the PISA scores are the most adequate measure of quality of education, they are not perfect either. Providing high-quality education for humankind is of crucial importance and, as such, has been listed as one of the priorities on various global development agendas, such as the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development [64]. Education is crucial for individual and social development given that it allows for the transmission of knowledge and facilitates the ability to understand and cope with the surrounding world in addition to inspiring innovation [65]. Good education reduces poverty and promotes prosperity.

#### **High-quality education solves sustainable development.**

WEF 15 (World Economic Forum, world-renowned economic/leadership organization, 5-19-2015, "Why education is the key to sustainable development," World Economic Forum, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/05/why-education-is-the-key-to-sustainable-development/>) AG

A strong education system broadens access to opportunities, improves health, and bolsters the resilience of communities – all while fueling economic growth in a way that can reinforce and accelerate these processes. Moreover, education provides the skills people need to thrive in the new sustainable economy, working in areas such as renewable energy, smart agriculture, forest rehabilitation, the design of resource-efficient cities, and sound management of healthy ecosystems.

Perhaps most important, education can bring about a fundamental shift in how we think, act, and discharge our responsibilities toward one another and the planet. After all, while financial incentives, targeted policies, and technological innovation are needed to catalyze new ways of producing and consuming, they cannot reshape people’s value systems so that they willingly uphold and advance the principles of sustainable development. Schools, however, can nurture a new generation of environmentally savvy citizens to support the transition to a prosperous and sustainable future.

Some schools are already becoming learning labs for sustainable development, where young students are being prepared to adapt to and help mitigate the consequences of climate change. Guided by the UNFCCC – as well as related initiatives like the UN Alliance on Climate Change Education, Training, and Public Awareness – governments are increasingly integrating education strategies, tools, and targets into national development policies. The UNESCO-led UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development, which began in 2005, was explicitly intended to instill in every human being “the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values necessary to shape a sustainable future.”

Together, UNESCO and the UNFCCC are not only promoting climate-change education in schools; they are also giving teachers the tools and knowledge they need to provide that education through online courses. Already, more than 14 million students and 1.2 million teachers in 58 countries have been engaged in such learning, and 550 business schools have signed on to the Principles for Responsible Management Education, developed by the UN Global Compact.

This progress, though important, is just the beginning. What is needed now is a global movement, with every student in every country learning about sustainable development from well-trained teachers, equipped with the appropriate curricula and resources. An ambitious sustainable development agenda, together with a legally binding global climate deal, could go a long way toward catalyzing such a movement.

Of course, we cannot secure a sustainable future in a matter of months. But, with a well-designed set of commitments and targets, we can move onto the right path. And, with effective educational programs that instill in future generations the importance of restoring Earth’s balance and delivering a prosperous future for the many, rather than the few, we can stay on that path.

#### **Solves a laundry list of existential threats.**

Tom Cernev & Richard Fenner 20, Australian National University; Centre for Sustainable Development, Cambridge University Engineering Department, "The importance of achieving foundational Sustainable Development Goals in reducing global risk," Futures, Vol. 115, January 2020, Elsevier. Recut Justin

4.1. Cascading failures Fig. 3 demonstrates that cascade failures can be transmitted through the complex inter-relationships that link the Sustainable Development Goals. Randers, Rockstrom, Stoknes, Goluke, Collste, Cornell, Donges et al. (2018) have suggested that where meeting some SDGs impact negatively on others, this may lead to “crisis and conflict accelerators” and “threat multipliers” resulting in conflicts, instability and migrations. Ecosystem stresses are likely to disproportionately affect the security and social cohesion of fragile and poor communities, amplifying latent tensions which lead to political instabilities that spread far beyond their regions. The resulting “bad fate of the poor will end up affecting the whole global system"(Mastrojeni, 2018). Such possibilities are likely to go beyond incremental damage and lead to runaway collapse. The World Economic Forums’ Global Risks Report for 2018 shows the top five global risks in terms of likelihood and impact have changed from being economic and social in 2008 to environmental and technological in 2018, and are closely aligned with many SDGs (World Economic Forum, 2018). The report notes “that we are much less competent when it comes to dealing with complex risks in systems characterised by feedback loops, tipping points and opaque cause-and-effect relationships that can make intervention problematic”. The most likely risks expected to have the greatest impact currently include extreme weather events natural disasters, cyber attacks, data fraud or theft, failure of climate change mitigation and water crises. These are represented in Fig. 3 by the following exogenous variables. “Climate change” drives the need for Climate Action (SDG 13), “Cyber threat” may adversely impact technology implementation and advancement which will disrupt Sustainable Cities and Communities (SDG 11); Decent Work and Economic Growth (SDG 8) and the rate of introduction of Affordable and Clean Energy (SDG 7), with reductions in these goals having direct consequences in also reducing progress in the other goals which they are closely linked to. “Data Fraud or Threat” has the capacity to inhibit innovation and Industrial Performance (SDG 9), reducing competitiveness (and having the potential to erode societal confidence in governance processes). “Water Crises” (linked with climate change) have a direct impact on Human Health and Well Being (SDG 3) as well as reducing access to Clean Water and Sanitation (SDG 6) and reducing agricultural production which increases Hunger (SDG 2). The causal loop diagram also highlights “Conflict” as a variable (driven by multiple environmental-socio-economic factors) which together with regions most impacted by climate degradation will lead to an increase in migrant refugees enhancing the spread of disease and global pandemic risk, thus impacting directly on Human Health and Well Being (SDG 3) 4.2. Existential and catastrophic risk The level and consequences of these risks may be severe. Existential Risks (ER) have a wide scope, with extreme danger, and are “a risk that threatens the premature extinction of humanity or the permanent and drastic destruction of its potential for desirable future development” (Farquhar et al., 2017,) essentially being an event or scenario that is “transgenerational in scope and terminal in intensity” (Baum & Handoh, 2014). With a smaller scope, and lower level of severity, global catastrophic risk is defined as a scenario or event that results in at least 10 million fatalities, or $10 trillion in damages (Bostrom & Ćirković, 2008). Global Catastrophic Risk (GCR) events are those which are global, but they are durable in that humanity is able to recover from them (Bostrom & Ćirković, 2008; Cotton-Barratt, Farquhar, Halstead, Schubert, & Snyder-Beattie, 2016) but which still have a long-term impact (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2018b). Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals can be considered to be a means of reducing the long-term global catastrophic and existential risks for humanity. Conversely if the targets represented across the SDGs remain unachieved there is the potential for these forms of risk to develop. This association combined with the likely emergence of new challenges over the next decades (Cook, Inayatullah, Burgman, Sutherland, & Wintle, 2014) means that it is of great value to identify points within the systems representations of the Sustainable Development Goals that could both lead to global catastrophic risk and existential risk, and conversely that could act as prevention, or leverage points in order to avoid such outcomes. This identification in turn enables sensible policy responses to be constructed (Sutherland & Woodroof, 2009). Whilst existential threats are unlikely, there is extensive peril in global catastrophic risks. Despite being lesser in severity than existential risks, they increase the likelihood of human extinction (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2018a) through chain reactions (Turchin & Denkenberger, 2018a), and inhibiting humanity’s response to other risks (Farquhar et al., 2017). It is necessary to consider risks that may seem small, as when acting together, they can have extensive consequences (Tonn, 2009). Furthermore, the high adaptability potential of humans, and society, means that for humanity to become extinct, it is most likely that there would be a series of events that culminate in extinction as opposed to one large scale event (Tonn & MacGregor, 2009; Tonn, 2009). Whilst the prospect of existential risk, or global catastrophic risk can seem distant, the Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change estimated the risk of extinction for humanity as 0.1 % annually, which accumulates to provide the risk of extinction over the next century as 9.5 % (Cotton-Barratt et al., 2016). With respect to identifying these risks, it is known that in particular, “positive feedback loops… represent the gravest existential risks” (Kareiva & Carranza, 2018), with pollution also having the potential to pose an existential risk. With respect to reinforcing feedback loops, there is particular concern about the effects of time delay, and the level of uncertainty when feedback loops interact (Kareiva & Carranza, 2018). It is difficult to identify the exact thresholds that are associated with tipping points (Moore, 2018), which leads to global catastrophic risk or existential risk, and thus it is necessary to understand the events that can lead to existential risks (Kareiva & Carranza, 2018). Table 1 identifies possible global catastrophic risks and existential risks as reported in the literature and from Fig. 3 these are aligned to the Sustainable Development Goals they impact on the most. 4.3. Linking risks with progress in the SDGs Generally it is the Outcome/Foundational and Human input SDGs that are most directly related. For example as the movement of refugees increases pandemic risk, poverty levels in low and middle income countries increase reducing the health of the population, and so restricting access to education which further enhances poverty and birth rates rise as family sizes increases generating unsustainable population growth which furthers the migration of refugees (Fig. 5). Fig. 3 shows that leverage points to reduce refugees lies in SDG 16 (Peace Justice and Strong Institutions), reducing malnutrition through alleviating SDG 2 (Zero Hunger) and taking SDG 13 (Climate Action) to avoid the mass movement of people to avoid the impacts of global warming. Global warming itself will drive disruptive changes in both terrestial and aquatic ecosystems affecting SDG 15 (Life on Land) and SDG 14 (Life Below Water) adding to their vulnerability to increases in pollution driven by a growing economy. Loop B (in Fig. 4)shows the constraints associated with SDG 13 (Climate Action) may slow the economic investment in industry and infrastructure reducing the pollution generated, encouraging adoption of SDG 7 (Affordable and Clean Energy) whilst stimulating carbon reduction and measures such as afforestation, which will also improve the foundational environmental goals. Depletion of resources and biodiversity are strongly linked to SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production) through measures such as halving global waste, reducing waste generation through recycling reuse and reduction schemes, and striving for more efficient industrial processes. The more resources that are used, the less responsible is Consumption and Production which may thus reduce biodiversity (Fig. 3) and increase the amounts of wastes accumulating in the environment. The final driver of Global Catastrophic Risk is an agricultural shortfall which will increase global Hunger (SDG 2) and widen the Inequality (SDG 10) between rich and poor nations and individuals. Quality Education (SDG 4) is important as a key leverage point to stimulate the generation and adoption of new technologies to improve energy (SDG 7) and water supplies (6) which can enhance agricultural production. Such linkages are convincingly examined and demonstrated in the recent film “The Boy Who Harnessed the Wind” (2019), based on a factual story of water shortages in Malawi in the mid 2000s. These examples may appear self evident, but it is the connections between the goals and how they adjust together that is important to consider so the consequence of policy actions in one area can be fully understood. Because of the underlying system structures global threats can quickly transmit through the system. Water Crises will limit the water available for agriculture and basic needs which in turn will stimulate a decline in Gender Equality (SDG 5). Technology disruption from cyber attacks will restrict the ability to operate Sustainable Cities and Communities (SDG 11) and potentially expose populations to extreme events by disrupting transport, health services, and the ability to pay for adaptation and mitigation of climate related threats from a weakened economy. Conflict (in all forms) will increase refugees and climate change provides the backdrop against which all these interactions will play out.