### 1

#### Interpretation: Affirmatives may not over-specify the plan of the 1AC. To clarify, you may spec 1) Governments 2) Subset of rights or 3) Subset of who gets the right to strike Violation: They spec governments and who gets the right to strike

#### Prefer-

#### 1] Limits - Their model of debate explodes the prep burden because I have to prep for thousands of permutations of planks wheras they just have to prep one aff making impossible for me to win – That causes psychic burnout

Harris 13Scott Harris (Director of Debate at U Kansas, 2006 National Debate Coach of the Year, Vice President of the American Forensic Association, 2nd speaker at the NDT in 1981). “This ballot.” 5 April 2013. CEDA Forums. http://www.cedadebate.org/forum/index.php?action=dlattach;topic=4762.0;attach=1655

I understand that there has been some criticism of Northwestern’s strategy in this debate round. This criticism is premised on the idea that they ran framework instead of engaging Emporia’s argument about home and the Wiz. I think this criticism is unfair. Northwestern’s framework argument did engage Emporia’s argument. Emporia said that you should vote for the team that performatively and methodologically made debate a home. Northwestern’s argument directly clashed with that contention. My problem in this debate was with aspects of the execution of the argument rather than with the strategy itself. It has always made me angry in debates when people have treated topicality as if it were a less important argument than other arguments in debate. Topicality is a real argument. It is a researched strategy. It is an argument that challenges many affirmatives. The fact that other arguments could be run in a debate or are run in a debate does not make topicality somehow a less important argument. In reality, for many of you that go on to law school you will spend much of your life running topicality arguments because you will find that words in the law matter. The rest of us will experience the ways that word choices matter in contracts, in leases, in writing laws and in many aspects of our lives. Kansas ran an affirmative a few years ago about how the location of a comma in a law led a couple of districts to misinterpret the law into allowing individuals to be incarcerated in jail for two days without having any formal charges filed against them. For those individuals the location of the comma in the law had major consequences. Debates about words are not insignificant. Debates about what kinds of arguments we should or should not be making in debates are not insignificant either. The limits debate is an argument that has real pragmatic consequences. I found myself earlier this year judging Harvard’s eco-pedagogy aff and thought to myself—I could stay up tonight and put a strategy together on eco-pedagogy, but then I thought to myself—why should I have to? Yes, I could put together a strategy against any random argument somebody makes employing an energy metaphor but the reality is **there are only so many nights to stay up all night researching**. I would like to actually spend time playing catch with my children occasionally or maybe even read a book or go to a movie or spend some time with my wife. A world where there are an **infinite** number of **affirmatives** is a world where the demand to have a specific strategy and not run framework is a world that says this community doesn’t care whether its participants have a life or do well in school or spend time with their families. I know there is a new call abounding for interpreting this NDT as a mandate for broader more diverse topics. The reality is that will create more work to prepare for the teams that choose to debate the topic but will have little to no effect on the teams that refuse to debate the topic. Broader topics that do not require positive government action or are bidirectional will not make teams that won’t debate the topic choose to debate the topic. I think that is a con job. I am not opposed to broader topics necessarily. I tend to like the way high school topics are written more than the way college topics are written. I just think people who take the meaning of the outcome of this NDT as proof that we need to make it so people get to talk about anything they want to talk about without having to debate against Topicality or framework arguments are interested in constructing a world that might make debate an unending nightmare and not a very good home in which to live. **Limits**, to me, **are a real impact because I feel their impact** in my **everyday** existence.

#### 2] Ground – 2 Internal links

#### A) Each specification makes linking our DA’s and CP’s significantly harder which forces us to resort to generics that always lose to docced 1ARs and 2ARs

#### B) They can specify the best combination of the three to delink out of core negative ground

#### 3] Fair version of the aff – Only defend one specification and have the rest as an advantage

### 2

#### Interpretation: Debaters must provide sources for all evidence cited in the speech that the evidence was read

#### Violation:

#### 1] Evidence ethics- It’s impossible to verify in-round whether or not their evidence was fabricated because there’s no direct link to their evidence. We don’t know what page the highlighted section is on or how we can even get to their evidence otherwise – that’s a voter since it is an academic d-rule to not cheat which outweighs because of sequencing – it questions my ability to engage with their arguments

#### 2] Inclusion- Them not providing direct links to sources crowds out small school debaters since not providing sci-hub or pdf links that get you access to pay-walled articles put them at a disadvantage from the very beginning

### 3

#### Interpretation – Debaters may not bracket cards, or insert any of their own words into a piece of evidence written by another author in brackets, unless doing so is necessary to avoid using offensive language.

#### Violation- Dictionary.com

#### Misappropriation of evidence – brackets represent their words as if they were written by the authors. Judges don’t have access to your speech doc and don’t know what you bracketed, so they perceive your words as your authors’.

#### Even if it’s subtle modification, this changes perception of the arguments since it is taken as the author’s words instead of the debaters. That kills fairness – it allows them to represent their own words as the authors, increasing the validity of their own arguments inaccurately.

### 4

#### Text: The United States ought to enter into prior, binding consultation with teacher advisory groups on whether or not [the United States ought to recognize the unconditional right to strike].  The United States will advocate the proposal during consultation and abide by the outcome of consultation.

#### Consultation is key to local buy in and implementation.

* AT Consultation is normal means

Honda 16 and Milgrom-Elcott Mike Honda and Talia Milgrom-Elcott 12-9-2016 “Bringing Teachers into the Policymaking Process” <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/education/309667-bringing-teachers-into-the-policymaking-process> (former California representative, Talia, co-founder and executive director of a STEM education organization)//Elmer

But even as legislators, from the local to federal level, understand the importance of education policy, they often **fail to seek counsel from perhaps the most important experts: teachers**. As a result, vital pieces of legislation like 2015’s Every Student Succeeds Act are drawn up and implemented across the country with limited **direct input from those who know America’s classrooms best.** This is not good politics. Teachers—and the parents of the children in their classrooms—are voters who don’t want to be ignored. This does not yield good policy. As we saw with the No Child Left Behind law in 2001, **when we fail to consult teachers, the result is legislation that does not work**. We should not make big picture decisions about education policy without consulting the end users who have the most expertise in how those choices play out in our nation’s schools. **These laws directly impact the daily lives of tens of millions of American school children, parents and teachers; we need to hear directly from teachers on what they need and what changes they think will have maximum impact.** Our failure to consult teachers on policy also speaks to the broader issue of how we as a society undervalue and underappreciate teachers. This is especially true when we compare the U.S. with other countries – such as Finland – where becoming a teacher is a professional career track on par with being a doctor or a lawyer—and one that commands societal respect. Fortunately, there is a simple fix. There is a legion of teachers in America, and their **knowledge, skills and expert**ise are **waiting to be tapped by any lawmaker** or other stakeholder willing to reach out and listen. They could be our “teacher advisors.” We need to engage them from the federal level to the local level, where so much education policy happens and where **knowledge of local needs is particularly key**. There are numerous ways to do this, many of which are happening right now across America. We don’t need to invent new approaches; we just need to expand the models that are already working. For example, teachers can act as full-time teacher advisors to policy-makers for a set period of time. This already occurs with the **Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowship**, where science, technology, engineering and math teachers spend 11 months in federal agencies or congressional offices, adding their voices to education policy discussions. Or it could be **summer internships** like those in the state of Delaware, where teachers spend six weeks working full-time in the state’s Department of Education. Or lawmakers could consult **teacher advisory groups**, such as the Teachers Advisory Council in Kentucky. Made up of about 40 teachers from across the state, the Council provides a direct line of communication from the classroom to the state commissioner of education. All these examples are invaluable, but we need more of them to ensure that this engagement becomes the rule, not the exception. An essential component of any of these initiatives is that the teachers involved are working in the classroom, so that their current teaching experience finds its way straight into policy debates and decisions. Their firsthand experience—more so than theories and abstractions—**can be our guide**. Engaging with teachers in this way helps everyone. Teachers **bring their knowledge into policy** circles and **then take that experience back to the classroom**—ultimately bettering both places. Creating space in the policymaking process for teachers’ voices also elevates the status and prestige of the profession, as the public sees practitioners and politicians engaging in dialogue for the betterment of all. These essential conversations provide an opportunity for teachers to take leadership on – and feel ownership over – policies they will help implement in classrooms. And this collaborative, inclusive approach will yield smarter decisions about America’s classrooms. If policymakers want **buy in from the educators** and stakeholders – who will eventually be the ones implementing new policy – we need to ensure that real life experts have a seat at the table as we hash out new education legislation. Including teachers in the development of policy not only benefits the quality of the policy itself – it also bolsters the success of its implementation.

#### Consultation is key to union legitimacy.

LUC 13 Loyola University Chicago “Teachers' Unions and Collective Bargaining Agreements: Roadblocks to Student Achievement and Teacher Quality or Educational Policy Imperatives?” <http://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/law/centers/childlaw/childed/pdfs/2013studentpapers/waters.pdf> //Elmer

This policy paper demonstrates the vital importance that unions play in education policy-making. Collective bargaining and CBA are an imperfect way for teachers to engage in policy-making, and at times, their restrictiveness impedes reform measures. However, excluding teachers from policy-making is dangerous because teachers have vital experience and knowledge and should play a prominent role in policy-making. Teachers are also essential advocates for their students because their needs are bound up with the needs of their students to the extent that concessions for teachers benefit students and enhance teacher quality and student achievement. When teachers are ignored and excluded from the negotiating table, ineffective corporatized policies like merit pay and teacher evaluations based on student test scores emerge and threaten the integrity of our schools. Unions that engage in collective bargaining are **imperative to education policy** making **because unions have been the only significant resistant force to these kinds of measures.** Excluding and weakening unions **will clear the way for these unacceptable new policies** and have a negatively impact on our public schools.

### 5

#### Covid has paved the way for school choice expansion but obstacles remain.

Ujifusa 2/21 Ujifusa, Andrew. “COVID-19 May Energize Push for School Choice in States. Where That Leads Is Unclear.” Education Week, Education Week, 23 Feb. 2021, www.edweek.org/policy-politics/covid-19-may-energize-push-for-school-choice-in-states-where-that-leads-is-unclear/2021/01.

**If ever there was a moment for circumstances to fuel a big expansion of school choice in states, that moment is now—at least in theory. With millions of children still shut out of closed school buildings due to the coronavirus pandemic, many parents have looked for months for different options to provide an education for their children. In the early weeks of 2021, lawmakers in nearly a third of the states have responded with bills intended to establish or expand on things like tax-credit scholarships and education savings accounts. Bellwether states such as Arizona and Florida, which have large and long-established school choice programs as well as a history of pioneering new forms of choice, are considering proposals to increase such options this year, along with states that have less robust track records such as Idaho and Iowa. And more broadly, K-12 choice supporters see the possibility that, with enough tacit or active support from lawmakers, things like learning “pods” and microschools could take root and grow. According to a count maintained by EdChoice, a research and advocacy group, 34 bills to expand private education options in some way had been introduced in 15 states as of the third week in January. This stands in contrast to the approach taken by Congress, which has so far ignored calls from the Trump administration and others to expand school choice in COVID-19 relief packages. But that doesn’t necessarily mean that school choice will experience an uncomplicated, nationwide boom that endures. For one thing, many of the proposed K-12 choice expansions are being considered in states that already offer one or more choice programs. That means that while the number of families taking advantage of new K-12 options in the coming months and years might grow, it’s not clear that this growth will break big new ground in states long resistant if not hostile to vouchers and ESAs. It’s also uncertain to what extent these state-level plans will provide targeted help to families that will be unable to send their children to in-person instruction at their local public schools long before any of these bills become law. In addition, the introduction of dozens of bills getting more attention because of the pandemic is no guarantee that they will be enacted. The increased prominence of the issue might, correspondingly, draw more skepticism or opposition. Is it a groundswell or a mirage? Nevertheless, fans of school choice (or more broadly, “education freedom,” as former Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos called it) see a pretty straightforward dynamic that will help their issue. In addition to traditional legislative measures, the interest in learning pods—which are informal groups set up by parents to help groups of students during school building closures—could be another source of energy for the movement. “The story is: Parents have had their lives turned upside down by the pandemic,” said Robert Enlow, the president and CEO of EdChoice. “It turned everything upside down, and it increased the demand that was already latent” for school choice, he said. But the extent to which many families might simply wish for a return to normalcy and for their children to go back to their prior schools, extracurricular activities, and social networks, could also play a big role in how much K-12 education choice grows in the pandemic’s wake. “I’m not convinced that there is this groundswell of public support for advancing private-school voucher programs,” said Neil Campbell, the director of innovation for K-12 education policy at the Center for American Progress, a think tank that’s critical of private-school choice programs like vouchers. Campbell added that “there are a lot of parents who want the certainty” of sending their kids back to the schools they attended before the pandemic hit, instead of sending them elsewhere or putting them in learning pods. ‘Let’s make choice an option for everyone’ If the pandemic does drive more interest and activity on school choice, it could lead to the reversal of a recent trend: The number of new laws expanding choice in some way dipped from 23 in 2017 to seven in 2020, according to EdChoice. Just a few weeks into 2021, Enlow said he’s seeing a relatively large amount of interest specifically in education savings accounts, which set aside money for parents to use on a wide variety of K-12 services including curriculum materials, tutoring, and more, not just private-school tuition. His group had identified, as of the third week in January, 19 bills creating, expanding, or changing ESAs in states in some form so far in 2021. One of the most sweeping proposals is in Iowa, where Gov. Kim Reynolds, a Republican, has endorsed a 65-page bill that would give charter applicants more opportunities to get approved (the state lists just two authorized charter schools), create a new scholarship program to provide state funding to help students attend private schools, and allow students to transfer out of a school in a district that has a voluntary diversity plan. Reynolds put the philosophy behind her plan in simple terms. “If there’s one thing the pandemic has taught us about education, it’s that our parents need choice. And it’s not just in-person versus virtual,” Reynolds said in her state of the state address on Jan. 12, adding later, “School choice shouldn’t be limited to those who have the financial means or are lucky to live in a district that’s confident enough to allow open enrollment. So let’s make choice an option for everyone.” Meanwhile lawmakers in Missouri, Iowa’s immediate neighbor to the south, have introduced nine K-12 choice bills so far for this year’s legislative session. It remains to be seen just how open state leaders and other education officials are to more ad hoc forms of education that have gained prominence during the pandemic. Antonio Parés, whose Walnut Hill Workshop firm in Colorado works to connect micro-school, in-home learning, and similar education models to the state, said that while lots of families will willingly send their children back to local public schools in a post-pandemic landscape, appetite also is growing for services that can be “layered on top of” what those schools provide. He pointed to Idaho’s October launch of a program that provides up to $3,500 per family in federal COVID1-9 relief funds to pay for educational services and devices like computers as one example, but not necessarily a widespread one, of how states are thinking about the issue. To the extent in-home and other supplemental services work in conjunction with districts, Parés said, they can improve the quality of the services while also smoothing the political path for these options. (EdChoice polling from December indicates✎ EditSign that those using learning pods are more likely to use them in addition to regular schooling than as a substitute.) “I think this is more gradual, and there will be families that will have alternatives now that they can continue with well into the future,” Parés said. Lawmakers looking at different options How states handle charter schools in the context of the pandemic presents another interesting policy and political wrinkle. With charters focused extensively on obtaining COVID relief funds, especially from the federal government, EdChoice’s Enlow observed, a large share of GOP state lawmakers see those who work in and attend charter schools as relatively unlikely to back Republicans. In addition, he said, officials and parents are interested in a level of education customization and flexibility that many charters aren’t in a position to provide during the pandemic. “I think lawmakers, particularly in states that have Republican control, are listening to their constituents who want more private school options … rather than the charter school options,” Enlow said. But Todd Ziebarth, the senior vice president for state advocacy for the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, pointed to the Iowa law, as well as discussions he’s heard about to expand the charter landscape in states like West Virginia, Wyoming, and South Dakota (where lawmakers are considering a bill to establish charter schools focused on serving Native American tribes), as signs of progress for charters in the current climate. While acknowledging his and other groups’ efforts to “rebuild” bipartisan support for charter schools in the wake of the Trump administration while also pushing for equitable funding, Ziebarth said he doesn’t see a zero-sum landscape for charters and private education options in states. “I don’t see anywhere where they’re doing one at the expense of the other,” Ziebarth said. “In most places, if they’re doing anything, they’re going to be doing both.” Campbell, of CAP, noted that regardless of the zeal and interest in pandemic-driven developments like learning pods, charters continue to enjoy the advantage of more transparency and accountability, in addition to civil rights protections. More broadly, he pointed to a survey conducted by the journal Education Next, which showed that the parents’ grades for their local public schools and public schools nationwide didn’t dramatically change over the course of the pandemic, as proof that some of the rhetoric about the fate of public schools might be misleading. Meanwhile, skeptics of choice in general are watching the landscape with unease. For example, there’s a growing concern that students who are relatively successful in remote learning options could eventually be exploited to expand private companies’ reach over online education services, said Melissa Tomlinson, the executive director of the Badass Teachers Association, an educator group with state-level affiliates that opposes charters, state private-school choice programs, and test-based accountability. Tomlinson also said a pandemic-driven focus on school choice threatens to divert attention and funding from the local public schools that are in dire need due to COVID-19. “It’s incumbent on lawmakers to provide the resources that the public schools need to meet the needs of the students,” Tomlinson said.**

#### Teacher’s unions use strikes to stop school choice efforts

Sledge 3/26 Sledge, Hayley. “Unions Deploy Teacher Strikes to Stop School Choice.” The Heartland Institute, 26 Mar. 2021, [www.heartland.org/news-opinion/news/unions-deploy-teacher-strikes-to-stop-school-choice](http://www.heartland.org/news-opinion/news/unions-deploy-teacher-strikes-to-stop-school-choice).

**Teacher strikes in Chicago and Los Angeles were two of the largest union actions in 2019, among an increasing number of protests by educators in government schools that included demands for restrictions on charter schools. Charter schools, a form of school choice, are less-regulated public schools. Chicago teachers unions expressed their opposition to charter schools in 2019 by demanding the continuation of a moratorium on additional charter schools in the city. The charter moratorium caps charter enrollment over the life of the five-year contract that ended the two-week strike on October 31. Strikes advocating similar freezes on charter schools occurred in California, Ohio, and South Carolina in 2019. The strike actions have proliferated since teachers in West Virginia left work in February 2019 to protest an education reform bill that would have authorized the state’s first charter schools. The legislature did not pass the bill, but a compromise law that allows the creation of three charter schools by 2023 was signed into law by Gov. Jim Justice on June 28. Unions ‘Slinging Mud’ The strikes show teachers unions feel pressure from charter school competitors, says Larry Sand, president of the California Teachers Empowerment Network. “The teachers’ unions are threatened by any disruption to their education monopoly,” Sand said. “Instead of trying to compete with these schools of choice, the unions try to kill them off.” Teachers unions routinely slander charters and private schools, says Sand. “Private schools are almost never unionized, and only a very small percentage—about 11 percent—of charters are,” Sand said. “[Unions] demean charters by accusing them of ‘cherry-picking students’ or claim that private schools are racist. Both are untrue, but when you are desperate to win a battle, slinging mud is just part of the deal.” ‘Throwing a Tantrum’ Teacher strikes come at the cost of students, says Teresa Mull, a policy advisor on education issues to The Heartland Institute, which publishes Budget & Tax News. “In striking, teachers are basically throwing a tantrum and refusing to do the work they were hired to do ... and while they strike, who suffers? Innocent parents and children,” Mull said.**

#### Teacher’s unions also lobby against school choice

OCR 19 “Local News, Sports and Things to Do.” Orange County Register, [www.ocregister.com/?returnUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ocregister.com%2F2019%2F08%2F08%2Fteachers-union-spends-millions-to-stifle-school-choice-in-california%2F%3FclearUserState%3Dtrue](http://www.ocregister.com/?returnUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ocregister.com%2F2019%2F08%2F08%2Fteachers-union-spends-millions-to-stifle-school-choice-in-california%2F%3FclearUserState%3Dtrue).

**Teachers’ union spends millions to stifle school choice in California Members of the California Teachers Association and supporters marched to the Capitol as part of RedForEd Day of Action Wednesday, May 22, 2019, in Sacramento, Calif. (AP Photo/Rich Pedroncelli) Members of the California Teachers Association and supporters marched to the Capitol as part of RedForEd Day of Action Wednesday, May 22, 2019, in Sacramento, Calif. (AP Photo/Rich Pedroncelli) By THE EDITORIAL BOARD | opinion@scng.com | PUBLISHED: August 8, 2019 at 5:00 p.m. | UPDATED: August 8, 2019 at 5:00 p.m. Anyone who wonders about the importance of the United States Supreme Court’s Janus decision, which declared that unions can no longer force public-sector workers to pay dues, should heed the latest lobbying numbers released by the state of California. The California Teachers’ Association spent more than $1 million a month since April to influence lawmakers as it pushed bills aimed at cracking down on charter schools, according to a report this month in the Sacramento Bee. The union topped the list of the state’s biggest spenders on lobbying. Its money wasn’t directed toward improving the lot of public-school teachers, but toward crushing a bright spot in public education. Charter schools are publicly funded, but their success has been an embarrassment to the union. They are exempt from many union-backed administrative rules and often hire teachers who are not members of unions. But they’ve been particularly successful in low-income communities where traditional public schools are failing. In Janus, the justices ruled last year that workers should not be forced to pay dues to an organization that espouses views they might not support. The court revisited the 1977 Abood case, which declared that public employees may withhold the portion of their dues used for direct political activities. The plaintiffs in Janus argued, correctly, that even the collective bargaining-related dues that unions collect, known as agency fees, amount to a form of coerced support. But there was a secondary benefit to the decision. Giving union members a choice means that many of them will opt out of union membership. “Members and money are power in politics,” Stanford political science professor Terry Moe told The New York Times soon after the decision. “This will weaken the teachers unions nationwide as a political force.” If the CTA has fewer members and less of a war chest, it will presumably have less money and time to spend lobbying the Legislature to hobble charter schools or promote other causes. Janus backers argued that the decision could force unions to focus on bread-and-butter issues. RELATED ARTICLES FPPC opens door to taxpayer-funded elections Government unions’ campaign to undermine the First Amendment GOP’s anti-tech efforts will give Democrats new power Ensure access to public meetings in California Higher education is on an unsustainable path Obviously, the CTA — as the Bee story makes clear — has yet to scale back its political activities. But recent statistics suggest that many unions are losing members and even the unions themselves expect to cut their budgets over time. The jury still is out, but it would be good news for public employees, taxpayers and maybe even the unions themselves if union must focus more on improving their services and less time influencing the Legislature. This session, some anti-charter measures already have failed, but one major remaining bill would strip charter schools of the ability to appeal for support beyond the local school board. That’s crucial, because many school boards have anti-charter majorities because of local union political efforts. The CTA is so active this year because of election changes. Jerry Brown was a dependable charter supporter, but was replaced by Gov. Gavin Newsom, whose support is less certain. Democrats also enhanced their supermajorities. Instead of spending millions of dollars pushing anti-competitive measures that will hurt kids, the unions should focusing on improving the education at unionized public schools. There’s so much work to be done on that front. They’re unlikely to do that on their own, which is why Janus offers some hope for the future.**

#### School choice is key to improving education- robust meta analysis confirms

DeAngelis 18 DeAngelis, Corey A. “What Leads to Successful School Choice Programs? A Review of the Theories and Evidence.” Cato.org, Cato Institute, 2018, [www.cato.org/cato-journal/winter-2018/what-leads-successful-school-choice-programs-review-theories-evidence](http://www.cato.org/cato-journal/winter-2018/what-leads-successful-school-choice-programs-review-theories-evidence).

**There is substantial evidence that private choice programs have positive effects for students. A meta‐​analysis of 19 voucher experiments around the world indicates that private school choice improves student math and reading test scores (Shakeel, Anderson, and Wolf 2016). Out of 20 experimental evaluations of private school choice in the United States, only two find negative impacts on student math and reading test scores (Abdulkadiroglu, Pathak, and Walters 2015; Dynarski et al. 2017). One notable experiment (Wolf et al. 2013) shows that the D.C. voucher program increased the likelihood of high school graduation by 21 percentage points and one quasi‐​experiment (Cowen et al. 2013) finds that the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (MPCP) increased high school graduation rates by 3 percentage points. While research of school choice effects on educational attainment is limited, a review of 12 studies suggests that private and public school choice has a positive effect on student attainment (Foreman 2017). A review of the experimental and quasi‐​experimental evidence finds that U.S. private school choice programs reduce criminal activity, increase civic engagement, and increase tolerance of others (DeAngelis 2017b). Another review of the evidence shows that seven out of eight voucher studies conclude that private school choice improves racial integration (Swanson 2017). Furthermore, Egalite’s (2013) review finds that 20 out of 21 empirical studies indicate that competitive pressures from school choice programs improve test scores for students who remain in traditional public schools. In addition, more than 20 evaluations (Forster 2016) have found that all of these benefits result in state (e.g., Costrell 2010, Spalding 2014, Trivitt and DeAngelis 2016) and district‐​level (Scafidi 2012) financial savings.**