### T

#### Interpretation: workers is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend that a just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of a specific type of workers to strike.

Nebel 19 Jake Nebel [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs.] , 8-12-2019, "Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution," Briefly, https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/ SM

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions. Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window. So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why. 1.1 “Colleges and Universities” “Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons. First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural. Second, “colleges and universities” fails the upward-entailment test for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals. Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universities generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution. Fourth, it is extremely unlikely that the topic committee would have written the resolution with the existential interpretation of “colleges and universities” in mind. If they intended the existential interpretation, they would have added explicit existential quantifiers like “some.” No such addition would be necessary or expected for the generic interpretation since generics lack explicit quantifiers by default. The topic committee’s likely intentions are not decisive, but they strongly suggest that the generic interpretation is correct, since it’s prima facie unlikely that a committee charged with writing a sentence to be debated would be so badly mistaken about what their sentence means (which they would be if they intended the existential interpretation). The committee, moreover, does not write resolutions for the 0.1 percent of debaters who debate on the national circuit; they write resolutions, at least in large part, to be debated by the vast majority of students on the vast majority of circuits, who would take the resolution to be (pretty obviously, I’d imagine) generic with respect to “colleges and universities,” given its face-value meaning and standard expectations about what LD resolutions tend to mean.

#### Rules readings are always generalized – specific instances are not consistent. Cohen 01

Ariel Cohen (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev), “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars,” Journal of Semantics 18:3, 2001 https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/188590876.pdf

In general, as, again, already noted by Aristotle, rules and definitions are not relativized to particular individuals; it is rarely the case that a specific individual¶ forms part of the description of a general rule.¶ Even DPs of the form a certain X or a particular X, which usually receive¶ a wide scope interpretation, cannot, in general, receive such an interpretation in the context of a rule or a definition. This holds of definitions in general, not¶ only of definitions with an IS subject. The following examples from the Cobuild¶ dictionary illustrate this point:¶ (74) a. A fanatic is a person who is very enthusiastic about a particular¶ activity, sport, or way of life.¶ b. Something that is record-breaking is better than the previous¶ record for a particular performance or achievement.¶ c. When a computer outputs something it sorts and produces information as the result of a particular program or operation.¶ d. If something sheers in a particular direction, it suddenly changes¶ direction, for example to avoid hitting something.

#### That outweighs—only our evidence speaks to how indefinite singulars are interpreted in the context of normative statements like the resolution. This means throw out aff counter-interpretations that are purely descriptive

#### Violation—they specified teachers

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Precision –any deviation justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 2] Limits—specifying a just government offers huge explosion in the topic since they get permutations of hundreds of types of workers in the world depending on their definition of “workers”.

#### Topicality is a voting issue that should be evaluated through competing interpretations – it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for

#### No RVIs—it’s your burden to be topical.

### DA

#### Debt ceiling passes now and solves collapse, but floor time is limited and avoiding new fights is key

Zhou 10/7 [Li, politics and policy reporter for Vox, “The debt ceiling fight is far from over” https://www.vox.com/22711441/debt-ceiling-congress-december]

Lawmakers have ended another standoff over the debt ceiling — at least temporarily.

On Thursday, the Senate voted 50-48 to increase the debt ceiling (a legal cap to how much the US can borrow) by $480 billion, an action the House is expected to take too. That money will enable the US government to cover its loan obligations until early December, when Congress will once again have to either pass a longer-term increase or another stopgap suspension. The current agreement is the product of a weekslong stalemate on the issue that saw Democrats trying to pressure the GOP into giving up their roadblock of an increase or suspension of the debt ceiling, and Republicans repeatedly refusing to do so. The impasse had high stakes, as the US faced a rapidly approaching default deadline. According to Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen, the US could run out of money as early as October 18. Passing that deadline without an increase or suspension would have likely triggered a massive domestic and international economic collapse. Ultimately, Republican senators decided to cooperate with Democrats, for now. However, in approving this short-term fix, lawmakers have failed to address the issues that brought them to a stalemate in the first place. They’ve now set themselves up for another dangerous impasse when this bill expires after December 3. The standoff, briefly explained Republicans have been intent on using the debt ceiling to make Democrats look bad. Prior to their offer to back an increase this week, Republicans had not only said that they wouldn’t vote for a suspension but also that they would be blocking Democrats’ attempts to approve one using regular legislative order. If Republicans didn’t previously block the vote, Democrats would have been able to pass it with 51 votes — but because they did, the measure required 60 to advance. Instead, Republicans pushed Democrats to use budget reconciliation — another process that would enable them to raise the debt limit with just 51 votes — to increase the cap on their own. Democrats were reluctant to use budget reconciliation both because it can be a lengthy and convoluted process and because it would have required them to specify how much they are raising the debt limit (something they ended up having to do anyway for the December increase). Effectively, Republicans wanted Democrats on the record as having increased the debt limit by trillions of dollars in order to portray them during the midterms as big spenders. Additionally, Republicans argued that because Democrats are working on a partisan basis to pass an expansive social spending bill, they should take care of any debt ceiling increases on a partisan basis, too. “Republicans’ position is simple,” Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell wrote to President Joe Biden on Monday. “We have no list of demands. For two and a half months, we have simply warned that since your party wishes to govern alone, it must handle the debt limit alone as well.” Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer (D-NY) talks with reporters on October 7. The Senate voted to increase the debt ceiling, enabling the US government to cover its loan obligations until early December. Win McNamee/Getty Images Democrats, on the other hand, have argued that Republicans ought to work with them to pass a suspension or increase, or simply get out of the way. One, because avoiding a gigantic economic collapse is in everyone’s interest, and the minority party hasn’t typically blocked action to this degree in the past. And two, because both Democrats and Republicans are responsible for the actual debt that this legislation would address. Both points are true: The debt grew nearly $8 trillion during the Trump administration as a result of massive tax cuts and pandemic relief. In that time frame, Republicans and Democrats both voted to suspend the debt limit three times. But that didn’t sway Republican lawmakers. Because Republicans had refused to give up their opposition and Democrats were intent on keeping the pressure on the GOP, the two sides were at an impasse until this week. How the debt deal came together On Wednesday, McConnell reversed his position and told Democrats that Republicans would not block a short-term increase to the debt limit into December. Adamant that they would not pursue reconciliation to raise the ceiling (and, given the deadline, likely out of time to try doing so) Democrats raised the possibility of creating a carve-out in the filibuster rules that would also allow them to pass debt ceiling measures with the 51 Democratic votes they have, rather than the 60 votes filibuster rules require. That latter option appeared to be gaining momentum this week, although key moderates like Sen. Joe Manchin (D-WV) were still wary of it. As a sign of its traction, however, Biden — who has traditionally been cautious of altering filibuster rules — called carving out a special debt-ceiling-related exemption to the filibuster a “real possibility.” That possibility may have spurred McConnell’s decision to cave for the time being. According to CNN’s Manu Raju, McConnell was worried about potential threats to the filibuster when he offered Democrats a deal to increase the debt ceiling for now. The filibuster has allowed McConnell to block a range of Democratic priorities — from police to voting reforms — despite his party being in the minority. The assumption is that exempting the debt ceiling from the filibuster would increase pressure on Democrats to do so for other issues Republicans oppose, like expanding protections for voting rights. For now, the filibuster stands. And the GOP’s move helps prevent the US from going into default in the near term. It does little to resolve the central conflict at hand, however. Republicans are still insisting, after all, that Democrats use budget reconciliation to approve a longer-term debt ceiling increase on a partisan basis. Democrats, meanwhile, are refusing to do so and may consider a filibuster carve-out again in December. “We’re not doing it on reconciliation,” Sen. Tim Kaine (D-VA) emphasized earlier this week. There will be more debt drama in December The use of the debt limit as political leverage is nothing new. As Republicans have been fond of pointing out, Biden was among the Democratic senators who voted against raising it in 2006 in order to send a message about his disagreement with Republican policies. In that scenario, though, Democrats did not filibuster the legislation or prevent Republicans from approving it with a simple majority. Additionally, Republicans have previously withheld votes for debt ceiling increases in exchange for policy concessions, something that’s not the case this time around. This year, as Republicans emphasized, they took issue with the debt limit in order to simply make a point, a tough position to negotiate with. Senator Elizabeth Warren (D-MA) speaks to reporters as the Senate was nearing a deal on a short-term increase to the debt ceiling. Bloomberg via Getty Images This short-term fix does help Democrats in that it allows them to focus their time and energies instead on a larger social spending bill they’ve struggled to complete. “McConnell caved,” Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-MA) told reporters. “And now we’re going to spend our time doing child care, health care, and fighting climate change.” But the larger disagreements between Republicans and Democrats regarding how to move forward remain. And by procrastinating on solving them, lawmakers have set themselves up for a difficult December. The new deadline to address the debt ceiling also coincides with another deadline to pass more government appropriations — that is, the money needed to keep the government functioning. That means Congress will find itself in a tough spot yet again in just a few months. Not only will lawmakers have to solve their debt ceiling disagreements and stave off economic disaster, but they’ll have to do so while fighting over how to avoid a government shutdown.

#### Manchin’s broadly opposed to strike activity – plan causes a fight

Furman & Winant 10/17/21 [Jonah Furman is a labor movement organizer and writer for Labor Notes based in Maryland. Gabriel Winant is an assistant professor of history at the University of Chicago. He is the author of “The Next Shift: The Fall of Industry and the Rise of Health Care in Rust Belt America.” "The John Deere Strike Shows the Tight Labor Market Is Ready to Pop." https://theintercept.com/2021/10/17/john-deere-strike-labor-market/]

In terms of strike activity, the current private sector wave picks up where the teachers left off, after an interlude of relative inaction during the height of the pandemic. In 2020, moreover, teachers formed the first major group of workers to refuse to accept whatever terms the employer dictated for reopening the workplace. It is difficult to imagine teachers speaking out against returning to work in unsafe conditions as much as they did without the national wave of militant teachers’ strikes in the two preceding years. This resistance has now spread across the economy, in both organized and individual forms.

TODAY, WORKERS’ ECONOMIC resistance — whether through organized strikes or in the refusal of dangerous, underpaid, and unappealing jobs — is shaping the political agenda. Many of the policies in the Democrats’ $3.5 trillion budget proposal would pursue the same ends as workers’ actions but in the realm of social policy. Proposed subsidies for home health care and child care, the child tax credit, Medicaid expansion, and investments in housing and green energy would all indirectly support workers’ power. Either by increasing demand for labor further or by alleviating some of the grotesque social pressures that have forced employees to accept whatever terms employers offered them, the federal government would strengthen workers’ bargaining position. When Sen. Joe Manchin, D-W.Va., warns against becoming an “entitlement society,” what he is opposing is the shift in labor market power that such policy measures help secure.

#### Debt default is the easiest way to wreck the US economy—ruins the US dollar and financial reputation

Egan 9/8 [Matt Egan is an award-winning reporter at CNN, covering business, the economy and financial markets across CNN's television and digital platforms, "'Financial Armageddon.' What's at stake if the debt limit isn't raised", 9/8/21, <https://www.cnn.com/2021/09/08/business/debt-ceiling-default-explained/index.html>]

The easiest way to spark a financial crisis and wreck the US economy would be to allow the federal government to default on its debt. It would be an epic, unforced error — and millions of Americans would pay the price. And yet that unlikely situation is once again being contemplated. If Congress doesn't raise the limit on federal borrowing the federal government will most likely run out of cash and extraordinary measures next month, Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen warned lawmakers on Wednesday. In short, a default would be an economic cataclysm. Interest rates would spike, the stock market would crater, retirement accounts would take a beating, the value of the US dollar would erode and the financial reputation of the world's only superpower would be tarnished. "It would be financial Armageddon," Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics, told CNN. "It's complete craziness to even contemplate the idea of not paying our debt on time." But it's a crazy world. Lawmakers in Washington are again playing chicken with America's creditworthiness. And the path to raising the debt ceiling is not clear. Even though Congress has in the past raised the debt ceiling with a bipartisan vote, Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell vowed in July that Republicans will not vote to raise the debt ceiling. JPMorgan Chase (JPM) CEO Jamie Dimon urged lawmakers not to even think about going down this path again. During a hearing in May, Dimon said an actual default "could cause an immediate, literally cascading catastrophe of unbelievable proportions and damage America for 100 years." 'Irreparable damage' In her letter to Congress, Yellen said history shows that waiting "until the last minute" to suspend or increase the debt limit "can cause serious harm" to business and consumer confidence, raise borrowing costs for taxpayers and hurt America's credit rating. "A delay that calls into question the federal government's ability to meet all its obligations would likely cause irreparable damage to the U.S. economy and global financial markets," Yellen wrote. A US default would undermine the bedrock of the modern global financial system. "We pay our debt. That's what distinguishes the United States from almost every other country on the planet," Zandi of Moody's said. Because of America's long track record of paying its debt, it's very cheap for Washington to borrow. But a default would force ratings companies to downgrade US debt and shatter that borrowing advantage. Markets plunged in 2011 when that debt ceiling standoff caused Standard & Poor's to downgrade America's credit rating. Higher borrowing costs would make it much harder for Washington to borrow to pay for infrastructure, the climate crisis or to fight future recessions. And refinancing America's nearly $29 trillion mountain of existing debt would become that much more expensive. Interest expenses, which totaled $345 billion in fiscal 2020, would quickly rival what Washington spends on defense.

#### Extinction

Joshua Zoffer 20, Investor at Cove Hill Partners, Fellow at New America, JD Candidate at Yale University Law School, AB from Harvard University, “To End Forever War, Keep the Dollar Globally Dominant”, The New Republic, 2/3/2020, https://newrepublic.com/article/156417/end-forever-war-keep-dollar-globally-dominant

In early 2016, Obama Treasury Secretary Jack Lew cautioned that the dollar’s dominance as a global currency rested, in part, on the U.S. government’s reluctance to fully weaponize it. If foreign markets and governments “feel that we will deploy sanctions without sufficient justification or for inappropriate reasons,” he warned, “we should not be surprised if they look for ways to avoid doing business in the United States or in U.S. dollars.” Lew’s case stemmed from the more fundamental view that the dollar’s international role is “a source of tremendous strength for our economy, a benefit for U.S. companies and a driver of U.S. global leadership”—in other words, a role worth keeping. This view is emblematic of American financial governance since the Second World War. U.S. economic analysts, especially at the Treasury, have jealously guarded the dollar’s role and the many benefits it offers: the ability to run large deficits at low cost and disproportionate influence over the structure of the global economy, among others. Yet in their recent article in The New Republic, David Adler and Daniel Bessner argue the U.S. should abandon these advantages. In their view, the dollar’s role has encouraged American militarism and should be relinquished to curb such behavior. Dollar hegemony is not without cost, but to renounce it would be a profound mistake. Adler and Bessner’s view neglects the sizable economic benefits the dollar’s role confers on the U.S., as well as its possible use as an antidote to military adventurism. It ignores the enormous good that can be done with deficit spending, much of which has gone to the American military but could instead fund progressive programs. And it elides the inability of the U.S. and its global trading partners to shift away from dollar dominance without creating worldwide financial distress. Adler and Bessner are right that the U.S. has misused its privilege, but Washington should not abandon it; rather, American leaders should seek to transform it. Generations of American policymakers have been right to protect the dollar’s key currency role for economic reasons. Most notably, dollar hegemony affords the U.S. the ability to run large and prolonged budget and balance-of-payments deficits. The dollar represents 62 percent of allocated foreign exchange reserves, is used to invoice and settle roughly half of world trade, and accounts for 42 percent of global payments. Because governments, banks, and businesses worldwide need lots of dollars, the world market always stands ready to absorb new U.S.-dollar-denominated debt without charging higher interest rates. Adler and Bessner correctly point out that the rest of the world considers the dollar’s role as the world’s reserve currency to be an “exorbitant privilege,” a term coined in the 1960s by then French Finance Minister Valéry Giscard D’Estaing. The ability to spend beyond its means has enabled the U.S. to fund its impressive military might, whether one views that power as the fountainhead of Pax Americana or the source of illegitimate military adventurism. But these economic benefits go beyond just deficits. The demand for dollars also pushes up the dollar’s value against other currencies, enhancing American purchasing power and offering consumers access to imports on the cheap. The dollar’s role also means American firms rarely need to do business in foreign currencies, reducing transaction costs and exchange-rate risks. More broadly, America’s central economic role gives it outsize influence at crucial moments. At the height of the financial crisis that began in 2008, the Federal Reserve was able to inject vital liquidity into the global financial system by selectively offering dollar swap lines to trusted foreign central banks. Dollar hegemony enabled the U.S. to act swiftly, effectively, and on its own terms. In addition, the dollar’s role offers a potent alternative to kinetic military action as a means of pursuing foreign policy objectives. The dollar’s broad use means access to dollar liquidity—which in turn requires access to the U.S. financial system—is essential for foreign governments and businesses. For foreign banks, especially, being cut off from dollar access is essentially a death sentence. That makes sanctions that do so a powerful tool in the international arena. In 2005, for example, the U.S. used the dollar to strike a devastating blow against North Korea without firing a single shot or even formally enacting sanctions. Using authority provided by Section 311 of the Patriot Act, the Department of the Treasury crippled Banco Delta Asia, a bank accused of facilitating illegal activity by the North Korean government, by merely threatening to cut off its access to the American financial system. Deposit outflows began within days; within weeks the bank was placed under government administration to avoid a full collapse. Pyongyang was hit hard, as other banks ceased their business with it to avoid meeting the same fate. Similarly, though the Trump administration has worked hard to undo it, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran to limit the development of nuclear weapons was made possible, in part, by painful dollar sanctions that brought Iran to the table. Far from being a proximate cause of military conflict, the dollar’s central global role has often been used to contain adversaries without military intervention. Still, skeptics are right to point out that the dollar’s role has indirectly funded American interventionism and that dollar sanctions have been overused, provoking the ire of American allies. But these facts suggest we should use our dollar power to forge a more progressive U.S. order, not abandon the advantage altogether. America’s exorbitant privilege need not fund warships and missiles: The same low-interest borrowing could be used to fund a new universal health care system, expand access to higher education, or pursue any number of large-scale social policy objectives, including financing global public goods that no other country or consortium of countries is prepared to fund, such as climate change mitigation.

### CP

#### As outlined by Darling-Hammond et al., a just government should improve

#### salaries and other compensation for teachers,

#### teacher preparation

#### hiring and personnel management,

#### induction and support for new teachers,

#### and working conditions, including school leadership, professional collaboration and shared decision making, accountability systems, and resources for teaching and learning.

#### and lower teacher’s costs to entry.

#### That solves teacher retention

Darling-Hammond et al. 16 [Linda Darling-Hammond is the Charles E. Ducommun Professor of Education Emeritus at Stanford University where she founded the Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education and served as the faculty sponsor of the Stanford Teacher Education Program, which she helped to redesign. Joseph Bishop served as a Senior Policy Advisor for the Learning Policy Institute. Tara Kini serves as the Chief of Staff and Director of State Policy for the Learning Policy Institute, where she works nationally to bring high-quality research to policymakers and other stakeholders to advance evidence-based policies that support empowering and equitable learning for each and every child. She has co-authored several LPI research reports, including serving as lead author of a comprehensive analysis of the impact of experience on teacher effectiveness, Does Teaching Experience Increase Teacher Effectiveness? A Review of the Research. Anne Podolsky is a member of LPI’s Educator Quality Team. Her work includes having served as the co-author of the report, Does Teaching Experience Increase Teacher Effectiveness? A Review of the Research? and lead author on LPI’s report, Solving the Teacher Shortage: How to Attract and Retain Excellent Educators. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/solving-teacher-shortage]

How many teacher vacancies and uncertified teachers are in your state?

This report reviews an extensive body of research on teacher recruitment and retention, and identifies five major factors that influence a teacher’s decision to enter, remain in, or leave the teaching profession, generally, and high-need schools, specifically. Those factors are: salaries and other compensation; preparation and costs to entry; hiring and personnel management; induction and support for new teachers; and working conditions, including school leadership, professional collaboration and shared decision making, accountability systems, and resources for teaching and learning.

Salaries and Other Compensation

Teachers’ salaries affect the supply of teachers, including the distribution of teachers across districts, and the quality and quantity of individuals preparing to be teachers. Salaries also appear to influence teacher attrition—teachers are more likely to quit when they work in districts with lower wages. Better pay is also what would bring them back to the classroom. Of public school teachers who left the profession in 2012 and said they would consider returning, 67% rated an increase in salary as extremely or very important to their decision to return.

Despite the evidence that salaries influence teacher recruitment and retention, a teacher’s salary in much of the United States is too low to support a middle-class existence. A recent study from the Center for American Progress, for example, found that, in 30 states, mid-career teachers who head families of four or more are eligible for government subsidies, such as subsidized children’s health insurance or free or reduced-price school meals.

Preparation and Costs to Entry

Strong preparation increases teachers’ efficacy and makes it more likely they will remain in the profession. Depending on the study, attrition rates are found to be two to three times higher for teachers who enter the profession without full preparation, than for teachers who are comprehensively prepared.

But the rising costs of higher education—and concern about student loan debt—has contributed to many prospective teachers choosing alternative pathways that allow them to begin teaching and earning a salary, while they are studying to be a teacher. Debt loads can be offset with forgivable loans and scholarships that can boost recruitment and retention. In addition, pathway programs that provide financial aid and support to prospective teachers who already work in schools, often as teachers’ aides or paraprofessionals in hard-to-staff schools, help to recruit teachers who are knowledgeable about the communities in which they will teach.

Hiring and Personnel Management

Research suggests that district and school practices related to hiring and supporting teachers influence teachers’ decisions to enter, remain in, or leave the profession. Based on their review of the research, authors identify the following practices as contributing to the quality of teachers hired, teacher retention rates, and student achievement:

Timing of hiring: The late hiring of teachers negatively affects teacher recruitment, retention, and student achievement.

Information in the hiring process: Schools and districts sometimes engage in weak hiring processes because they have outdated technology, poor capacity to transmit information, and limited time for candidate demonstration lessons.

School and district support for mobile teachers: Of public school teachers who left and said they would consider returning to teaching, more than 40% cited state certification reciprocity as an important factor, and nearly 70% cited the ability to keep retirement benefits. Also cited is the loss of seniority when teachers move to another state or district.

Working Conditions

Teaching conditions—which also define learning conditions for students—are a strong predictor of teachers’ decisions about where to teach and whether to stay. Four factors are consistently cited:

School leadership and administrative support: Administrative support is often the top reason teachers identify for leaving or staying in the profession, or in a given school, outweighing even salary considerations for some teachers.

Opportunities for professional collaboration and shared decision-making: Teachers’ career decisions are shaped by their connectedness to a team working with a shared purpose. Opportunities for teacher collaboration and input are key factors.

Accountability systems: Approximately 25% of public school teachers who left the profession in 2012 reported that dissatisfaction with the influence of school assessment and accountability measures on their teaching or curriculum was extremely or very important in their decision to leave.

Resources for teaching and learning: Schools with sufficient instructional materials and supplies, safe and clean facilities, reasonable student-to-teacher ratios, and adequate support personnel can positively affect teacher retention rates, and influence the kind of teaching and learning that can occur.

### CP

#### A just government should ban strikes.

### Case

#### Successful teacher unions don’t require strikes – Their evidence says collective bargaining in general not strikes are necessary

#### Teacher strikes hurt education

Finne 15 [Liv Finne is the education director at Washington Policy Center, an independent policy-research organization. September 1, 2015. “Teacher Strikes Hurt Students and Divide the Community” <https://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/teachers-please-dont-strike-again/> Accessed 10/19 //gord0]

Families across our state are getting kids ready to go back to school. Yet too many families have to prepare for a different ritual — when a teacher strike hits their local school.

Teacher strikes close schools in Washington with depressing regularity. Reporting by the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that a child in Washington is at proportionately greater risk of missing school due to a union walkout here than in any other state.

A number of teacher strikes are looming now, on top of those called by union executives in just the last few years. Union executives in Seattle say they want to call a strike to get a 21 percent pay raise over three years. In Pasco, union leaders say they plan to close schools unless they receive a 9 percent pay increase. In April and May, union leaders around the state called rolling one-day strikes across the state, affecting 65 districts and closing the schools of 573,000 children, affecting more than half of all Washington students.

In recent years, union strikes in Tacoma temporarily closed schools to 30,000 students, closed schools in Bellingham to 10,000 students, closed schools in Kent to 26,000 students, and in Bellevue closed schools to 16,000 students.

As union executives call for new strikes to close schools, it is helpful to know how much teachers make now. On average, public-school teachers in Washington receive just over $83,000 in pay and benefits for a 10-month work year. This amount is scheduled to increase. This year, the Legislature increased school spending by 19 percent. It also provided full funding for two teacher pay raises over the next two years — a 3 percent cost-of-living raise to K-12 employees over the next two years, plus an additional temporary 1.8 percent increase that expires in 2017.

By comparison, the average worker pay with benefits in our state is about $68,300 for a 12-month work year. Most working families do not know whether they will receive a raise this year, let alone what they might receive over two years.

The relatively high level of average teacher pay is good news, both for the public and for children. Most teachers work hard and should be well paid. The work they do is essential to building bright futures for Washington’s children.

This is why strikes are so hurtful to communities, families and children. People work hard to pay their taxes and support local schools. When union executives continually ask for more and seek leverage in contract talks by shutting kids out of school, it weakens the bonds of community that should draw people together

Strikes divide parents from teachers, and teachers from administrators. Strikes damage the social fabric of school communities, especially when families are returning to school with high hopes for a successful year of learning.

The community is already working to boost teacher pay, even as many teachers make more than the average family income in their area.

The public money is already there. Union executives do not need to disrupt the lives of thousands of students and their families to get teacher pay increases.

Not all children are at risk of school closures. The education of students at religious and other private schools, students at public charter schools, and children who are home-schooled or take online courses are protected from the politics and controversy of union strikes. Strikes are illegal under state law, so in theory all children are protected — now parents, teachers and school board members need to work collaboratively to make this true in practice as well.

#### A review of the empirical evidence proves strikes hurt educational achievement and worsen inequality

Matthews 12 [Dylan, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2012/09/10/how-teacher-strikes-hurt-student-achievement/]

Talks between the Chicago Public Schools and the Chicago Teachers Union broke down yesterday, and now the city's teachers are on strike, just as class was about to start for the 2012-13 school year. Labor will insist that the strikes lead to contracts that attract good teachers who promote student learning in the long-run, while Emanuel notes that the teachers are striking over his proposed evaluation system, which he argues will help achievement going forward. Leaving that debate aside, what does the strike itself mean for students?

Nothing good, the best empirical evidence suggests. Two of the best recent studies on the effects of teacher work stoppages and strikes concern labor disputes in Ontario schools in the late '90s and early 2000s. One, by the University of Toronto's Michael Baker, compared how standardized test scores rose between grade 3 and grade 6 for students who lost instructional time because of the Ontario strikes, and for students who were unaffected.

Baker found that if the strike happened when a student was in grade 2 or 3, their scores rose by slightly less. But if the strike happened when the student was in grade 5 or 6, their scores rose by a whole lot less. Scores for strike-affected fifth-graders were a full 3.8 percent lower than those for fifth-graders in schools and grades not affected. If that doesn't seem like much, it's 29 percent of the standard deviation (or the typical amount by which students differ from their class average).

Wilfrid Laurer's David Johnson studied the same Ontario strikes and also found that they hurt student achievement. Like Baker, he found only small effects for students for whom the strike occurred in third grade, but large effects if the student was in sixth grade. In the latter case, the percentage of students getting a passing score on math standardized tests fell by 0.21 percentage points per day, and the percentage getting a non-failing score across all tests fell by 0.10 points per day. The effects were much more dramatic in poorer and more socially disadvantaged school districts, where overall passing scores went down by 0.35 points per day. Given that strikes typically last a week or more, these results can add up. A nine-day strike, for instance, reduces passing rates 3.15 percentage points.

And it's not just Ontario. Michèle Belot and Dinand Webbink, now of the Universities of Edinburgh and Rotterdam, respectively, found that work stoppages hurt student achievement, increased the number of students repeating grades and reduced higher education attainment in Belgium. What's more, studies dealing with teacher absences for reasons other than strikes bolster these findings.

A study (pdf) by Harvard's Raegen Miller, Richard Murnane and John Willett tracked the effects of teacher absences while controlling for teacher experience and skill level. They noted that teachers who are absent more regularly may be less motivated and skilled, and so they isolated absences due to poor weather, the idea being that even highly skilled teachers will be absent if the weather prevents them form getting to work.

The study found that absences lead to statistically significant drops in student math and reading scores. The drops are lower than those found in the Baker and Johnson studies, but then again, the students in the Harvard study received instruction from substitutes, whereas students in strikes get no instruction at all. Studies by Charles Clotfelder, Helen Ladd and Jacob Vigdor at Duke and by Mariesa Herrmann and Jonah Rockoff (pdf) at Columbia found significant drops in student achievement because of absences in North Carolina and New York schools, respectively, with the latter finding that a lengthy absence had the same effect as replacing an average teacher with one at the 30th percentile.

The only recent study (pdf) to find no significant results from teacher strikes was conducted by Harris Zwerling, a researcher at the Pennsylvania State Education Association, the state's largest teacher's union. That study compared Pennsylvania school districts that experienced strikes to those that didn't, and found no difference in outcomes once one controls for demographics and years of teacher service; this is much the same methodology as the Ontario studies. One could argue that because the study focused on U.S. schools rather than Canadian or Belgian ones, it is more directly relevant.

But then again, Pennsylvania requires schools to make up lost time due to teacher strikes at the end of the school year, which Canadian and Belgian schools don't. Illinois schools are required to teach 176 days a year, and the union insists that agreements to make up lost school days are traditional in bargaining agreements. But the 176-day requirement is frequently ignored, with 400,000 Chicago schoolchildren only attending school for 170 days. So there's a real possibility that the Chicago strike will end up like the Canadian and Belgian ones, with real lost instructional time and big effects on student learning as a result, rather than like the Pennsylvania one, with no lost time and no effect on learning.

One last thing — one could protest that all these results rely on standardized testing, which may or may not correlate to real learning. That's fair enough, but there's a bounty of evidence, from Harvard's Raj Chetty (pdf) and Stanford's Eric Hanushek, among others, suggesting that standardized test scores correlate with higher education achievement, lifetime earnings and more. So if the Chicago strike does end up hurting student scores, it could affect their lives for years into the future.

#### Research on Columbia proves

Alvarado et al. 21 [Luz KarimeAbadía AlvaradoSilvia C.Gómez SolerJuanitaCifuentes González

Department of Economics, Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Cra. 7 # 40b – 36, Bogotá, Colombia, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0738059321000225]

International literature on the effects of teacher strikes on academic performance is scarce. Colombia offers a unique opportunity to study these effects given the high frequency of stoppages and the availability of high-quality data. Exploiting the exogenous variations of teacher strikes at school, municipality and department level, we find that those students who have been exposed to more and longer strikes obtain on average, lower scores in math and reading. We also find that students who were exposed to more strikes during secondary school score on average 41 % and 29 % of a SD lower in math and reading, respectively.

#### Teacher strikes hurt the economy and have intergenerational effects

David Jaumeb and Alexander Willén 18 [b Department of Economics, Cornell University (djj56@cornell.edu). c Department of Policy Analysis and Management, Cornell University ([alw285@cornell.edu](mailto:alw285@cornell.edu)). http://barrett.dyson.cornell.edu/NEUDC/paper\_179.pdf]

This paper presents novel evidence on the effect of school disruptions on student long-run outcomes, exploiting variation in the prevalence of teacher strikes within and across provinces in Argentina over time. On average, a student during our analysis period lost 88 days of primary school due to teacher strikes, making this a particularly interesting case for the study of the consequences associated with school disruptions. We find robust evidence in support of adverse labor market effects when the students are between 30 and 40 years old: being exposed to the average incidence of teacher strikes during primary school reduces annual labor market earnings of males and females by 3.2 and 1.9 percent, respectively. A back-ofthe-envelope calculation suggests that this amounts to an aggregate annual earnings loss of $2.34 billion, equivalent to the cost of raising the employment income of all Argentinian primary school teachers by 62.4 percent. We also find evidence of an increase in unemployment, an increase in the probability of not working or studying, and a decline in the skill levels of the occupations into which students sort. Our analysis suggests that these labor market effects are driven, at least in part, by a reduction in educational attainment. Using data on students who have just finished primary school, we demonstrate that many of the adverse education effects are visible immediately after primary school. We also find some suggestive evidence that exposure to teacher strikes in early grades have larger effects than strikes in later grades. Finally, our analysis identifies significant intergenerational treatment effects, such that children of individuals who were exposed to teacher strikes also experience adverse education effects.

#### Economists agree strikes are bad

Illinois Policy 19 [https://www.illinoispolicy.org/press-releases/teacher-strikes-hurt-student-outcomes-and-may-worsen-income-inequality/]

CHICAGO (Oct. 2, 2019) – As the Chicago Teachers Union plans to announce this afternoon whether it will walk out on more than 360,000 students, studies show strikes negatively affect student academic outcomes.

Research published in the National Bureau of Economic Research indicates strikes can temper growth in elementary student test scores by 2.2%. Given 90% of Chicago Public School students in 2018 were minority and 83% were classified as low-income, this means a strike will disproportionately harm those most in need and leave them to endure the long term negative consequences.

Experts from the nonpartisan Illinois Policy Institute are available to comment on how a strike would hurt minority and low-income students, potentially worsening income inequality.

How strikes harm student populations:

Test score decline: Expert consensus finds strikes have long-term negative effects

on students. One study published by the NBER discovered that long strikes of 10 or more days have a significant negative effect on math test scores. Another published by Columbia University economists found extended disruptions, such as a strike, have negative effects on math and English achievement.

Less instruction: Unless the educational time lost during a strike is made up – such as by extending the school year – students lose the corresponding time in the classroom. In addition, students may require extensive review of material to get back up to speed.

Underperforming state averages: CPS already underperforms state academic achievement benchmarks. Its average SAT scores are 56 points lower than the state average, its four-year graduation rates are 11 percentage points lower and the percentage of CPS teachers rated proficient or excellent is 11 percentage points lower. A strike could exacerbate this.

Quote from Orphe Divounguy, chief economist for the nonpartisan Illinois Policy Institute:

“In the case of a teachers’ strike in Chicago, it is students who will ultimately be left behind. Lost classroom time worsens academic achievement and harms poor and disadvantaged students the most.

“With growing concerns about income inequality, the best way to ensure low-income students succeed is for CTU to accept Mayor Lightfoot’s generous offer and keep students in the classroom.”

#### Teacher strikes harm students, and the counterplan resolves the justification for strikes

Washington Post Editorial Board 18 [https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/teachers-strikes-hurt-children-but-stingy-state-officials-are-to-blame/2018/04/05/1a1e68ca-38ea-11e8-9c0a-85d477d9a226\_story.html]

THE SURPRISING success of last month’s strike by West Virginia’s teachers in securing overdue pay raises has emboldened teachers in several other states to launch walkouts and stage demonstrations. In Oklahoma, public schools were closed as teachers rallied at the state Capitol. In Kentucky, teachers who banded together to call in sick forced some classroom closures. Teachers in Arizona have threatened to go on strike.

When teachers walk out, children get hurt. Learning is interrupted and hard to make up, routines are upended as parents scramble for child care, and students who rely on school breakfasts and lunches go hungry. But in this case what the teachers are protesting also hurts children — that is, a long- ­ running and systemic disinvestment in public education.

Responsibility therefore lies with the governors and legislatures in these red states who have allowed teacher salaries to get so low. Many educators say they have to take a second or third job just to get by, and effective teachers are driven out of the profession altogether. A West Virginia high school teacher told the New York Times her take-home pay was less than $650 a week, while another West Virginia teacher wrote in The Post about taking home less now than in 2012 because of increased premiums for public-employee insurance. They were among thousands of teachers who staged a nine-day walkout that led to legislation giving teachers, along with other public employees, a 5 percent raise.

But teachers are not protesting only their own inadequate paychecks. Cuts in state education funding have harmed school quality and equity. In Oklahoma, despite a booming economy, public schools have lost about 30 percent of their funding, adjusted for inflation, over the past decade. Facilities have deteriorated, and classrooms lack textbooks and other basic supplies. Some districts can afford to keep schools in session only four days a week.