# T – Education

## Negative

### 1NC — Topicality “Education”

#### The [first/next] Off-Case is Topicality “Education”:

#### First, our interpretation — “education” means curriculum.

TINSAE ’16 (Esayas W.; Addis Ababa University, School of Graduate Studies, College of Education and Behavioral Studies, Department of Mathematics Education, Ethiopia, “A critical Review and Analysis of the Definitions of Curriculum and the Relationship between Curriculum and Instruction,” International Journal of Research in Engineering and Social Sciences, April, v. 6 i. 4)ww

Introduction

Before defining the term curriculum, it is better to define Education and relate with curriculum. Education has been described differently by different scholars of the field. According to Nyagah G. (2010) education is defined as a process of acquiring the desirable knowledge, skills and attitudes to fit well in and become a useful member of that society. The term education means “to draw out”, i.e. facilitating realization of self-potential and latent talents of an individual. The teacher thus uses curriculum to bring out the best of learners. What then are the functions of education?

Education has a variety of functions including the following:

• Intellectual function. This is to enable men awaken in and have a taste of knowledge. It is also to develop intellectual powers of learners.

• Productive function i.e. provides individuals with knowledge, skills and attitudes that could be used for economic activities in a society. Vocational training contributes to this function.

• Social function. In this context, education is considered as a process of preserving and transmission of cultural heritage. Beside education helps learners acquire skills for interpersonal

• Education is also a means of individual development. It therefore serves a personal function (Nyagah, ibid).

Definition of Curriculum

The term ‘curriculum’ originated from the Greek word “curere” meaning “to run a course”. But debate is still continuing as to the definition of curriculum. It has varied definitions and this variation is due to scholars‟ position or approach or philosophical basis or understanding of the world in general.

Though there is no universal/ common definition of curriculum, different scholars defined curriculum in their philosophical or contextual basis. Some of the definitions are: The definition of curriculum placed on continuum from the narrowly focus to the broad. The narrow focus is one that define curriculum as plan for discipline or course of study. In its broader sense, however, the curriculum is considered to everything that transpires in the course of planning, teaching, and learning in an educational institution (Derebssa, 2004).

#### Second, the violation — the affirmative does not increase funding or regulation of curriculum.

[If Title I]

#### The plan deals with *overall school funding*, not school *curriculum.*

[If Hazelwood]

#### The plan prevents censorship of *school media* — it doesn’t mandate changing what is *taught* to students.

#### Third, our standards —

#### Limits — Broader definitions of education allow a host of affirmatives that the negative could never prepare for, including school lunches, busing, sports, school construction and teacher training.

#### Ground — Limiting the affirmative to curricular changes creates a stable and predictable base of literature for disadvantage links and counterplan competition.

#### Effects — At best, the affirmative is topical *by effect* — no part of the plan mandates a curriculum change.

#### Finally, topicality is a voting issue because it is key to competitive equity.

### 2NC/1NR — Extend: “Education Means Curriculum”

#### Broadening education beyond the curriculum explodes limits

Ikonen 99 – PhD, faculty of education (Risto, “What is this Thing called Education? - An Attempt to reveal the True Nature of the Science of Education,” http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001354.htm)//BB

[3] Michael Naish (1984, 151) argues that ‘education’ is a legitimatizing word: "the teaching of a particular subject or range of topics may be the more legitimated the more widely it is believed to fall under that term [i.e. education]". This is exactly what I mean with the manifesto-like character of the word ‘education’: it is not just a name, it is an ultimately concentrated piece of information. [4] Actually, the same idea can be found in Frankena (1973, 73), when he writes that education must foster disposition and use methods "that are desirable and morally unobjectionable, or at least regarded as such, otherwise it is not education" (emphasis mine). - Obviously this notion should lead to a conclusion that the characteristics of the phenomenon of ‘education’ have to be sought from the name-giving process, not from the things that are named as education. [5] Frankena (1973, 75) writes that Plato, Kant, Dewey or Chinese ---"all mean by ‘education’ (or its equivalents in their languages) the same thing, i.e. a process, involving an educator and an educated, of forming ’desirable dispositions by desirable methods’" (emphasis mine). [6] In The New Encyclopaedia Britannica (15th edition, Vol. 4) ‘education’ is defined as a discipline that is concerned --- "mainly with methods of teaching and learning in schools or schoollike environments as opposed to various informal means of socialization". - The connection to schooling is obvious.

### Extend: “Narrow Definitions Good”

#### Narrow definitions of education are necessary for limits

Clarke 61 — [Wade Clarke, Iowa Supreme Court Judge, 5-2-1961, Supreme Court of Iowa, “COMMUNITY DRAMA ASSOCIATION OF DES MOINES, Appellee, v. IOWA STATE TAX COMMISSION (members), Appellants,” pg. 6, Lexis, NVM]

X. The broad definition of the word "education" finds support in our cases. In re Petty, 241 Iowa 506, [\*\*\*13] 511, 41 N.W.2d 672, 675, quotes with approval: "\* \* \* [HN3] education is defined as a broad and comprehensive term with a variable and indefinite meaning, and in its broadest significance comprehends the acquisition of all knowledge tending to develop and train the [\*862] individual. '"Education" is a broad term, and includes all knowledge, if we take it in its full, and not in its legal or popular, sense. Whatever we learn by observation, by conversation, or by other means, away from what has been implanted by nature, is education. In fact, everything not known intuitively and instinctively is education \* \* \*.' \* \* \* It has been defined as 'the process of developing and training the powers and capabilities of human beings.'"

## Affirmative

### 2AC — Topicality “Education” (if reading Title I)

#### 1. We Meet — the plan dramatically increases funding to low-income schools — that expands their curriculum and course offerings.

#### 2. Counter Interpretation — “Education” is the school system.

JUNG and LIPPITT ’66 (Charles; Acting Project Director AND Ronald; Program Director – Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge – Institute for Social Research – The University of Michigan, “The Study of Change as a Concept – In Research Utilization,” Theory Into Practice, v. 5 i. 1, JSTOR)ww

Education is defined here as creating and maintaining good learning experiences for children. This must be considered in the context of the total school system, not just the classroom. The primary objective of the system is to support the child's motivation and perception of himself as a learner so he will be active in learning experiences. This is seen as the major responsibility of the teacher. The instrumental means require creating an organizational system which supports the teacher's efforts and providing the classroom with materials and curriculum designs which are up to date and appropriate in content and method. The structure of the school system is a coordination of educational process at five levels of human phenomena-the pupil as a functioning, unique self; the classroom peer group; direct workers with the pupils (e.g., teacher, counselor, etc.); those who directly facilitate or inhibit the efforts of the direct workers; and persons who influence the policy and structure of the school system as a total com- munity organization. Persons at these levels need to have three kinds of awareness and knowledge in order to help improve educational activities: (1) a diagnosis of the priority needs for change; (2) an awareness of existing innovations as alternatives for action toward change; (3) knowledge of the re- sources available to work toward change.

#### 3. Prefer Our Interpretation — the negative’s interpretation is *overly limiting.* Allowing only curricular changes prevents affirmatives that have good defenses against core generic negative arguments like the states counterplan or make structural changes to the educational system.

#### 4. No Ground Loss — the Affirmative’s interpretation still allows for the Negative to read core generic arguments like fiscal discipline, federalism, and the states CP.

#### 5. Reasonability is key for the affirmative to have predictable debates — the affirmative should merely have to provide a debatable interpretation of the resolution, not the best.

#### 6. Err Aff — Title I is the principle federal program for education.

LIU ’08 (Goodwin; Assistant Professor of Law at the Boalt Hall School of Law of University of California, Berkeley, “Improving Title I Funding Equity Across States, Districts, and Schools,” 93 Iowa L. Rev. 973, HeinOnline)ww

In evaluating federal policy against this principle, I will focus on Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (now NCLB).8 Although the federal role in K-12 education encompasses more than Title I,9 this focus is important for several reasons. Title I has long been the single largest federal investment in public schools, totaling $12.7 billion, or one-third of federal K-12 spending, in 2006.10 Title I also dictates federal aid allocations under several other education programs totaling $1.6 billion in 2006.11While these amounts are small within a combined local, state, and federal education budget of $400 billion, Title I provided 5% to 10% of total revenue in more than 1,200 school districts in 2003-2004.12 Moreover, Title I will serve for the foreseeable future as the policy vehicle for expanding federal aid to public schools. Congress has authorized almost twice the current level of spending for Title I, leaving ample room for appropriations to grow.' Finally, as a component of NCLB, Title I is the principal federal program with the purpose of driving systemic education reform and narrowing achievement gaps by race and income. The allocation of Title I aid should bear a close relation to these policy goals.

### 2AC — Topicality “Education” (if reading Hazelwood)

#### 1. We Meet — the plan changes requirements for journalism courses.

#### 2. Counter Interpretation — “Education” is the school system.

JUNG and LIPPITT ’66 (Charles; Acting Project Director AND Ronald; Program Director – Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge – Institute for Social Research – The University of Michigan, “The Study of Change as a Concept – In Research Utilization,” Theory Into Practice, v. 5 i. 1, JSTOR)ww

Education is defined here as creating and maintaining good learning experiences for children. This must be considered in the context of the total school system, not just the classroom. The primary objective of the system is to support the child's motivation and perception of himself as a learner so he will be active in learning experiences. This is seen as the major responsibility of the teacher. The instrumental means require creating an organizational system which supports the teacher's efforts and providing the classroom with materials and curriculum designs which are up to date and appropriate in content and method. The structure of the school system is a coordination of educational process at five levels of human phenomena-the pupil as a functioning, unique self; the classroom peer group; direct workers with the pupils (e.g., teacher, counselor, etc.); those who directly facilitate or inhibit the efforts of the direct workers; and persons who influence the policy and structure of the school system as a total com- munity organization. Persons at these levels need to have three kinds of awareness and knowledge in order to help improve educational activities: (1) a diagnosis of the priority needs for change; (2) an awareness of existing innovations as alternatives for action toward change; (3) knowledge of the re- sources available to work toward change.

#### 3. Prefer Our Interpretation — the negative’s interpretation is *overly limiting.* Allowing only curricular changes prevents affirmatives that have good defenses against core generic negative arguments like the states counterplan or make structural changes to the educational system.

#### 4. No Ground Loss — the Affirmative’s interpretation still allows for the Negative to read core generic arguments like fiscal discipline, federalism, and the states CP.

#### 5. Reasonability is key for the affirmative to have predictable debates — the affirmative should merely have to provide a debatable interpretation of the resolution, not the best.

### They Say: Ikonen Evidence

#### Socialization *is* education.

Benton et al 12 professor of middle and secondary education, Southeast Missouri State University, Cape Girardeau (“The Teacher Work Sample: A Professional Culminating Activity that Integrates General Studies Objectives,” The Journal of General Education, Volume 61, Number 4, 2012, Project Muse)

The fourth objective relates to the degree to which individuals and societies assimilate the accrued knowledge of previous generations and the degree to which they are able to use creative and intellectual abilities to enrich their lives and the culture of which they are a part. Education and, by extension, schools are the agencies for social change and the inculcation of citizenry into the broad culture of the country. Therefore, the purpose of education is defined as the socialization of the next generation, in the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes shared by the majority of the people in a society or macroculture.

### Extend: “Narrow Definitions Bad”

#### Narrow definitions of education lead to bad policies

Labaree 13 (David, May 15, “Let’s Measure What No One Teaches: PISA, NCLB, and the Shrinking Aims of Education,” Graduate School of Education at Stanford, <https://web.stanford.edu/~dlabaree/publication2013/Let's_Measure.pdf>)

This brings us back to where we started. If we are going to understand the meaning of the new accountability regime in education, as represented by PISA and NCLB, we need to understand the particulars of how it defines and measures educational quality. Everything depends on how you define a good school and on what evidence would be needed to persuade you that a particular school or school system is good or bad. As we have seen, for all their differences, PISA and NCLB employ an extraordinarily narrow definition of education, and they deploy an extraordinarily impoverished metric for assessing educational quality. To hold schools accountable in these terms is to do them great harm. Both programs talk about setting a high standard so schools will race to the top; but in both cases the mechanics of the assessment regime set a diminished standard for schools, which drives them to race to the educational cellar.

#### Narrowly defining “education” destroys policy skills and create bad education

Monson 16 (Derek, policy director at Sutherland Institute, “Education spending and the danger of narrow policy thinking”, <http://sutherlandinstitute.org/education-spending-and-the-danger-of-narrow-policy-thinking/>, NRG)

Government is similar: It is a significant actor in the economy, as measured by personal income, but is still just one of millions and controls only a fraction of all personal income in Utah. As such, comparing public education revenues to all personal income in the state is an incomplete, though useful, gauge of education funding effort. Narrowing how we think about public education funding efforts to this single, limited measure of public education funding creates a distorted and misleading view of what is happening in the real world. Based on these realities, the answer to the second question (“is such a narrow thought process likely to produce good public policy?”) is also “no.” After all, how can we make good public policy from a misinformed view of reality, except by sheer ~~dumb~~ luck? As the saying goes, “garbage in, garbage out.”