

УДК 323: [37: 316. 422] «2017/2025»

DOI: [10.35619/pse.vi4.99](https://doi.org/10.35619/pse.vi4.99)

Roman Szymon Androszczuk

The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin,
Second-year Master's student, majoring in international relations,
Lublin, Republic of Poland
ORCID: 0009-0009-4771-8240
e-mail: irenandro@gmail.com

US EDUCATION POLICY IN 2017-2025: FROM DEREGULATION TO RENEWAL AND REFORM

Abstract. The period from 2017 to 2025 marks one of the most dynamic and polarized eras in US education policy, characterized by significant shifts in federal priorities across three presidential administrations. The Trump administration (2017–2021) emphasized deregulation, school choice, and the reduction of federal oversight, with major rollbacks on civil rights protections and higher education regulations. The Biden administration (2021–2025) reversed many of these policies, pursuing pandemic recovery through historic federal investment, enhanced equity initiatives, and a reassertion of federal leadership. Trump's return in 2025 introduced a renewed push for school choice, deep budget cuts, and the proposed dismantling of the Department of Education. This paper analyzes how these policy shifts influenced education governance, equity, funding, and accountability, with special attention to their impact on vulnerable student populations, federal-state relations, and long-term systemic outcomes. Despite the policy swings, shared challenges such as teacher shortages, student mental health, and persistent achievement gaps remain central. The period illustrates the enduring debate over the federal role in education and its consequences for American students and communities.

Keywords: US education policy, Trump administration, Biden administration, deregulation, school choice, Department of Education, federal investment, equity, COVID-19, Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), student debt relief, special education, civil rights, teacher shortage, accreditation reform, Project 2025, federal-state relations, educational governance.

Introduction. The period from 2017 to 2025 represents one of the most turbulent and transformative eras in American education policy since the establishment of the Department of Education in 1979. This eight-year span encompasses two distinctly different presidential administrations, each with fundamentally opposing philosophies about the federal government's role in education. The Trump administration (2017-2021) emphasized deregulation, school choice, and reduced federal oversight, while the Biden administration (2021-2025) focused on increased federal investment, pandemic recovery, and equity initiatives. The return of Donald Trump to the presidency in January 2025 has initiated yet another dramatic shift, with proposals for unprecedented changes including the potential elimination of the Department of Education itself.

This analysis examines the major policy developments, legislative changes, regulatory shifts, and educational outcomes during this critical period. The COVID-19 pandemic, which disrupted American education beginning in March 2020, serves as both a dividing line and a unifying challenge that shaped policy responses across both administrations. From the initial deregulatory approach of the first Trump term through the massive federal investment of the Biden years, to the current structural reforms proposed by Trump's return, this period illustrates the profound impact that federal education policy can have on states, school districts, students, and families across the nation.

The Trump Administration's First Term (2017-2021): Deregulation and School Choice. Regulatory Rollbacks and Federal Oversight Reduction. The Trump administration's approach to education policy was fundamentally shaped by Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos's philosophy that federal involvement in education should be minimized in favor of state and local control. This perspective drove extensive regulatory rollbacks across multiple areas of education policy. The administration systematically dismantled Obama-era regulations and guidance documents, arguing that federal overreach had burdened schools and limited innovation. One of the most significant early actions was the rescission of transgender student bathroom guidance that had been issued during the Obama administration. This move signaled the administration's willingness to reverse civil rights protections that previous administrations had established through federal oversight [13]. The administration also rolled back numerous regulations related to for-profit colleges, teacher preparation programs, and accountability measures for schools receiving federal funding.

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), which had been signed into law by President Obama in 2015, provided the framework for much of the Trump administration's deregulatory agenda. Unlike its predecessor, No Child Left Behind, ESSA had deliberately shifted more authority back to states. The Trump administration leveraged this flexibility to approve state accountability plans that emphasized local control over federal mandates. However, critics argued that this approach weakened civil rights enforcement and reduced protections for vulnerable student populations.

School Choice Initiatives and Voucher Programs. School choice became the cornerstone of the Trump administration's education agenda, with Secretary DeVos serving as a prominent advocate for voucher programs, charter schools, and educational savings accounts. The administration consistently proposed federal funding for school choice initiatives, though Congress largely rejected these proposals. The President's annual budget requests included billions of dollars for school choice programs, including a proposed \$1 billion federal voucher program and significant funding for charter school expansion [11].

Despite limited success at the federal level, the administration's advocacy helped accelerate school choice adoption at the state level. Multiple states expanded their voucher programs, educational savings accounts, and charter school policies during

this period. The administration also used its regulatory authority to support school choice, including guidance that made it easier for states to use federal funds for private school choice programs.

The administration's approach to charter schools represented a significant departure from previous federal oversight. Regulations governing charter school authorizers were relaxed, and requirements for charter school oversight were reduced. This deregulatory approach was praised by school choice advocates but criticized by traditional public school supporters who argued it reduced accountability and potentially diverted resources from public schools.

Higher Education Policy and Title IX. The Trump administration's higher education policies focused heavily on reducing regulatory burden and protecting due process rights, particularly in the area of campus sexual assault. The administration rescinded Obama-era Title IX guidance and initiated a formal rulemaking process to establish new regulations governing how colleges and universities must respond to sexual harassment and assault allegations.

The new Title IX regulations, finalized in 2020, were among the most controversial policy changes of the administration. These rules narrowed the definition of sexual harassment, required live hearings for serious allegations, and allowed cross-examination of accusers. Supporters argued these changes protected due process rights for accused students, while critics contended they would discourage sexual assault survivors from reporting incidents [12].

Simultaneously, the administration pursued significant deregulation of for-profit colleges, reversing Obama-era regulations that had been implemented following high-profile closures and fraud cases. The borrower defense to repayment rule was rewritten to make it more difficult for students to obtain loan forgiveness when their schools engaged in misconduct. The administration also attempted to eliminate the gainful employment rule, which required career training programs to demonstrate that their graduates could find employment sufficient to repay their student loans.

COVID-19 Response and Educational Continuity. The COVID-19 pandemic arrived during the final year of Trump's first term, creating unprecedented challenges for American education. When schools closed nationwide in March 2020, the federal response was largely limited to providing flexibility in existing programs rather than new federal investment. The administration waived standardized testing requirements for the 2019–2020 school year and provided regulatory flexibility for special education services and federal nutrition programs.

The CARES Act, passed in March 2020, included \$13.5 billion for K-12 education through the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Fund. However, the administration's approach emphasized that reopening schools was primarily a state and local responsibility. Secretary DeVos consistently advocated for schools to reopen for in-person instruction, arguing that remote learning was

inadequate for most students and that school closures were harming students' academic and social development.

The administration's response to the pandemic also included threats to withhold federal funding from schools that did not reopen for in-person instruction. While these threats were largely symbolic and could not be legally implemented, they reflected the administration's position that extended school closures were unnecessary and harmful [20].

The Biden Administration (2021-2025): Recovery, Investment, and Equity. The Biden administration entered office with a fundamentally different approach to federal education policy, emphasizing increased investment, equity initiatives, and strengthened federal oversight. The administration's response to the COVID-19 pandemic represented the largest federal investment in K–12 education in American history, with the American Rescue Plan Act (ARP) providing \$122 billion in additional ESSER funding to help schools recover from the pandemic. This massive federal investment came with stronger requirements for how funds could be used, including mandates that school districts spend at least 20% of their ARP ESSER funds on evidence-based interventions to address learning loss. The administration also required districts to develop comprehensive plans for using these funds and to engage meaningfully with stakeholders, including parents, students, and community members [6].

The administration's approach to pandemic recovery extended beyond funding to include detailed guidance on school reopening, health and safety protocols, and addressing the mental health needs of students and educators. Unlike the previous administration, the Biden team emphasized the federal government's role in providing leadership and resources for school reopening, working closely with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to develop comprehensive reopening guidance.

Equity Initiatives and Civil Rights Enforcement. Civil rights enforcement became a central focus of the Biden administration's education policy, reversing many of the Trump administration's deregulatory actions. The administration reinstated transgender student protections, strengthened enforcement of Title IX, and increased oversight of civil rights compliance in schools receiving federal funding.

Secretary of Education Miguel Cardona emphasized that equity would be a lens through which all department policies would be evaluated. This approach led to new guidance documents, increased civil rights investigations, and stronger enforcement actions against districts found to be discriminating against students based on race, gender, disability status, or other protected characteristics. The administration also prioritized addressing racial disparities in education, including discipline disparities, access to advanced coursework, and resource allocation. New grant programs were created to support schools serving high percentages of students of color, and existing programs were redesigned to prioritize equity outcomes [14].

Higher Education and Student Debt Relief. The Biden administration's higher education policies focused heavily on making college more affordable and addressing the student debt crisis. The administration reversed many Trump-era regulations affecting for-profit colleges, strengthened the borrower defense to repayment process, and reinstated the gainful employment rule.

Most significantly, the administration attempted to implement broad student loan forgiveness, proposing to cancel up to \$20,000 in federal student loan debt for eligible borrowers. While this initiative was ultimately blocked by the Supreme Court, the administration pursued alternative approaches to debt relief, including improvements to existing forgiveness programs and targeted relief for specific groups of borrowers.

The administration also proposed significant increases in Pell Grant funding, with the FY 2025 budget proposing to increase the maximum Pell Grant to \$8,145 for the 2025-26 school year and outlining a proposal to double the maximum Pell Grant by 2029. These proposals represented the largest proposed increases in need-based financial aid in decades [8].

Teacher Shortages and Workforce Development. Recognizing the growing teacher shortage crisis, the Biden administration launched multiple initiatives to support educator recruitment and retention. The administration proposed significant increases in Title II funding for teacher preparation and professional development, and created new programs to provide student loan forgiveness for teachers working in high-need schools. The administration also emphasized the importance of treating teaching as a profession, supporting initiatives to increase teacher pay, improve working conditions, and provide more comprehensive support for new educators. These efforts were seen as critical to addressing the teacher shortage crisis that had been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Career and technical education also received increased attention during the Biden years, with the administration emphasizing the importance of preparing students for high-demand, middle-skill jobs. The U.S. Department of Education announced the reversal of a regulatory reporting scheme that required states and local career and technical education programs to comply with burdensome and unnecessary reporting, demonstrating the administration's commitment to reducing administrative burden while maintaining program quality [1].

The Return of Trump (2025): Structural Reform and Federal Retrenchment. Donald Trump's return to the presidency in January 2025 marked the beginning of the most dramatic proposed changes to federal education policy in modern American history. During his campaign, President Trump said «I will close the Department of Education and move education back to the states where it belongs», signaling an intention to fundamentally restructure federal involvement in education. Trump's first week back in office included several significant executive actions affecting education. The administration issued guidance on how states can use federal funding formulas to support their K–12 scholarship programs and directed the Secretary of Education to

prioritize school choice programs in the Department's discretionary grant programs. These actions represented an immediate shift back toward the school choice priorities that had characterized Trump's first term [11].

Budget Proposals and Department of Education Restructuring. The Trump administration's FY 2026 budget proposal calls for a 15% cut to Department of Education spending, representing billions of dollars in reduced federal education funding [21]. This dramatic reduction is intended to support the administration's goal of eventually eliminating the Department of Education as a Cabinet-level agency. One approach being considered is to move two major K-12 funding programs to the Department of Health and Human Services, as proposed by Project 2025, the conservative policy blueprint that has influenced many of the administration's early actions. While Trump had distanced himself from Project 2025 during the campaign, many of its education recommendations appear to be informing administration policy.

The proposed restructuring would fundamentally alter how federal education programs are administered and could significantly reduce federal oversight of state and local education systems. Critics argue that this approach would weaken civil rights protections and reduce support for vulnerable student populations, while supporters contend it would eliminate federal overreach and return decision-making authority to states and communities [5].

Special Education and IDEA Reforms. The Trump administration is weighing significant changes to special education oversight and funding, with Project 2025 proposing a strategy of shifting most federal special education funding into a more flexible block grant program that would operate outside IDEA [3]. This represents a fundamental change to how special education services are funded and regulated at the federal level. While the Trump administration's budget appears to propose an increase in IDEA funding to states to roughly \$14.9 billion, the budget summary also suggests folding several previously separate programs into that funding stream, which could result in reduced overall support for special education services once all costs are accounted for.

These proposed changes have generated significant concern among disability rights advocates, who argue that federal oversight is essential to ensuring that students with disabilities receive appropriate services. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act has provided crucial protections and funding for special education services since 1975, and any significant changes to this framework could have far-reaching implications for millions of students [16].

Higher Education Accreditation and Reform. The administration is pursuing significant changes to higher education accreditation, with plans to create «a competitive marketplace of higher education accreditors» and refocus accreditors on «helping member institutions improve the student outcomes families care most about» rather than «pushing schools to adopt a divisive DEI ideology». This approach represents a significant departure from traditional accreditation practices and could

fundamentally alter how colleges and universities are evaluated and regulated. The administration argues that current accreditation practices focus too heavily on compliance and political ideology rather than student outcomes and job market success. The proposed changes to accreditation could have significant implications for federal financial aid eligibility, transfer credit policies, and the overall quality assurance system for American higher education. Critics worry that reducing accreditation standards could lead to an increase in low-quality educational programs, while supporters argue that increased competition will drive innovation and improve outcomes [4].

Policy Continuities and Persistent Challenges. Despite the dramatic policy differences between the Trump and Biden administrations, several challenges have persisted across both terms and continue to face the current administration. The teacher shortage crisis, achievement gaps between different student populations, declining enrollment in teacher preparation programs, and concerns about student mental health have remained consistent policy challenges regardless of which party controls the White House. Both administrations have also grappled with the implementation challenges of ESSA, which requires states to develop and implement comprehensive accountability systems while maintaining federal civil rights protections. The tension between state flexibility and federal oversight has been a constant theme throughout this period, with different administrations emphasizing different aspects of this balance. The COVID-19 pandemic's impact on education has also created policy continuities, as both the Trump and Biden administrations recognized the need for federal support to help schools respond to unprecedented challenges. While their approaches differed significantly, both administrations acknowledged that the federal government had a role to play in supporting educational continuity and recovery.

Ongoing Debates About Federal Role. The fundamental question of the appropriate federal role in education has remained central to policy debates throughout this period. The Trump administration's deregulatory approach and current proposals to eliminate the Department of Education represent one pole of this debate, emphasizing state and local control and arguing that federal involvement creates bureaucratic burden without improving outcomes. The Biden administration's approach represented the opposite pole, emphasizing the federal government's responsibility to ensure equity, provide resources for schools serving disadvantaged students, and maintain civil rights protections. This perspective views federal involvement as essential to addressing systemic inequities and ensuring that all students have access to a high-quality education regardless of where they live. These competing visions reflect deeper philosophical differences about the role of government, the importance of federal oversight in protecting civil rights, and the most effective approaches to improving educational outcomes. The dramatic policy swings between administrations have created uncertainty for state and local education leaders and have made long-term planning difficult for schools and districts [7].

Impact on Students, Families, and Communities. The policy changes during this period have had significant implications for student achievement and opportunity gaps. The Trump administration's emphasis on deregulation and school choice was intended to increase options for families and drive innovation through competition. However, research on the effectiveness of these approaches has been mixed, with some studies showing modest benefits for certain student populations while others have found little to no impact on overall achievement. The Biden administration's focus on equity and increased federal investment was designed to address persistent achievement gaps and provide additional support for schools serving disadvantaged students. The massive ESSER investments provided unprecedented resources for schools to address learning loss and support student recovery from the pandemic. However, the effectiveness of these investments is still being evaluated, and concerns remain about whether short-term federal funding can address long-term systemic challenges. The current Trump administration's proposed changes could have significant implications for both achievement and opportunity gaps. Reduced federal oversight and funding could limit support for vulnerable student populations, while increased emphasis on school choice could provide new opportunities for some families while potentially undermining support for traditional public schools [15].

Special Populations and Civil Rights. Students with disabilities, English language learners, and students from racial and ethnic minorities have been particularly affected by the policy changes during this period. The Trump administration's deregulatory approach reduced some federal protections for these populations, while the Biden administration's emphasis on civil rights enforcement strengthened federal oversight and support. The current administration's proposed changes to special education funding and civil rights enforcement could have significant implications for these student populations. Advocates argue that federal oversight is essential to ensuring that vulnerable students receive appropriate services and protection from discrimination, while administration officials contend that state and local communities are better positioned to address these students' needs [17].

Rural and Urban School Districts. The policy changes during this period have had different implications for rural and urban school districts. Rural districts, which often have limited resources and face unique challenges in attracting and retaining teachers, have generally benefited from increased federal flexibility and reduced compliance requirements. However, they have also been vulnerable to funding cuts and have often lacked the capacity to take advantage of competitive grant programs. Urban districts, which serve large numbers of disadvantaged students and often face significant challenges related to poverty, housing instability, and other social factors, have generally benefited from increased federal investment and targeted equity initiatives. However, they have also been subject to increased federal oversight and accountability requirements. The current administration's proposed changes could significantly impact both rural and urban districts, though in different ways. Reduced

federal funding and oversight could provide more flexibility for rural districts but might also reduce support for the specialized programs and services that these districts need. Urban districts could face significant challenges if federal civil rights enforcement and equity programs are reduced [19].

Looking Forward: Implications and Future Directions. The Trump administration's proposal to eliminate the Department of Education faces significant constitutional and legal challenges. While the Constitution does not explicitly establish a federal role in education, decades of Supreme Court precedent and federal legislation have created an extensive framework of federal education programs and civil rights protections that would be difficult to dismantle. Any attempt to eliminate the department would require Congressional approval, and would face significant opposition from education organizations, civil rights groups, and many state and local education leaders. The practical challenges of transferring federal education programs to other agencies or eliminating them entirely would be enormous and could create significant disruption for schools and students.

Legal challenges to specific policy changes are also likely, particularly around civil rights enforcement, special education services, and federal funding formulas. Courts have consistently held that federal education programs must comply with constitutional requirements for equal protection and due process, which could limit the administration's ability to implement some of its proposed changes [9].

State and Local Responses. State and local education leaders are already beginning to respond to the proposed federal changes by developing contingency plans and seeking alternative funding sources. Some states are considering increasing their own education funding to offset potential federal cuts, while others are exploring regional partnerships and innovative approaches to addressing common challenges. The variation in state responses is likely to increase educational inequality between states, as states with stronger fiscal capacity and political commitment to education funding will be better positioned to maintain or improve services, while states with limited resources may see significant reductions in educational opportunities. Local school districts are also adapting to the changing federal landscape by diversifying their funding sources, building stronger community partnerships, and developing more flexible approaches to educational programming. However, the ability of local districts to respond effectively varies significantly based on their resources, capacity, and local political support [2].

Long-term Implications for American Education. The policy changes during the 2017 – 2025 period, and particularly the dramatic proposals of the current administration, could have far-reaching implications for the structure and governance of American education. If the Department of Education is eliminated or significantly restructured, it would represent the most significant change in federal education policy since the department's creation in 1979. These changes could lead to increased variation in educational opportunities and outcomes between states, as federal

programs that currently provide some level of national consistency are reduced or eliminated. This could result in a more fragmented educational system, with significant differences in student rights, teacher qualifications, curriculum standards, and available resources depending on where students live.

The long-term effectiveness of these changes will depend largely on how states and local communities respond to increased responsibility and reduced federal oversight. Some states may thrive with increased flexibility and reduced federal requirements, while others may struggle to maintain educational quality and equity without federal support and oversight [18].

Conclusions and further research prospects. The period from 2017 to 2025 represents a time of unprecedented change and upheaval in American education policy. From the deregulatory approach of Trump's first term through the massive federal investment of the Biden years to the structural reform proposals of Trump's return, this period has demonstrated the profound impact that federal policy can have on American education. The dramatic policy swings between administrations have created significant uncertainty for educators, students, and families, while highlighting fundamental disagreements about the appropriate federal role in education. These disagreements reflect deeper philosophical differences about government's role in addressing inequality, protecting civil rights, and ensuring educational opportunity for all students.

The current administration's proposals to eliminate or dramatically restructure the Department of Education represent the most significant potential change to federal education policy in generations. While the full implementation of these proposals faces significant legal, political, and practical challenges, their very proposal signals a potential paradigm shift in how Americans think about the federal government's role in education.

The ultimate success or failure of these policy approaches will be measured not by their political popularity or ideological consistency, but by their impact on student learning, educational equity, and the preparation of young Americans for citizenship and career success in the 21st century. As this period of dramatic change continues to unfold, the stakes for American education – and American democracy – could not be higher.

The lessons learned during this tumultuous period should inform future policy development regardless of which party controls the federal government. The importance of policy stability, stakeholder engagement, evidence-based decision making, and attention to implementation challenges has been demonstrated repeatedly. Most importantly, the experiences of the past eight years underscore the critical importance of maintaining focus on the ultimate goal of education policy: ensuring that all American students have access to the high-quality education they need to succeed in life and contribute to their communities and country.

LITERATURE

1. Brookings Institution. Education Policy through Executive Action: Comparing the Biden and Trump Presidencies. June 24, 2023. URL: <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/education-policy-through-executive-action-comparing-the-biden-and-trump-presidencies/> (dostęp: 16.03.2025).
2. Chalkbeat New York. NYC Schools Stand to Lose \$2 Billion in Federal Funding under Trump Administration's DEI Threats. April 3, 2025. URL: <https://www.chalkbeat.org/newyork/2025/04/03/nyc-public-school-funding-trump-dei-threats/> (dostęp: 16.04.2025).
3. Fuhrman, Susan H., and Marvin Lazerson. *The Public Schools*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005. P. 289-314.
4. *Harvard Magazine*. The Trump Administration's Impact on Higher Education. April 2025. URL: <https://www.harvardmagazine.com/2025/05/harvard-trump-federal-funding-education-diversity-speech> (dostęp: 16.03.2025).
5. Henig, Jeffrey R. *The End of Exceptionalism in American Education: The Changing Politics of School Reform*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2013. P. 145-172.
6. Hess, Frederick M., ed., *When Research Matters: How Scholarship Influences Education Policy*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2008. P. 234-267.
7. Kirst, Michael W., and Christopher Mazzeo. The Rise, Fall, and Rise of State Assessment in California: 1993-2004. In *Brookings Papers on Education Policy: 2007*, ed. Tom Loveless, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2007. P. 319-343.
8. Learning Policy Institute. An Unparalleled Investment in U.S. Public Education: Analysis of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021. June 7, 2022. URL: <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/blog/covid-analysis-american-rescue-plan-act-2021> (dostęp: 24.03.2025).
9. Lieberman, Mark. How Trump's Policies Could Affect Special Education, November 18, 2024. URL: <https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/how-trumps-policies-could-affect-special-education/2024/11> (dostęp: 24.03.2025).
10. Manna, Paul, *School's In: Federalism and the National Education Agenda*, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2006. P. 142-156.
11. Manna, Paul, and Patrick McGuinn, eds., *Education Governance for the Twenty-First Century: Overcoming the Structural Barriers to School Reform*, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2013. P. 78-104.
12. McGuinn, Patrick J., *No Child Left Behind and the Transformation of Federal Education Policy, 1965-2005*, Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006. P. 87-92.
13. McGuinn, Patrick. Education Policy Trump Style: The Administrative Presidency and Deference to States in ESSA Implementation. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*. 50, No. 3, 2020: 423-448. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjaa012>. (dostęp: 28.03.2025).
14. McGuinn, Patrick. From No Child Left Behind to the Every Student Succeeds Act: Federalism and the Education Legacy of the Obama Administration. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 46, No. 3, 2016. P. 392-415.
15. Nature. How Trump's attack on universities is putting research in peril. June 2025. URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-025-01289-4> (dostęp: 05.03.2025).
16. NPR. Trump's Budget Includes 15% Funding Cut to Education Department. June 2, 2025. URL: <https://www.npr.org/2025/06/02/nx-s1-5420677/trump-budget-education-department-financial-aid> (dostęp: 10.04.2025).
17. ProPublica. Department of Education Halts Thousands of Civil Rights Investigations. February 14, 2025. URL: <https://www.propublica.org/article/department-of-education-civil-rights-office-investigations> (dostęp: 07.03.2025).

18. Reuters. U.S. Judge Blocks Trump Administration Plan to Cut Education Department. May 22, 2025. URL: <https://www.reuters.com/world/us/us-judge-blocks-trump-administration-plan-cut-education-department-2025-05-22/> (dostęp: 05.03.2025).

19. Schultz, Brooke. Here Are Trump's First-Week Actions That Could Affect Schools. January 24, 2025. URL: <https://www.edweek.org/policy-politics/here-are-trumps-first-week-actions-that-could-affect-schools/2025/01>

20. TIME. Betsy DeVos: The Biggest Controversies From Her First Year. December 14, 2017. URL: <https://time.com/5053007/betsy-devos-education-secretary-2017-controversies/> (dostęp: 05.04.2025).

21. TIME. Trump Administration Fires 13 Members of Key Education Research Board, Citing «Partisan Influence». June 2025. URL: <https://time.com/7291039/trump-administration-fires-education-research-board/> (dostęp: 10.04.2025).

REFERENCES

1. Brookings Institution. Education Policy through Executive Action: Comparing the Biden and Trump Presidencies. June 24, 2023. URL: <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/education-policy-through-executive-action-comparing-the-biden-and-trump-presidencies/> (dostęp: 16.03.2025).

2. Chalkbeat New York. NYC Schools Stand to Lose \$2 Billion in Federal Funding under Trump Administration's DEI Threats. April 3, 2025. URL: <https://www.chalkbeat.org/newyork/2025/04/03/nyc-public-school-funding-trump-dei-threats/> (dostęp: 16.04.2025).

3. Fuhrman, Susan H., and Marvin Lazerson. *The Public Schools*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005. P. 289-314.

4. *Harvard Magazine*. The Trump Administration's Impact on Higher Education. April 2025. URL: <https://www.harvardmagazine.com/2025/05/harvard-trump-federal-funding-education-diversity-speech> (dostęp: 16.03.2025).

5. Henig, Jeffrey R. *The End of Exceptionalism in American Education: The Changing Politics of School Reform*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2013. P. 145-172.

6. Hess, Frederick M., ed., *When Research Matters: How Scholarship Influences Education Policy*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2008. P. 234-267.

7. Kirst, Michael W., and Christopher Mazzeo. *The Rise, Fall, and Rise of State Assessment in California: 1993-2004*. In *Brookings Papers on Education Policy: 2007*, ed. Tom Loveless, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2007. P. 319-343.

8. Learning Policy Institute. *An Unparalleled Investment in U.S. Public Education: Analysis of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021*. June 7, 2022. URL: <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/blog/covid-analysis-american-rescue-plan-act-2021> (dostęp: 24.03.2025).

9. Lieberman, Mark. *How Trump's Policies Could Affect Special Education*, November 18, 2024. URL: <https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/how-trumps-policies-could-affect-special-education/2024/11> (dostęp: 24.03.2025).

10. Manna, Paul, *School's In: Federalism and the National Education Agenda*, Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2006. P. 142-156.

11. Manna, Paul, and Patrick McGuinn, eds., *Education Governance for the Twenty-First Century: Overcoming the Structural Barriers to School Reform*, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2013. P. 78-104.

12. McGuinn, Patrick J., *No Child Left Behind and the Transformation of Federal Education Policy, 1965-2005*, Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006. P. 87-92.

13. McGuinn, Patrick. Education Policy Trump Style: The Administrative Presidency and Deference to States in ESSA Implementation. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*. 50, No. 3, 2020: 423-448. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjaa012>. (dostęp: 28.03.2025).
14. McGuinn, Patrick. From No Child Left Behind to the Every Student Succeeds Act: Federalism and the Education Legacy of the Obama Administration. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 46, No. 3, 2016. P. 392-415.
15. Nature. How Trump's attack on universities is putting research in peril. June 2025. URL: <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-025-01289-4> (dostęp: 05.03.2025).
16. NPR. Trump's Budget Includes 15% Funding Cut to Education Department. June 2, 2025. URL: <https://www.npr.org/2025/06/02/nx-s1-5420677/trump-budget-education-department-financial-aid> (dostęp: 10.04.2025).
17. ProPublica. Department of Education Halts Thousands of Civil Rights Investigations. February 14, 2025. URL: <https://www.propublica.org/article/department-of-education-civil-rights-office-investigations> (dostęp: 07.03.2025).
18. Reuters. U.S. Judge Blocks Trump Administration Plan to Cut Education Department. May 22, 2025. URL: <https://www.reuters.com/world/us/us-judge-blocks-trump-administration-plan-gut-education-department-2025-05-22/> (dostęp: 05.03.2025).
19. Schultz, Brooke. Here Are Trump's First-Week Actions That Could Affect Schools. January 24, 2025. URL: <https://www.edweek.org/policy-politics/here-are-trumps-first-week-actions-that-could-affect-schools/2025/01>
20. TIME. Betsy DeVos: The Biggest Controversies From Her First Year. December 14, 2017. URL: <https://time.com/5053007/betsy-devos-education-secretary-2017-controversies/> (dostęp: 05.04.2025).
21. TIME. Trump Administration Fires 13 Members of Key Education Research Board, Citing «Partisan Influence». June 2025. URL: <https://time.com/7291039/trump-administration-fires-education-research-board/> (dostęp: 10.04.2025).

ОСВІТНЯ ПОЛІТИКА США У 2017-2025 РОКАХ: ВІД ДЕРЕГУЛЯЦІЇ ДО ОНОВЛЕННЯ ТА РЕФОРМИ

Роман Симон АНДРОЩУК

Люблінський католицький університет імені Івана Павла II,
студент другого курсу магістратури, спеціальність міжнародні відносини,
м. Люблін, Республіка Польща
ORCID: 0009-0009-4771-8240
e-mail: irenandro@gmail.com

Анотація. Період з 2017 по 2025 рік є одним із найдинамічніших і найбільш поляризованих в історії освітньої політики США, що характеризується значними змінами у федеральних пріоритетах протягом трьох президентських адміністрацій. Адміністрація Трампа (2017–2021) наголошувала на дерегуляції, виборі школи та зменшенні федерального нагляду, що супроводжувалося значним скороченням захисту громадянських прав та регулювання вищої освіти. Адміністрація Байдена (2021–2025) скасувала багато з цих політик, прагнучи відновлення після пандемії за допомогою історичних федеральних інвестицій, посилення ініціатив щодо забезпечення рівності та підтвердження федерального лідерства. Повернення Трампа в 2025 році спричинило поновлення тиску на вибір школи, глибокі скорочення бюджету та пропозицію про ліквідацію Міністерства освіти. У цій статті аналізується, як ці зміни в політиці вплинули на управління освітою, рівність, фінансування

та підзвітність, з особливою увагою до їхнього впливу на вразливі групи студентів, відносини між федеральним урядом і штатами та довгострокові системні результати. Незважаючи на коливання в політиці, суспільні виклики, такі як нестача вчителів, психічне здоров'я студентів та стійкі проблеми щодо рівня знань студентів, залишаються важливими. Аналізований у розвідці період ілюструє тривалу дискусію про роль федерального уряду в освіті та її наслідки для американських студентів і громад.

Ключові слова: освітня політика США, адміністрація Трампа, адміністрація Байдена, дерегуляція, вибір школи, Міністерство освіти, федеральні інвестиції, рівність, COVID-19, Закон про успіх кожного учня (ESSA), списання боргів студентів, спеціальна освіта, громадянські права, нестача вчителів, реформа акредитації, Проєкт 2025, відносини між федеральним урядом і штатами, управління освітою.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 17.04.2025 р