Introduction

In 1954, the Supreme Court ruled in *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education* that schools in the United States needed to desegregate and begin integration. The decision was a radical departure from the facilities argument initially presented. More importantly, the *Brown* decision highlighted that the segregation of Black students was having a detrimental effect on their self-concept. Over 60 years later, many scholars argue that integration, as well as the desegregation work, has not been sustained (Ashenfelter et al., 2005; Orfield and Frankenberg, 2014); in fact, a 2014 Civil Rights Project report highlights that Black, Latino, and Native American students are less integrated with White and Asian students today than in 1954 (Orfield & Frankenberg, 2014). For example,

> in a classroom of 30 students, the classmates of the typical White student would include 22 Whites, 2 Blacks, 4 Latinos, 1 Asian and 1 "other" . . . the typical Black or Latino student would have 8 White classmates and at least 20 Black and/or Latino classmates. (p. 12)

Despite this reverse movement in integration, the *Brown v. Topeka Board of Education* decision did set forth another integration project—the integration of White practitioners with Black, Latino, and Native American student populations. Research on the Black teaching force highlights that approximately 38,000 Black teachers were laid off or demoted between 1954 and 1965 (Ethridge, 1979; Holmes, 1990). The implications of this change were twofold: (1) as schools with Black children were viewed as inferior, so were their teachers, which limited the opportunities for them to be hired in White schools, and (2) this change meant Black children and their parents would be entrusting Whites who previously were legally able to live, work, and socialize separately from Blacks. The questions and concerns raised by this historical context include: What are the ways in which this integration affected the educational progress of Black, Latino, and Native American children? How do we equip school leaders with an understanding of the integration project?

This book explores the integration project that has involved social interactions occurring in school environments among racial and ethnic groups with conflicting understandings and experiences of race, ethnicity, gender, and other social identities. Of particular interest is how those

Copyright Corwin 2017

understandings and experiences are translated by practitioners into a range of bias-based beliefs premised on these social identities: beliefs such as deficit thinking, colorblindness, and poverty disciplining. And this book is intended to provide for practitioners, specifically leaders, the opportunity to reconstruct the integration project so that it is based on positive understandings of social identities.

CHANGING LANDSCAPE OF TEACHING FORCE AND ITS EFFECT ON DISPROPORTIONALITY

Over the last 60 years, the proportion of White females teaching Black, Latino, and Native American students has increased; the female teacher force grew from 69% in 1986 to 84% in 2011, and from 2004 to 2011, the rate of White teachers has stayed consistent from 83.1% to 81.9%, respectively (National Center on Education Statistics [NCES], 2004, 2011). Additionally, in 2011, among the teaching population, 36% had 10 to 20 years of experience, while 21% had more than 20 years of experience. Among principals in K–12 settings, as recent as 2011–2012, 80% were non-Hispanic White, 10% Black or African American, 7% Hispanic/Latino, and 3% other. In addition, 52% were female and 48% male (Bitterman, Goldring, & Gray, 2013). Meanwhile, the public school enrollment grew decidedly Black and Latino; as of 2011, these two populations comprise 40% of enrollment and are projected to be the majority by 2020 (NCES, 2004, 2011). Furthermore, Black and Latino students specifically are primarily attending schools with only Black and Latino students (NCES, 2004, 2011). These trends demonstrate that White and female teachers are the primary teaching force for Black and Latino children, and a question that needs to be raised is, what are the outcomes of this integration?

The correlated effect of this integration project is noted in research on the achievement and opportunity gap, and disproportionality in special education, gifted/AP/honors programs, and suspension and behavioral referrals. Disproportionality is the over- and underrepresentation of racial/ethnic minority in relation to their overall enrollment (Ahram, Fergus, & Noguera, 2011). Although rates in disproportionality range across the United States, there is a common pattern.

Special Education Classification

In 2011–2012, nationally among the slightly more than 50 million students enrolled in public schools, the racial/ethnic enrollment was the following: White 51.7%, Hispanic 23.7%, Black 15.8%, Asian, 4.7%, and Native American 1.1%. However, the enrollment in special education programs differed greatly from these national patterns. Among the roughly 6 million students with disabilities in 2011–2012, the distribution is distinct across race/ethnicity and gender groups (see Table I.1). Among the students enrolled in special education, 53.1% are White, 21.3% Hispanic/Latino,

Copyright Corwin 2017

19.1% Black, 2.3% Asian, and 1.5% Native American. As expected, a larger percentage of male students are receiving special education services compared to female students, 10.6% and 5.4% respectively. Additionally, Black, White, and Native American males have the largest rates of enrollment in special education services. These patterns highlight a proportional difference between overall enrollment and special education enrollment.

Gifted/AP/Honors Enrollment

Among the roughly 3 million students enrolled in gifted and talented programs in 2011–2012, the distribution is distinct across race/ethnicity and gender groups (see Table I.2). Asian and White males and females maintain the highest proportions enrolled in gifted/talented programs, which means this population has more members enrolled in these programs. Meanwhile, the overall distribution of gifted and talented enrollment is 61% White, 17% Hispanic/Latino, 9.5% Asian, 8.8% Black, and 0.9% Native American.

Suspensions and Behavioral Referrals

Among the 2.8 million students that received at least one in-school suspension, the racial/ethnic disparity is apparent (see Table I.3). Among the population of students receiving in-school suspensions, over 50% are Black and Latino students.

Among the 3 million students receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions in 2011–2012, the pattern also shows Blacks and Latinos comprise more than 50% of the students receiving this consequence (see Table I.4). Of particular interest is the pattern of Black female students nearing 50% of all female students receiving one or more out-of-school suspensions.

Table I.1 Percentage of Students With Disabilities in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, by Race/Ethnicity and Gender (2011–2012)

	Male	Female	Overall
White	13.3	7.1	53.1
Black	13.5	6.6	19.1
Hispanic/Latino	5.0	2.2	21.3
Asian	2.5	.8	2.3
Native American	9.5	4.6	1.5
English language learner	2.2	0*	9.3
Total	10.6	5.4	

*The numbers are too small and thus are suppressed, and percentage cannot be calculated.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Civil Rights Data Collection (2011–2012)

Copyright Corwin 2017

Table I.2 Percentage of Gifted and Talented Students in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, by Race/Ethnicity and Gender (2011–2012)

	Male	Female	Overall
White	7.3	7.8	60.8
Black	3.2	4.2	8.8
Hispanic/Latino	4.5	4.8	16.9
Asian	13.0	13.9	9.5
Native American	5.7	6.3	0.9
English language learner	1.9	2.0	2.7
Total	6.2	6.8	

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Civil Rights Data Collection (2011–2012)

Table I.3 Percentage of Students Receiving One or More In-School Suspensions in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, by Race/Ethnicity and Gender (2011–2012)

	Male	Female	Overall
White	41.8	35.2	41.3
Black	29.4	35.8	31.2
Hispanic/Latino	22.9	23.1	22.6
Asian	1.4	1.0	1.0
Native American	1.3	1.5	1.3

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Civil Rights Data Collection (2011–2012)

Table I.4 Percentage of Students Receiving One or More Out-of-School Suspensions in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, by Race/Ethnicity and Gender (2011–2012)

	Male	Female	Overall
White	36.9	29.1	34.5
Black	35.4	44.7	38.2
Hispanic/Latino	22.3	21.2	21.9
Asian	1.2	0.8	1.1
Native American	1.4	1.5	1.4

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Civil Rights Data Collection (2011–2012)

Copyright Corwin 2017

The research on disproportionality provides a range of factors affecting this outcome. For instance, one line of inquiry focuses on the types of student-level demographic and school-level factors that are predictive of the presence and intensity of disproportionality in special education and suspension. For instance, Beck and Muschkin (2012) identify student-level demographic factors (i.e., gender, race, parent educational level, eligibility for free or reduced lunch program) as explanatory variables of disciplinary infractions. Additionally, they cite that academic differences comprise the largest racial difference contributing to behavioral infractions. Sullivan et al. (2013) also identify a similar pattern between student-level demographic factors and discipline infractions. Moreover, Bryan et al. (2012) identify students' race, gender, and teachers' postsecondary expectations as predictors of behavioral referrals. Also, Skiba et al. (2014) in a multilevel modeling approach identify the varying influence of infraction type, individual-, and school-level characteristics in out-of-school suspensions (OSS). The most salient findings include those that show that schools with higher proportions of Black students contribute to OSS and that systemic school level variables are more important in determining Black overrepresentation in suspension. Additional research on exploring the nature of the problem has also situated its association with the juvenile justice system. The Council of State Government Justice Center report (Fabelo et al., 2012) highlights through an extensive multivariate regression analysis the effect of school- and student-level social demographic variables, and the trajectory of the most vulnerable population, which based on their analysis are Black males with Individual Education Plans (IEPs). Other research on this school and juvenile justice connection supports this conclusion (Nicholson-Crotty, Birchmeier, & Valentine, 2009).

Another line of research focuses on the documentation of district- and/or school-level educational practices and policies that are "feeding the problem." Understanding disproportionality as an educational practice or phenomenon that is not occurring by chance, this line of research has robustly engaged the ways in which the adequacy and inadequacy of practice can affect disproportionality rates. This research outlines the following practices that involve various systems (i.e., procedures, guidelines) as interacting with rates of disproportionality: limited interventions, procedures, and teams for implementing these interventions (Gravois & Rosenfield, 2006), differential implementation of referral processes (Harry & Klingner, 2006); inappropriate approaches to behavior management (Milner, 2006; Skiba et al., 1997; Weinstein et al., 2003); inadequate framing of zero tolerance and other behavior management policies (Noguera, 2003; Skiba et al., 2002); and problematic beliefs about poverty, race, and learning (Skiba et al., 2006). In sum, these various lines of research provide a textured documentation of school processes as flawed, the outcome pattern of disproportionality ever-present, and race as a predictive variable. In fact, these various forms of disproportionality highlight an outcome that comes from century-old beliefs about Black, Latino, and Native American populations—that is, these groups have limited

Copyright Corwin 2017

cognitive ability, and aggressive and disruptive behaviors (Annamma et al., 2013). And the concern about these beliefs is how do we remove them from our day-to-day interactions of teaching, organizing schools, and supporting students. In the aggregate, this formula of bias-based beliefs, structures, and outcomes narrows the educational landscape of opportunity for racial/ethnic minority students.

My stating these patterns does not suggest the demographic pattern is *the inherent* problem, but rather, the pattern suggests a major question we need to explore as educational practitioners: Have we cultivated the tools for this integration project? I argue our inadequate preparation of practitioners for the current integration project has caused our disproportionality. And while teacher preparation programs decide on how to integrate pedagogy, methodology, and educational beliefs as central to training, I view school and district leaders as poised to do this work. In this book, I will describe how leaders need to understand the complexity of the disproportionality problem, how it stems from our personal and societal integration projects, and how bias-based beliefs need to be changed in order to improve the integration project. Finally, the book will provide a myriad of activities for leading the integration project and data strategies for monitoring whether it is shifting the patterns of disproportionality.

THE BACKDROP OF THE INTEGRATION PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Education in its broadest form and schooling specifically has always been a space in which I have excelled in understanding its content and purpose, but struggled with the social dynamics that made it unsafe. In particular, my own experiences of being othered by practitioners culturally different than myself raised concerns many times whether school was a culturally safe environment.

As a 2nd- or 1.5-generation Black Latino, my schooling and immigrant adaptation experiences have been closely connected. The soundtrack to my life has always been, "How can you be Black and speak Spanish?" This comment has become synonymous with reductionist behavior in the United States. In the United States and other Western hemisphere countries, racial categories are prescribed with specific markers that include skin color, language, cultural attributes, hair texture, and so on. It is these markers that satisfy our need to categorize individuals in order to determine the ways in which to engage them. However, what happens when we encounter in the same person two markers generally ascribed to different racial/ethnic groups? For example, Chinese individuals who speak Spanish and identify as Chino-Latino; East Indians who identify as Guyanese or Jamaican; and Blacks who speak Spanish and identify as Mexican? In these instances, we experience a dissonance between our self-constructed racial world and this new body. How do we situate ourselves?

Copyright Corwin 2017

In 1983, I arrived to the United States as a 9-year-old worried about accommodating to a new context without my extended family. My first schooling encounter involved my third-grade teacher, who asked my name on the first day, and I replied "Eduar" (officially my English translated birth certificate says "Edward," but my entire family has always called me "Eduar" or "Eduardo." My third-grade teacher replied, "No, I won't call you that; you can choose either Eddie or Ed." Before coming to the United States, I watched a lot of American television, which I credit for helping me to understand American cultural cues and language; one of the many shows I saw was Mr. Ed, the talking horse. Thus, at that moment in third grade, my teacher was asking me whether I wanted to be named after a horse, and of course I chose Eddie. Since that moment, I have recognized the power others have in naming who you are because of how they elect to situate your racial and ethnic identification and the extent to which they are willing to be responsive. To this day, I am Eddie to most of the English-speaking world and Eduar/Eduardo to my family and friends.

Between the 8th and 12th grades, I was the only Latino in my Spanish classes, and I was affectionately renamed "Platanos." However, outside that class, I was reclassified as evidenced by one 10th grade teacher's comment, "You're such a smart Black kid." This racial affiliation continued into 11th grade, as indicated by my White social studies teacher's comment: "I'm recommending you to AP history, you're a smart enough Black kid." Again, when I was an undergraduate student, a faculty member stated, "I enjoy having you in class because you don't make us feel bad when we talk about race." Another time, a White economics professor stated while talking about Detroit, "Aren't you from Detroit?"; meanwhile, neither I nor the only other Black student in the class (and department) was from Detroit. Finally, in graduate school, a White faculty member asked, "How can you be Black and speak Spanish?" Though these experiences reflect my own lived reality, I know they are widely shared and continuously present in K–12 environments. These moments represent the encounters that emerge from an integration project that is not fully articulated by educational policy reforms, much less practitioners.

ORGANIZATION OF THE BOOK

The work of developing a plan for this integration project requires three levels of leadership capacity: (1) understanding of bias-based beliefs in educational practice; (2) inquiry and interpretation skills to examine and monitor the reduction of these beliefs in school improvements; and (3) leadership skills to translate such understandings into progressive, equity-driven reform. Such leadership capacity is necessary for ensuring equity, as is discussed later in this book, because it entails numerical goals, social justice goals (i.e., access and opportunity), and cultural and belief goals. Our integration project is one of the more significant adaptive work (Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009) that occurs in the schooling context. As

Copyright Corwin 2017

such, this book is organized to assist leaders in harnessing an understanding of the more complex dimensions of this adaptive work, which is peppered by bias-based beliefs about culture and race and which necessitates adaptive strategies to systematically replace these beliefs.

The book is organized into three strands of targeted work: (1) root cause analysis of disproportionality; (2) policy and process reform; and (3) culture and belief reform. Chapters 1 through 3 focus on building the internal capacity of leaders to understand the integration project and their skill set to do the work. Chapters 4 and 5 focus on the external capacity that leaders need to maintain to create a positive integration project. The Road Map reflects a visual for leaders of that external capacity work. Chapters 1 and 2 provide a clear understanding of bias-based beliefs and how they appear in educational practice. In Chapter 1, I frame the details of how the demographic shifts in student enrollment by race and ethnicity as well as the teacher and principal workforce alignment with each other. And in Chapter 2, I focus on explaining the three types of bias-based beliefs that operate within our current integration project. In this chapter, I list various examples to provide leaders an opportunity to practice understanding how these bias-based beliefs appear in educational practice.

In Chapters 3, 4, and 5, the focus is on building the skills capacity of leaders to manage a more intentional integration project. This process begins in Chapter 3 with building inquiry and interpretation skills among leaders. It is important for leaders to develop a core inquiry for why disproportionality is a relevant conversation at their school or in their district. Simultaneously, this involves them being able to know it and make the right interpretations. Chapter 4 provides a detailed process for leaders to conduct a root cause analysis of their disproportionality problem. This chapter provides lots of tools for analysis, as well as the manner in which to develop a long-term remedy plan. At the end of Chapters 3 and 4, leaders should be clear on how to do a root cause analysis, have a determination of the policy and practice reform to reach equitable outcomes, and have clarity on the bias-based beliefs that need to be reduced to meet those outcomes. Finally, Chapter 5 provides leaders with a sequence of activities which tackle the toughest questions about the integration project: *How do we change practitioners' beliefs?* The aggregate of these chapters will provide leaders with a depth of understanding the complexity of race, culture, ethnicity, and difference, and how they seep into the beliefs that set the stage for our disproportionality problem.

Copyright Corwin 2017