

Got Equity? Educational Leaders' Descriptions of Enacting Equitable Practices

Mollie Galloway¹
Ann Ishimaru²
Rob Larson³
Carolyn Carr¹

In recent years, national organizations, researchers, and practitioners have called for placing issues of equity at the center of training and practice for educational leaders (Brown, 2004; Larson & Murtadha, 2002; Marshall, 2004; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003). More specifically, these calls stress that the field must prepare leaders who are capable and willing to address the persistent opportunity gaps that pervade our educational system and continue to marginalize students of color and under-represented groups (see Brown, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2010). Still, the practice of leadership for equity has gone largely under-studied. Moreover, educators struggle to have open, deep, and specific conversations about race (Pollack, 2008); and educational leaders report they lack the specific training or tools to address racial conflict, build community among diverse groups, or lead for social justice (Henze, Katz, Norte, Sather, & Walker, 2002; Theoharis, 2007). How then, can we develop leaders who are culturally competent? What does “equitable practice” look like on the ground, and how do we measure it? This paper provides a first step in answering these questions.

Using the Leadership for Equity Assessment & Development (LEAD) tool being devised through the Oregon Leadership Network (a leadership network of state educational agencies, school districts, higher education, and non-profit organizations), the purpose of our study was: (1) to examine how educational leaders rate themselves on two rubrics designed to measure leadership behaviors for equity, and (2) to understand how educational leaders describe the kinds of equitable

¹ Graduate School of Education and Counseling, Lewis & Clark

² Education Northwest and College of Education, University of Washington

³ Education Northwest

*Please address all correspondence regarding the paper to Mollie Galloway, Educational Leadership Department, Lewis & Clark; 503-768-6130; galloway@lclark.edu

(or inequitable) practices they use in their day-to-day work. Two research questions guided this work:

1. How do Oregon educational leaders rate themselves in their equity practices?
2. How does educational leaders' evidence of equitable practice align with their self-assessed rating?

We invited a group of 180 practicing administrators, teacher-leaders, and state and higher education leaders to complete part of the LEAD tool, a set of rubrics tied to the Oregon state standards that guide licensure of aspiring and practicing PK-12 administrators. These standards are based upon the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards and include: 1. Visionary Leadership, 2. Instructional Improvement, 3. Effective Management, 4. Inclusive Practice, 5. Ethical Leadership, and 6. Sociopolitical Context. However, the Oregon licensure standards are also unique in that each standard embeds cultural competence as part of state licensure using the following definition:

“Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge, ability, and cultural competence to improve learning and achievement to ensure success of all students...” (TSPC, 2005).

In this paper we first share the tool's history and the theoretical framework that guides its development. Next, we share the alignment study that is the focus of the present paper. This study is one in a series of research studies we are conducting to revise and validate the tool. It also provides a first look at how educational leaders (those in a network designed to focus on equity) rate and describe their equitable practice. Finally, we describe how the study's findings have led to changes in the tool and discuss implications of our findings for the state of the field.

LEAD Tool Background

The LEAD tool has a long history of development. In 2007, guided by the OLN, a group of 250 practitioners, higher education leadership faculty, state policy-makers and OLN-affiliated

educators gathered to identify equitable leadership behaviors and activities in each element of the six standards along a continuum (beginning, emerging, proficient, exemplary). They were charged with answering the question: What would leadership for equity look like in practice? The markers they devised were the basis of the first draft of the LEAD tool.

Theoretical Framework

In January 2010 (again initiated by the OLN), a group of four scholars (this paper's authors), began a process to revise the tool. Our aim was both to maintain the practitioner-driven lens that allowed the tool's original content to emerge from work on the ground, and to apply a robust theoretical framework to situate the tool in broader academic discussions and understandings of equity and equitable practice.

To revise the tool, we have drawn primarily upon an equity framework presented by Gutierrez and Jaramillo (2006). These and other scholars (see Bell, 2004; Gotanda, 2004) argue that the landmark decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* has done little to examine or counter the sociopolitical and historical belief and practices that maintain ideologies of white supremacy and racism in this country. Crosland (as cited in Gutierrez & Jaramillo, 2006) contends that an "equity-minded agenda" must be distinguished from "one that considers equal opportunity as the single organizing principle of reform" (p. 174). Instead, Gutierrez and Jaramillo (2006) propose "an accountability framework that begins to dismantle inequality and ensures that educational reform and its instantiations in practice are organized around robust learning practices that are simultaneously race conscious and equity-oriented" (p. 174). They argue against the belief that creating "sameness" means achieving fairness, because practices using this principle often fail to address the structures that created and sustain inequities in the first place. By failing to situate decisions in broader the social, historical and political context, the authors argue that whites – the dominant subject-position, rather than the racial category - remain able to maintain their

“innocence” (a concept they take from Gotanda, 2004). Using this framework, we have designed our tool to help leaders move from maintaining the status quo or thinking of equity as sameness to collaborating with traditionally marginalized communities in order to challenge and change dominant beliefs and practices that continue to uphold white supremacist ideologies and further achievement, learning, and opportunity gaps for non-dominant students and communities.

In addition, we draw from the work of numerous scholars including to provide content for the tool (in addition to the tool’s original practitioner content); for example, Bell’s (2004) work indicating that equity is best achieved through policies and practices that equalize disparities in resources and provide equitable representation in governing bodies; CampbellJones, CampbellJones and Lindsey’s (2010) recommendation to embed multicultural content in learning and Ladson-Billings (1994) work on culturally responsive teaching; and Gutierrez & Jaramillo’s argument for “the use of students’ complete linguistic, sociocultural, and academic repertoires in learning processes and events” (Gutierrez & Jaramillo, 2006, p. 180), just to name a few.

Method

Participant

Attendees at the 2010 OLN Institute completed an alignment study for Standards 1 and 2 (Visionary Leadership for Equity and Instructional Improvement for Equity). Though we had 180 total participants, we focus here on those who were current practicing administrators (defined as Principals, Assistant Principals, Superintendents, or Central Office Administrators). In total, we had 114 practicing administrators (54.3% were principals or APs, 36.0% were central office administrators, and 9.60% were superintendents). Participants had varying years of experience ranging from being in their first year to 34 years experience ($M=11.13$, $SD=6.91$). More than half (56%) of participants were female, and the majority (75%) responded to our question on participant race and/or ethnicity by selecting White/European American (frequency for other responses

included: 8.8% Hispanic/Latino(a), 5.3% African American, 2.6% Asian, 1.8% Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 2.6% who reported a combination of White and either Asian, Hispanic, or Native American, and 1.8% who elected not to respond).

Alignment Study Tool and Analysis

Study participants were randomly assigned to complete the rubric for either Standard 1: Visionary Leadership for Equity (which includes four elements: vision content for equity, vision development for equity, vision implementation for equity and vision assessment for equity), or Standard 2: Instructional Improvement for Equity (which includes eight elements such as: school culture, culturally responsive instruction, and staff-wide professional development). Fifty-nine practicing administrators completed Standard 1 and fifty-five participants completed Standard 2.

We asked participants to rate themselves from unsatisfactory to exemplary on the elements of their standard (note here the change from the original tool's "beginning" rating language to the use of "unsatisfactory" for the lowest level on the continuum. We made this change aligned with Lindsey and CampbellJones et al.'s argument that leader behaviors and practices upholding the status quo are proactively destructive (CampbellJones et al., 2010; Lindsey, Robins & Terrell, 2003). Thus, a person who demonstrates behaviors aligned with this rating cannot be considered "beginning"). After selecting a rating, participants then provided supporting evidence/examples for their rating (see Appendix A for sample items and definitions of each rating). Finally, participants were asked to provide demographic data (e.g., gender, race and/or ethnicity, years of experience, role).

For our analysis, we first ran descriptive statistics on participants' ratings by standard. We then examined relationships among demographic variables and participants' ratings to determine whether relationships existed between gender, role, and years of experience (we did not have a sizeable enough sample to look at differences by race/ethnicity, though this is an important next

step). To analyze the qualitative evidence, two members of the writing team conducted line by line coding of the data, allowing concepts to emerge from the data, rather than applying predetermined codes (Charmaz, 2006). Two team members separately coded one element from Standard 1 and one element from Standard 2. We then shared our emergent codes and developed consensus in instances where we differed, developing an initial coding scheme to use with the remainder of the elements. We split the rest of the coding in half, with each of the two members taking half of Standard 1 and half of Standard 2, allowing new codes to emerge as needed. In the end, we had 19 codes.

Here, we report on the major themes that emerged as leaders identified behaviors, practices, policies, etc. that represented their level of capacity to act as leaders for equity for each element in their rubric. We also describe how well participants’ stated evidence aligned with the rating levels they selected (i.e., if a participant rated himself/herself as exemplary, was the evidence he/she then provided reflective of the rubrics’ descriptions of what it meant to be exemplary?). Finally, we indicate how the data has informed the tool’s development.

Results

Participants’ Rating of their Equitable Practice

We began our analysis with simple descriptive statistics to examine how participants rated themselves on equitable practices. Tables 1 and 2 show the percentage of leaders who rated themselves on each level of the continuum.

Table 1. Frequencies of Leader Ratings along Standard 1 Continuum

	Unsatisfactory	Emerging	Proficient	Exemplary	Not Enough Evidence	Unanswered
Vision Content	0.00%	15.3%	62.7%	15.3%	0.00%	6.80%
Vision Development	0.00%	35.6%	47.5%	5.10%	3.40%	8.50%

Vision Implementation	0.00%	22.0%	50.8%	20.3%	0.00%	0.00%
Vision Assessment	0.00%	42.4%	35.6%	11.9%	3.40%	6.80%

*n=59

Table 2. Frequencies of Leader Ratings along Standard 2 Continuum

	Unsatisfactory	Emerging	Proficient	Exemplary	Not Enough Evidence	Unanswered
School Culture	0.00%	7.30%	70.9%	18.2%	0.00%	3.60%
Eliminating Disparities	0.00%	27.3%	56.4%	14.5%	0.00%	1.80%
Rigor	0.00%	12.7%	65.5%	16.4%	3.60%	1.80%
Culturally Responsive Teaching	0.00%	63.6%	23.6%	3.60%	7.30%	1.80%
Differentiated Instruction	0.00%	41.8%	27.3%	20.0%	5.50%	5.50%
Using Data to Improve Teaching and Learning	0.00%	32.7%	38.2%	23.6%	1.80%	3.60%
Professional Growth Plans	0.00	47.3	32.7	9.10	5.50	5.50
Staff-wide Development	1.80	34.5	50.9	5.50	3.80	3.60

Overall, participants were most likely to rate themselves as proficient (proficiency gained the highest percentage of ratings for 8 of the 12 elements). There were notable exceptions. In four cases, participants were most likely to rate themselves as emerging (we found this for vision assessment, culturally-responsive teaching, differentiated instruction, and professional growth plans). Only one participant provided a rating of unsatisfactory on any element; thus, participants were much more likely to rate themselves as exemplary than unsatisfactory.

Next we were interested in examining the relationship between participants' ratings and demographic variables including gender, role and years of experience. We found no gender differences for elements in either Standard 1 or Standard 2. The overall Standard 1 mean score for males was 2.79 ($SD=.44$), and for females was 2.81, ($SD=.51$). The overall Standard 2 mean score for males was 2.88 ($SD=.41$), and for females was 2.74, ($SD=.45$).⁴ We also found no subgroup differences by role. For Standard 1: Principal/Assistant Principal overall $M=2.77$ ($SD=.46$) and Central Office Administrator overall $M=2.80$ ($SD=.46$) (only 1 superintendent completed Standard 1). For Standard 2, Principal/Assistant Principal overall $M=2.75$ ($SD=.40$), Central Office Administrator overall $M=2.92$ ($SD=.52$), and Superintendent $M=2.76$ ($SD=.42$). Using correlational analysis, we found number of years as a practicing administrator was positively associated with rating scores on only one element across the two standards, vision development for equity, $r=.30$, $p<.05$ (while this may sound counterintuitive, the new administrative licensure standards went into effect in 2005, so many long-time administrators have not been prepared under the new standards).

Analysis of Evidence and Alignment between Evidence and Participant Rating

Overall, the evidence participants used to support their practices for equity and their self-assessed ratings appeared somewhat misaligned based on the definitions of the proficiency levels used in the tool (See Appendix A). We present our four main findings below.

Finding 1: Not evidence and not unsatisfactory. We applied our “not evidence” code more than any other code in our scheme. Some participants indicated they were unable to attend to certain practices or people, though some described being in a planning stage, or recognizing the need for action. For example, participants stated:

⁴ Before calculating overall mean scores, we first ran reliability analysis to determine internal consistency in participants' responses for each standard. Reliability was robust for Standard 2, $\alpha=.85$ and modest for Standard 1, $\alpha=.67$.

- I recognize the importance of culturally responsive teaching, but have not made it a key component of my work with principals.
- [I] recognize need to plan for PD focused on equity, too many [competing interests] limit action.

Participants felt particularly unable to conduct community outreach or develop an assessment system for their vision. These were described by some as “next steps” that they had not yet taken in their equity work. For example, one participant simply reported, “I don’t have any formal systems in place to assess vision.” Another participant described vision assessment as the area in which he “[struggles] the most”. Though he has “set goals and revisited to see progress monthly, [he is] not always clear how to implement finance and measurable work.” With regard to outreach, some reported they had done work inside their school walls, but their connection with the community was lacking. One participant expressed, “I explicitly call out inequities and we create shared understanding within the org, but not yet with external stakeholders.” Another similarly indicated, “I have not sought out ELL parents and community members to develop vision. I have only sought out staff.”

We also used the “not evidence” code for those who reported lacking the particular *capacity* or set of behaviors in an element. For example, one participant openly stated, “This is an area of weakness for me. At the end of this year, I hope to have this focused and systemized.”

Though we coded many statements as “not evidence” only one participant receiving this code rated himself as unsatisfactory, and 9% selected the “not enough evidence” rating we provided. Most (72%) rated themselves as emerging, while a significant minority (16%) rated themselves as proficient and another 2.2% as exemplary. There were also a significant number of participants who rated themselves yet left the evidence section blank. While we did not include these in our code of “not evidence”, we have no way to assess whether these participants’ ratings align with their actions.

Finding 2: Beyond talk, teams, and test scores: Moving to change. Rather than rating themselves as *Unsatisfactory*, the data indicated a tendency to select *Proficient*, with participants viewing “action” as: talking about equity, being a member of a PLC or an equity or data team, having a plan or vision, or examining data. However, few indicated how these practices have led or could lead to change. For instance, respondents indicated that they were members of various teams and that they engaged in equity discussions, but these descriptions were rarely tied to particular changes in school practices, policies, decisions or outcomes. The following evidence statements highlight this finding:

- Equity, data and site council work in collaboration to discuss issues around race and student achievement.
- Equity and data teams formed and active at school (uses courageous conversation model to discuss issues and make changes)
- Member of equity leadership team for administrators, monthly PLC centered around equity work in the district. Facilitator for courageous conversations book group at central office with classified, licensed, and administrative members. Formed book group for budget committee members.

Similarly, in the area of professional development and data use, leaders indicated that they provided staff trainings focused on particular student populations, but there was not an indication of how this was tied to school change:

- Provided inservice for own department and opened trainings and PD to the entire district on systems change to address student outcomes, particularly placing subgroups, ELL, SpEd, our Hispanic population at the center of the discussion/dialogue.
- Disaggregated data, teachers with training in racial equity, and community agreements to discuss race have been embedded in this process

Finally, the existence of an equity plan or school improvement plan was considered evidence of proficiency by a number of participants, without reference to actions to eliminate inequities. For example, many participants simply provided evidence such as “district equity plan”, “CIP plans”, or “department plan reflects vision”. The majority of these participants rated themselves as “*Proficient*”.

This finding suggests that those who did not have deep understanding of the issues or actions needed (as evidenced by their statements) often rated themselves as doing enough to be proficient. Actions we would have classified as *Emerging* (e.g., just having a CIP or being on a team without reference to changes in school practices) were most frequently cited as evidence for *Proficient* or even *Exemplary*.

Finding 3: Community engagement as challenge. Though we reported on the challenges participants described with community engagement in Finding 1, community engagement warranted its own theme. Not only did participants describe lacking time, ability, etc. to reach out to the community, but they were limited in their deep engagement with the community (particularly marginalized communities) to create shared decision-making. For example:

- Engagement of teachers, instructional assistants, administrators well developed. Families and student voices are far less involved unless the parent and student have regular IEP meetings. Parent advisory groups to dialogue about issues of equity regarding race and color are less apt to happen in relation to those conversations regarding student disabilities and student access.
- The leader holds listening sessions to gather info from many stakeholder groups, but budget cuts are used as an excuse for not hiring interpreters so parents with languages other than English are not included or heard.

When participants did report on community engagement, it was often one-way (i.e., outreach), or used to gather input (though as noted in finding 2, it was not often clear how input was used to guide action). For instance, leaders indicated:

- Setting up meetings at community centers to garner input. Consistent translation of all school info to be accessible.
- Offering parenting classes, English classes and tech classes for parents.
- [Working] to bring families into the school for student assessment and parent help night, high poverty school that has high achievement.

- [Providing] school newsletters; communications go home in the language spoken in the home; translations/translators are available at school events; community outreach/support for marginalized families.

Most often educators used these practices as evidence of *Proficient* practice, but such one-way outreach is more an *Emerging* practice, according to the definitions in the tool. Those who rated themselves *Exemplary* tended not to incorporate building community capacity or engaging collaboratively with community to effect change, though this was a critical component of the *Exemplary* rating. Rather, we received evidence such as:

- Specific discussion and questions are asked of staff in teams on how a strategy, plan, assessment, etc., will accelerate student achievement for our students of color.
- All expenditures go through the filter of vision (budget aligned to vision). Required staff development and consistent long term, comprehensive PLC work each week with vision as basis. All decisions filtered through vision with specifics of the vision cited as rationale. Weekly notice to staff re vision and actions related to it.

Finding 4: Access as rigor. Many leaders described a focus on creating access to “rigorous coursework” for all students. They described providing, “Access to higher level courses without prerequisite”, “All levels of all classes [being] offered to all students”, or Removal of all barriers to rigorous classes.” The access itself was often considered by participants as *Proficient*. Some described providing support once access was open, however, participants did not describe work to make all courses rigorous (defined by the tool as *Exemplary*). Thus, leaders described making a technical change, rather than a change to address the root of the problem.

Discussion

Overall, we found a misalignment between the evidence provided by educational leaders and the ratings they selected to describe their practices for equity using the LEAD tool. The findings from this alignment study suggest the need for further refinements to the tool, which we describe in the first section below, and point to recommendations for the use of the tool in school settings. In addition, though, we argue that this misalignment also suggests potential trends in the field of

educational leadership, particularly in Oregon. In light of the literature challenging the notion that changes in thinking and beliefs precede changes in practice and behavior (Guskey, 2002), the predominant focus on efforts to change educator thinking and belief systems may suggest the need to transform approaches to leading for equity.

Tool Improvement

The misalignment between educational leaders' evidence and their ratings suggests several refinements to LEAD tool to improve its ability to reliably assess equity leadership practice. First, our findings highlight the need for clearer distinctions between the four proficiency levels, so that leaders can more readily link their evidence to the appropriate rating. In particular, this study highlighted the need to articulate the distinguishing evidence and change required to be at the proficient or exemplary levels. Subsequent refinements to the tool have included evidence statements at the proficient level focused on changes in school practices, policies, or procedures aimed at decreasing inequities. At the exemplary level, however, leaders should have evidence of decreased inequities as a result of those changes in the school (see Appendix B for examples of tool revisions).

Secondly, the evidence provided by educational leaders in this study repeatedly includes certain terms or educational jargon that can be defined in various ways. For instance, respondents consistently claimed to be looking at data in their practice, but it was not clear what data they were looking at or how they were using it to inform changes. The use of shorthand terms, like "examining data," masks potentially important differences in practice; that is, some leaders are concerned only with sub-group disaggregation of standardized state test scores as required by federal mandate, while others are focused on a wide array of data from formative and summative classroom or district assessments to student and parent climate survey and focus group data. Similarly, the terms "stakeholder" and "access" are variously interpreted based on the leader's own understanding.

Lacking an equity lens, the default notion of “stakeholder” might only include school staff, and “access” might mean only removing course pre-requisites. As Parish and Arends (1983) explain, such terms are part of a dominant school discourse that upholds the status quo and fails to recognize the systemic nature of inequities. Eubanks, Parish and Smith (1997) expand on this notion:

Words like “staff development,” “inservice,” and “school improvement” are terms that have meaning in the existing school cultures. They have invariably come to mean that people in schools can go through a process that appears to be change oriented but, in fact, has not resulted in any substantial improvement of student learning. These processes are cultural ways to maintain the status quo without appearing to be unresponsive to outside demands for improvement. (p. 3)

Such educational jargon makes a rubric challenging to create because these terms are undefined and interpreted by participant. This necessitates that we define key terms used in the rubric so they are not subject to individual interpretation, and the final version of the rubric will include hyperlinked definitions of all key terms. Beyond these changes to the tool, as we will discuss in the final section, the embedded assumptions that often accompany the use of such shorthand terms also speaks to the state of the field.

Use of the Tool in School Settings

The findings from our alignment study also suggest two implications about the use of the LEAD tool in actual school settings. First, leader self-assessments may not be a very accurate view of one’s own practice. Our analysis of the evidence leaders provided in this study suggests that their view on their practice alone is insufficient (since they rate themselves higher than their evidence suggests). A 360 degree use of the tool, in which others – teachers, parents, community members, students, supervisor – complete the assessment for the leader, might provide more reliable perceptions on which to base an assessment of one’s leadership practice.

Secondly, the lack of unsatisfactory ratings across the sample may reflect leaders’ desire to feel competent in their jobs and have a sense of self-efficacy, but another aspect of the reluctance to

select “Unsatisfactory” may also have to do with the current context of high-stakes accountability, particularly given the conversation about principal effectiveness that has recently arisen quite prominently across the country. That is, there could be consequences to leaders for not being seen as competent around issues of educational equity. Thus, the misalignment might also suggest the importance of using this tool within the context of an organizational climate focused on learning and of institutional supports for professional growth. A sense of psychological safety within an organization enables individuals to seek help and admit mistakes (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006), essential pre-requisites for professional growth within a school. The LEAD tool was never intended to be used in high-stakes decision-making, but a leader using the tool in an environment that is not intentional about creating the space and supports for professional growth would have a much greater incentive to select a self-assessed rating higher than the evidence they can produce.

State of the Field

Although the misalignment we found in this study highlights improvements to the tool, we also argue that the evidence provided by educational leaders suggests that our aspirations – as articulated by both practitioners and researchers – surpass our actions. The leaders in our sample (and again, this is a sample of leaders who have been working on issues of equity) still need additional knowledge and skills to develop a thorough understanding of what leadership for equity is about and how to practice it. This was reflected by their idea of action as participation, whereas our definition of “action” is change. We were purposeful in setting the bar of the tool high. In fact, we recognize few will be at the *Exemplary* level. At the same time, this bar is crucial if we want a tool that will identify the behaviors and practices to effectively address pervasive inequities and support leaders’ growth toward transformative change in their schools.

References

- Bell, D. (2004). *Silent covenants: Brown v. Board of Education and the unfulfilled hopes for racial reform*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, K.M. (2004). Leadership for social justice and equity: Weaving a transformative framework and pedagogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40, 77 - 108.
- CampbellJones, F., CampbellJones, B. & Lindsey, R.B (2010). *The cultural proficiency journey: Moving beyond ethical barriers to profound school change*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide Through Qualitative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Eubanks, E., Parish, R., & Smith, D. (1997). *Changing the discourse in schools*. Retrieved from: <http://www.sfcss.org/pdf/Changing%20the%20Discourse%20Eubanks%20Parish%20Smith%201997.pdf>
- Gotanda, N. (2004). Reflections on *Korematsu*, *Brown* and White innocence. *Temple Political and Civil Rights Law Review*, 13, 663.
- Guskey, T. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching*, 8 (3), 381-391.
- Gutiérrez, K., & Jaramillo, N. (2006). Looking for educational equity: The consequences of relying on Brown. In A. Ball (Ed.) *With More Deliberate Speed: Achieving Equity and Excellence in Education - Realizing the Full Potential of Brown v. Board of Education*. 2006 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Volume 105, Issue 2. (pp. 173-189). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Henze, R., Katz, A., Norte, E., Sather, S.E., & Walker, E. (2002). *Leading for diversity: How school leaders promote positive interethnic relations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Larson, C. & Murtadha, K. (2002). Leadership for social justice. In J. Murphy (Ed), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century*. NSSE Yearbook. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lindsey, R. Robins, K. & Terrell, R. (2003). *Cultural proficiency: a manual for school leaders*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Marshall, C. (2004) Social justice challenges to educational administration: Introduction to a special issue. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40, 3-13.
- Nembhard, I. & Edmondson, A. (2006). Making it safe: the effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27(7), 941-966.
- Pollock, M. (2008). An intervention in progress: Pursuing precision in school race talk. In M. Shinn & H. Yoshikawa (Eds.) *Toward positive youth development: Transforming schools and community programs* (102-114). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Scheurich, J., & Skrla, L. (2003). *Leadership for equity and excellence: Creating high achievement classrooms, schools, and districts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (2005). *Oregon administrative rules: Knowledge, skills and abilities required for initial and continuing administrator license* (584-017-0251, 584-017-0261). Salem: Oregon.
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43, 221 - 258.

Appendix A – Sample of Alignment Study Rubrics

VISION DEVELOPMENT

1.2 VISION DEVELOPMENT

UNSATISFACTORY (Allows/accepts the problem of school inequities)	EMERGING (Recognizes the problem of school inequities, beginning to examine)	PROFICIENT (Examining the problem of school inequities, seeking change)	EXEMPLARY (Taking action to institutionalize equity beyond school walls)	NOT ENOUGH Evidence/Information
The leader creates and refines the vision based primarily upon his/her own views and does not recognize the need for (or engage in) dialogue about issues of equity in the vision process. The perspectives of students, families, and communities who have been historically marginalized are not represented in the vision.	The leader engages staff in the visioning process and recognizes the need for dialogue about issues of equity in the vision process. The leader involves students, parents and community members in the development of the vision, but their involvement is inconsistent, and the leader does not proactively seek voices of those historically marginalized.	The leader engages most communities (staff, students, families) and their needs and interests in development of the vision. Issues of equity and identification of inequities are part of discussions with these communities. The leader provides opportunities for historically marginalized voices to be heard and represented and is proactive in seeking out these voices or dialogues.	The leader creates and refines the vision in collaboration with staff, students, families, and community members. Issues of equity and identification of inequities are the focus of discussions with these communities. The leader facilitates ongoing dialogue with those who have been historically marginalized in the visioning process. Their needs and interests are central to the vision.	
<input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY	<input type="checkbox"/> EMERGING	<input type="checkbox"/> PROFICIENT	<input type="checkbox"/> EXEMPLARY	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT ENOUGH

Evidence to support rating for 1.2:

Appendix A – Sample of Alignment Study Rubrics

CREATING AN EQUITABLE SCHOOL CULTURE				
UNSATISFACTORY (Allows/accepts the problem of school inequities)	EMERGING (Recognizes the problem of school inequities, beginning to examine)	PROFICIENT (Examining the problem of school inequities, seeking change)	EXEMPLARY (Taking action to institutionalize equity beyond school walls)	NOT ENOUGH Evidence/Information
Leader allows for a school culture that prioritizes the voices, values, beliefs and experiences of the dominant culture to the exclusion of the voices, values, beliefs and experiences of historically marginalized groups.	Leader recognizes that the school culture prioritizes the voices, values, beliefs and experiences of the dominant of the dominant culture, and excludes historically marginalized voices, values, beliefs and experiences. The leader does not yet advocate for a change in priorities.	Leader surfaces the exclusion of historically marginalized voices, values, beliefs and experiences in the school culture. He/she publicly advocates for the inclusion of multiple voices, values, beliefs and experiences and for change in school policies and practices.	Leader collaborates with teachers, students, families and community members to ensure inclusion of multiple voices, values, beliefs and experience. He/she ensures that historically marginalized voices, values, beliefs and experiences in the school and community are central in school policies and practices.	
<input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY	<input type="checkbox"/> EMERGING	<input type="checkbox"/> PROFICIENT	<input type="checkbox"/> EXEMPLARY	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT ENOUGH
Evidence to support rating for 2.1a:				

2.1A SCHOOL CULTURE

Appendix A – Sample of Alignment Study Rubrics

PROVIDING INCLUSIVE AND EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION				
UNSATISFACTORY (Allows/accepts the problem of school inequities)	EMERGING (Recognizes the problem of school inequities, beginning to examine)	PROFICIENT (Examining the problem of school inequities, seeking change)	EXEMPLARY (Taking action to institutionalize equity beyond school walls)	NOT ENOUGH Evidence/Information
Leader tolerates or does not recognize that students in the school have different access to rigorous content and pedagogy across courses and within classrooms. The leader provides little or no oversight over rigor within courses or classrooms.	Leader recognizes that students in the school have inequitable access to rigorous content and pedagogy across courses and within classrooms. Leader regularly monitors instruction, but does not actively confront issues.	Leader surfaces and engages staff in recognizing that students in the school have inequitable access to rigorous content and pedagogy across courses and within classrooms. She/he fosters teacher capacity to address inequities.	Leader surfaces, addresses and collaborates with staff, families, and district or other leaders to institutionalize systems, policies and practices for ensuring equitable access to rigorous content and pedagogy for all students across all courses and within all classrooms.	
<input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY	<input type="checkbox"/> EMERGING	<input type="checkbox"/> PROFICIENT	<input type="checkbox"/> EXEMPLARY	<input type="checkbox"/> NOT ENOUGH
Evidence to support rating for 2.2a:				

2.2A RIGOR

Appendix B – Sample of Current LEAD Tool Rubrics

VISION DEVELOPMENT

1.2 VISION DEVELOPMENT

UNSATISFACTORY (Takes no action or limited action to address inequities)	EMERGING (Begins to examine, plan, and initiate actions to address inequities)	PROFICIENT (Takes consistent action for change in school policies and practices for equity)	EXEMPLARY (Institutionalizes school policies and practices for equity and has evidence of more equitable student outcomes)
The leader develops a vision based primarily on his/her own views without acknowledging the need for dialogue about equity or seeking outside input. Few stakeholders know about the vision or feel ownership of it.	The leader acknowledges the need for dialogue about equity and involves staff in the visioning process. The leader has evidence that staff members are aware of the vision, but they do not demonstrate collective ownership of it along with students, families, and community members.	The leader collaborates with staff in developing the vision and discusses equity in the process. The leader provides opportunities for historically marginalized voices to be heard. Students and families understand the vision, and school staff members know, own, and are engaged in it.	The leader collaborates with staff, students, families, and community members, including those from historically marginalized groups, in creating and refining the vision. The vision, which is centered on equity, is broadly understood and collectively owned by staff, students, families, and community members.
<input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY	<input type="checkbox"/> EMERGING	<input type="checkbox"/> PROFICIENT	<input type="checkbox"/> EXEMPLARY

Evidence to support rating for 1.2:

Appendix B – Sample of Current LEAD Tool Rubrics

2.1 CREATING AN EQUITABLE SCHOOL CULTURE				
2.1A SCHOOL CULTURE	UNSATISFACTORY (Takes no action or limited action to address inequities)	EMERGING (Begins to examine, plan, and initiate actions to address inequities)	PROFICIENT (Takes consistent action for change in school policies and practices for equity)	EXEMPLARY (Institutionalizes school policies and practices for equity and has evidence of more equitable student outcomes)
	The leader tolerates a school culture that prioritizes the voices, values, beliefs and experiences of the dominant culture and excludes those of historically marginalized groups.	The leader verbally acknowledges that the school culture prioritizes the voices, values, beliefs, and experiences of the dominant culture. He/she begins to examine how the culture excludes historically marginalized voices, values, beliefs and experiences and plans for change.	The leader collaborates with staff to assess school culture for equity and to change policies and practices to include the voices, values, beliefs and experiences of historically marginalized groups. He/she has evidence of changes to school policies and practices that reflect inclusiveness in school culture.	The leader’s sustained collaboration with staff, students, families and community members has created a school culture where historically marginalized voices, values, beliefs and experiences are central. He/she has evidence that staff, students, family, and community members experience a deeply rooted equity culture at the school.
	<input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY	<input type="checkbox"/> EMERGING	<input type="checkbox"/> PROFICIENT	<input type="checkbox"/> EXEMPLARY
	Evidence to support rating for 2.1a:			

Appendix B – Sample of Current LEAD Tool Rubrics

2.2 PROVIDING INCLUSIVE AND EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION					
UNSATISFACTORY (Takes no action or limited action to address inequities)	EMERGING (Begins to examine, plan, and initiate actions to address inequities)	PROFICIENT (Takes consistent action for change in school policies and practices for equity)	EXEMPLARY (Institutionalizes school policies and practices for equity and has evidence of more equitable student outcomes)		
<p>The leader has not examined whether students have different access to rigorous content and pedagogy across courses and within classrooms. He/she provides little or no oversight over instructional rigor.</p>	<p>The leader acknowledges that students have inequitable access to rigorous content and pedagogy across courses and within classrooms. Using this lens, he/she begins to monitor instruction.</p>	<p>The leader engages staff in recognizing that students have inequitable access to rigorous content and pedagogy across courses and within classrooms. He/she consistently monitors instruction with an equity lens and helps build teacher capacity to address inequities.</p>	<p>Collaborating with school and district staff, families and the community, the leader institutionalizes policies and practices to ensure equitable access to rigorous content and pedagogy across courses and within classrooms. The leader’s monitoring of instruction provides evidence that rigorous content and pedagogy are offered throughout the school.</p>		
<input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY	<input type="checkbox"/> EMERGING	<input type="checkbox"/> PROFICIENT	<input type="checkbox"/> EXEMPLARY		
<p>Evidence to support rating for 2.2a:</p>					

2.2A RIGOR