

# The Challenges and Opportunities of Advancing Equity through Education Policy: A Research Overview

Laura E. Hernández  
Learning Policy Institute

August 2020  
A white paper written for the  
Spencer Foundation.

White Papers for  
**SPENCER**  
FOUNDATION

# Executive Summary

Shifting sociopolitical and policy dynamics have put a spotlight on systemic inequities and the need for school systems to implement policies that can make inroads into equity's advancement.

With these changes underway, this research synthesis takes stock of education policy research over the last 15 years, elucidating how scholars have investigated reforms intended to redress inequity and what directions the field may undertake to inform equitable schooling and policymaking. Specifically, it answers: How have scholars examined the intersection of policy and equity in K-12 schooling?; and 2) How have scholars examined power and oppression in policy development and implementation?

This analysis revealed that researchers investigating policy and equity have primarily examined the impact and evolution of familiar (e.g., finance, accountability) and emerging policies (e.g., discipline reform) that seek to address inequities. In addition, scholars have shed light on the impact of universal and targeted policies on student subgroups and investigated policy processes to examine reform's equitable and democratic character. While research has provided important insights, this review points to areas for further inquiry, including the evolution of prominent policies, intersectional analyses, greater attention to specific student subgroups (e.g., Indigenous students, undocumented youth), and attention to the sociopolitical dimensions of change circumscribing educational justice movements.

This synthesis also suggests bolder paths forward for the field. It elevates the need for scholarship that examines how multiple policies affect young people and their communities to consider how education can work within policy ecosystems to support healthy development and success. It also encourages scholars to pair important policy critique with discussions of evidence-based practices that may prevent or remedy inequities. Finally, the review concludes with a call for the adoption and consistent use of robust conceptualizations of equity in policy scholarship to support inquiry that illustrates how equity is or is not realized.

*Keywords:* equity, educational policy, educational reform, policy implementation, politics of education.

# The Challenges and Opportunities of Advancing Equity through Education Policy: A Research Overview

With the long-standing and persistent inequities that U.S. schools have perpetuated and exacerbated since the nation's inception, many rightfully invoke the concept of equity in the development and enactment of educational policy. Some appeal to equity as they advocate for policies that enhance individual freedoms, using traditional concepts of liberalism to ground arguments for achieving equity through the protection of individual choice and access. Others invoke a different vision of equity—one grounded in communitarian aims with the goal of mitigating the “education debt” (Ladson-Billings, 2006) that has resulted from centuries of systemic oppression and subjugation of marginalized groups. Despite the varying definitions and attention to equity in education policymaking, its advancement in the educational arena remains a persistent yet elusive goal for policymakers seeking to reduce the opportunity gaps that nondominant racial, economic, linguistic, and gender groups face in U.S. schools.

While the effort to advance opportunities for disenfranchised groups is a centuries-long project, equity has taken center stage in education policy since the landmark *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision in 1954. Policymakers have tried to fulfill *Brown's* promise by alleviating gross inequities largely through a few policies: 1) desegregation; 2) school finance reform; 3) the marketization of schooling; and 4) accountability regimes (Superfine, 2013). Despite facing legislative, judicial, and/or community resistance in each instance, decision makers have nonetheless persisted, enacting policies that carry differing theories of action that suggest that a particular input, structure, or practice will provide much needed resources and opportunities for communities put at risk. Even as these policies hold the potential to be mutually reinforcing in their ability to alleviate educational inequities, more often they have operated as competing reforms (Bishop & Noguera, 2019), creating a fragmented policy agenda. Consequently, the pursuit of equity has become a “conservative force” (Mehta, 2019), resulting in policies and practices that have generated modest changes at best and exacerbated systemic oppression at worst.

Education policy scholars driven by equity questions have examined the development and implementation of these policy waves at various institutional levels (e.g., federal, state, local) and drawn attention to the shortcomings of decades of reform aiming to address inequities. While the ideas embedded in earlier reform waves continue to color the policy landscape, the U.S. educational system is in a unique political and policy moment that can affect the scope of education policy in the service of equity. First, U.S. schools have entered a post-No Child Left Behind (NCLB) era and have even witnessed the temporary and unprecedented suspension of accountability measures due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Practitioners and school systems leaders have increasingly grown suspicious and weary of high-stakes accountability policies and their inability to spur improvement and equity over the years, often pointing to the laws' punitive orientations, laser-like foci on test

scores as a sole metric for school quality, and the negative consequences they have had on teaching and learning (Booher-Jennings, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2007; Mathis & Trujillo, 2016). NCLB's replacement, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), recently became federal law in 2015 and granted increased autonomy to states and emphasized the use of multiple measures to assess school quality (e.g., course access, college readiness, school climate). Many see the current era as an opportunity to advance whole child education, wherein schools and systems become more equitable by developing policies that attend to students' academic, social, and emotional needs (Kostyo et al., 2018), and to reimagine accountability and assessment practices writ large. Yet, questions remain as to whether the behaviors and mindsets cultivated by NCLB will surface in a new wave of educational policies and their implementation.

Shifts in the broader political environment also beget questions as to the role of schools in advancing equity in the face of systems of oppression and injustice. Education scholars have long interrogated how schools function as sites of social reproduction that perpetuate inequities (Anyon, 1995; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Lareau, 2003; Leonardo, 2009; Oakes, 2005; Pascoe, 2007) while noting the emancipatory potential that schools hold in forging a new equitable future and vision (Anyon, 2014; Freire & Macedo, 2000). With the dissipating optimism following President Obama's administration, ongoing displays of racial violence, and the public outrage around the discriminatory policies advanced by the Trump administration, individuals in the U.S. have a unique opportunity to assess persistent inequities in U.S. schools and to agitate for policies that transform unjust schooling systems. The emergence and prominence of equity-oriented social movements, including Black Lives Matter and those initiated by educators in red, blue, and purple states, further underscore this call to action by exposing systemic inequities along race, class, ethnicity/nationality, and gender lines.

Overall, U.S. schools are in the midst of policy shifts and political dynamics that elevate the importance of advancing equity and implementing policies that can finally make inroads into equity's advancement. With these changes underway, it is critical to assess the state of the education policy research field to examine the topics and approaches that policy scholars employ as they investigate reforms, policymaking, and implementation processes that aim to redress inequity. This literature review engages in this undertaking and answers the following questions: 1) How have education policy scholars examined the intersection of policy and equity in K-12 schooling?; and 2) How have education policy scholars examined lines of power and oppression in the context of education policy development and implementation?

This systematic analysis of the scholarship investigating educational policy and equity suggests that the field has primarily attended to:

- The impact and evolution of familiar policies e.g., school finance, market-oriented reforms, accountability) and emerging reforms related to learning environments (e.g., school climate) that seek to redress persistent inequities
- The policy processes surrounding policy development and implementation and their equitable and democratic character.
- The effects of universal and targeted policies on student subgroups, including nondominant racial groups, English learners, students from rural communities, and those with special needs.

After describing the methods employed in this synthesis, I provide an overview of the research and argumentation in each of these areas. Following these assessments, I describe the state of the field and discuss possible directions for future scholarship that can support ongoing inquiry into education policy and equity advancement.

# Reviewing the Research on Education Policy for Equity

To understand the knowledge base examining the intersection of education policy and equity, I engaged in a systematic analysis of the research to identify the primary topics and empirical approaches that comprised the field. Guided by the study's research questions, I first searched for peer-reviewed and research center-generated studies published between 2005 and 2019 that explicitly examined the intersection of education policy and equity. To engage in this broad, systematic scan, I used the databases Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and Google Scholar to inductively identify topical trends in the field. I used the search terms *education policy* or its counterparts, *educational policy* and *educational reform*, in conjunction with the term *equity* in this initial search, which generated a list of over 3000 articles. I further bounded the search by excluding the terms higher education, early education, and international to limit the research sample to U.S. policies related to K-12 schooling. In analyzing this bounded scan, I identified 16 primary themes in the research. Themes included policies that were the primary foci of the literature, lines of inquiry that examined how policies served or underserved disenfranchised groups, and scholarship that examined policy processes. (Table 1 contains the list of themes that were inductively identified in this initial scan.) These emerging themes guided the second phase of review and analysis.

## Topical Themes and Foci in the Research on Education Policy and Equity

### Policies at the Center of Research

- School finance
- Accountability
- Market-based reform (e.g., choice, charters)
- Teaching and learning/instructional
- School climate
- Educators (e.g., unions, credentialing)
- School leader/administrator

### Policy in the (Dis)Service of Disenfranchised Groups

- Nondominant racial groups
- English learners
- Students with special needs
- Students in rural communities

### Processes Surrounding Policy Enactment

- Policy creation
- Implementation
- Actors and coalitions engaged in efforts
- Reform rhetoric
- Policy fidelity and adaptation

The second phase of analysis included targeted identification and in-depth review of research studies in each of the topical areas inductively identified in the initial scan. First, I conducted a targeted search of research studies using the newly generated themes as search terms in conjunction with the phrases *education policy* and *equity*. To illustrate, in exploring the research on school finance reform since 2005, I used the terms *school finance*, *education policy*, and *equity* while excluding *higher education*, *early education*, and *international* to identify relevant research. In another example, the terms *education policy*, *equity*, and *English learners* were utilized along with the excluded search terms to generate a list of studies that examined the equitable and inequitable policy impact and processes surrounding English learners. This process was repeated for each of themes identified in the initial scan. Once studies were identified, I reviewed studies to investigate the approaches and lines of argumentation that policy scholars have used to examine policies and their ability to advance equity. Overall, this multi-pronged literature review process resulted in an examination of 527 articles.

While this review process enabled a systematic assessment of the research base, this approach had limitations—one of which pertains to the identification of absences in the research on education policy and equity. The approach used in this synthesis allowed me to identify the topical and empirical themes that were present in the literature, shedding light on the prominent patterns in scholarship and providing some insight into what topics and lines of inquiry were under-explored. While this helped to delineate the state of published work in the field, future literature reviews should identify and interrogate the absences of policy topics or lines of inquiry in the literature to elevate its implications for the scholarly field.

Other limitations primarily stem from differences in how researchers define and operationalize policy and equity. With regard to policy, there undoubtedly are studies that examine equity-oriented reforms in education that may not explicitly ground their work in the education policy field and would thus not be captured in this review. For example, what constitutes education policy can be broadly conceptualized to include economic and social policies that affect communities and students (Anyon, 2005). Scholars that maintain this broader policy analysis in their investigations may or may not directly situate their work in the education policy field but rather in other disciplines and fields that examine public policy. Moreover, what constitutes policy can be broadly conceived. While some define policy as formal legislation to be adopted or developed by a governing body or institution, others emphasize the relevance and importance of unstated policy—the norms and uncodified rules that govern educational settings and/or those driven by community partners that affect the equitable character of how policy

is adopted and implemented (Ball, 1993; Dumas & Anderson, 2014). Those who investigate these implicit or unofficial instantiations of policy may not situate their work in the education policy field, but their scholarship nonetheless has implications for understanding if or how reforms meet their equity promise.

The definition and use of the term equity also complicates the scholarship identified in this systematic review. Equity has become a ubiquitous term that is espoused across the ideological and research spectrum, albeit with disparate undergirding conceptualizations. For example, some advance a vision of equity that is grounded in exercising individualism, wherein individuals have access to equal opportunity regardless of race, class, language, or creed. Others hold more communitarian aims and often seek the redistribution of resources to address societal and educational ills. While individuals advancing these contrasting visions of equity invoke the term, they nonetheless hold distinct aims and advance different means by which an equitable society and educational system can be nurtured and maintained. This review did not distinguish or account for the differing conceptualizations of equity that researchers advance through their work and argumentation, instead opting to cast a broad net to capture the current state of the scholarship that is intended to understand and interrogate policies seeking to advance equity. Despite these important limitations, the approach used in this research synthesis does advance key insights into the state of the research field by identifying scholarship that is explicitly situated in the policy field and explores policy development or implementation in the service of equity.

## Policies for the Advancement of Educational Equity

With the changes of the past 15 years, education policy scholars have examined the evolution of prominent policy initiatives and other reforms to address persistent inequities that have captured the attention of key decision makers. Many of the policy topics scholars investigate are familiar features of education's "policy primeval soup"—the ecology of ideas that emerge, compete, combine, and recirculate to inform policymakers and the mechanisms they identify to address policy and equity challenges (Kingdon, 2010). This section describes the ongoing research into these familiar policy topics at the center of inquiry and the emerging reforms that have garnered scholarly attention. These topics include investigations into *resource and finance equity*, the impact of *market-oriented policies*, and the nature and form of accountability policies. Researchers have also examined the effect of these prominent reform waves on policies related to *teaching and learning* and have shed light on the growing efforts to support the development of *positive and inclusive school climates* as a means to advance equity. An overview of the scholarship in each of these topical areas is discussed in turn.

### Continued Focus on Resource and Finance Equity

The role of school resources in addressing entrenched opportunity gaps in U.S. schools comprises much of the research at the intersection of education policy and equity. While scholars have debated if money matters for schools for decades (Grubb, 2009), much of the scholarship over the past 15 years has demonstrated that it indeed does (Baker, 2017; Jackson, 2018). For example, using quasi-experimental methods, researchers have conducted multistate investigations to examine the impact of school finance reforms (SFRs), many of which were spurred by adequacy lawsuits over the last five decades, on spending and student achievement. Despite using different data sets and statistical techniques and examining different time periods, multiple studies have reached similar conclusions: SFRs have generated sustained increases in per pupil spending, closed spending gaps between high-income and low-income districts, and have been associated with improvements in student test scores and graduation rates (Baker & Weber, 2016; Biasi, 2015; Candelaria & Shores, 2019; Darling-Hammond, 2019; Hyman, 2017; Jackson, Johnson, & Persico, 2016; Lafortune, Rothstein, & Schanzenbach, 2016). Many single state studies of school finance, which typically examine the effects of particular types of spending (e.g., Title I, unrestricted, construction), also found positive effects of increased funding streams on student outcomes (Cascio et al., 2013; Conlin & Thompson, 2017; Holden, 2016; Hong & Zimmer, 2016; Roy, 2011). However, the presence of significant relationship between outcomes and these funding streams has varied across contexts and settings (Jackson, 2018).

In examining the relationship between school finance and student outcomes, researchers also illustrate how policymakers can increase investments in particular structures and resources to improve student learning (Baker & Weber, 2016; Jackson et al., 2016). For example, researchers have shown that investments in smaller class sizes for younger students and students from marginalized groups produce greater and sustained achievement and postsecondary outcomes (Dynarski et al., 2013; Finn & Achilles, 1999; Kim, 2006; Levin et al., 2007). Other studies have found similarly positive effects of investments in early childhood (Barnett, 2011; Ladd et al., 2014) and competitive teacher compensation (Adamson & Darling-Hammond, 2012; Baker & Weber, 2016; Jackson et al., 2016) on student learning, thus demonstrating to policymakers how additional monies can be invested to increase opportunities and school quality for all students.

As scholars make the case for how money matters for schools and students, others continue to track fiscal inequities and the ongoing disinvestment in traditional public schools. For instance, scholars have traced how charter schools divert public monies and create financial strain on U.S. public schools (Baker, Libby, & Wiley, 2015; Bifulco & Reback, 2013), revealing the challenges these institutions pose to the sustainability of equitable and adequate funding streams. Others have more broadly interrogated the inadequacies of state finance laws to advance and secure resource equity between advantaged and disadvantaged groups (Rolle et al., 2008; Steinberg & Quinn, 2015; Sweetland, 2014; Versteegen, 2013), with many elevating how the 2008 recession exacerbated or generated new challenges to investing in public schools (Baker, 2014; Evans, Schwab, & Wagner, 2017; Knight, 2017; Strunk & Marianno, 2019).

Counterbalancing the research on obstacles to finance equity is the recent scholarship investigating innovative and equity-oriented school funding initiatives, such as weighted school funding (WSF), to assess their ability to redistribute public dollars to students and schools that have been historically disenfranchised. While WSF has generated increased funding equity between high-income and low-income districts in some instances (Chambers et al., 2010), including under California's landmark Local Control Funding Formula (Furger et al., 2019; Koppich & Humphrey, 2018; Roza et al., 2017), other studies have shown that WSF's impact is variable and has been undermined by technical, fiscal, and political factors that affect its impact, including local resistance to redistribution initiatives and the inadequacies of weighted formulas and overall funding levels to enable necessary changes and supports (Baker & Elmer, 2009; Halverson & Plecki, 2015; Ladd, 2008; Malen, Dayhoff, Egan, & Croninger, 2017).

**Summary.** Researchers investigating the intersection of school finance policy and equity have illustrated how increased financial investment in public schools can help mitigate entrenched opportunity gaps. Yet, despite this growing consensus in the research base, scholars suggest that in practice, there are critical and persistent challenges in identifying and implementing the policy mechanisms that can achieve and sustain finance equity. Thus, while a select few continue to interrogate the more fundamental question of if money matters for student learning (Hanushek, 2006), particularly in light of criticisms that the research base is too methodologically diverse and too inconsistent to generate reliable inferences and syntheses (Hedges et al., 2016), the question of how to overcome contextual, economic, and sociopolitical challenges to ensure that increased resources are allocated to students and schools that need them most remains pressing.

### **Ongoing Research on the (In)Ability of Market Reforms to Advance Equity**

While the systematic marketization of the education field has been underway for several decades (Horsford et al., 2018), researchers have continued to investigate the ability or inability of market-based policies to spur educational equity for marginalized groups over the past 15 years. By definition, market-oriented policies aim to translate private sector structures and practices for use in school systems to improve school and student performance. In turn, researchers have empirically tested the assumptions in these theories of action (Bulkley & Burch, 2011; Scott & Holme, 2016) in the context of various reforms and have found mixed results as to their ability to improve student outcomes. For example, studies of the Portfolio Management Model (PMM)—a district reform strategy that aims to diversify school options to increase competition and stakeholder responsiveness (Bulkley et al., 2010)—have found variable effects of PMMs on student achievement and other non-test outcomes (Harris & Larsen, 2015; Kemple, 2011; Marsh et al., 2013; McEachin et al., 2016; Strunk et al., 2016). Scholars examining the impact of state and district vouchers programs have also drawn mixed conclusions (Boser, Benner, & Roth, 2018; Egalite, 2013; Sude, DeAngelis, & Wolf, 2018; Wolf, 2008), with some researchers arguing that limited participation in voucher programs and their race-neutral logics undermine their policy potential in advancing educational equity and opportunity (Gooden, Jabbar, & Torres, 2016).

Studies of charter schools predominate the research base on market-oriented policies given their proliferation and the support they have accumulated across partisan lines. Because advocacy for charter schools is often grounded in claims that charters spur school quality and equity, researchers have assessed if or how these schools have advanced opportunities and outcomes for nondominant groups. For example, many researchers have investigated the demographic composition of independent and network-

operated charter schools, noting the disproportionate presence of students of color and the disproportionate under-enrollment of students with special needs and English learners in many charters when compared to schools in their host districts (Carnoy et al., 2005; Furgeson et al., 2012; Miron, Urschel, & Saxton, 2011). The concentration and exclusion patterns of these student populations within their school walls have raised questions of how charters have served as a re-segregation mechanism in U.S. school systems (Frankenberg et al., 2010; Orfield et al., 2012) and spurred scholars to investigate the processes and practices that some charters use to disproportionately exclude students with challenging learning and behavioral needs (Epple, Romano, & Zimmer, 2016; Nichols-Barrer et al., 2016; Vasquez Heilig et al., 2011; Zimmer & Guarino, 2013).

In addition to surfacing the equity implications of who charters serve, scholars have generated evidence that cast doubt on charters' claims of positive impact on student learning for marginalized groups. In many studies, researchers have found that students of color enrolled in charter schools perform on par with and sometimes lower than their counterparts in traditional public schools, as measured by traditional outcome measures such as standardized tests in English Language Arts and mathematics (Barr, Sadovnik, & Visconti, 2006; Buddin & Zimmer, 2005; Carnoy et al., 2005; CREDO, 2013; Welner, 2013). Scholars have also investigated if the presence of charters spur improvements in overall district performance by virtue of introducing greater competition, as purported by their theory of action (Arsen & Ni, 2008; Bifulco & Ladd, 2006; Booker et al., 2008; Carr & Ritter, 2007; Imberman, 2008; Jabbar et al., 2019; Loeb, Valant, & Kasman, 2011). Here, too, studies point to mixed effects, suggesting that charters and their surrounding schools may not be fulfilling their theoretical and equity promises.

As quantitative studies provide inconclusive evidence of positive charter impact, qualitative studies complement and complicate many of these empirical trends by revealing how charter school practices may undermine equitable learning opportunities. For example, scholars have indicated that charter school and traditional public school leaders alter their practices in response to increased competition in local landscapes in ways that do not directly enhance school quality such as increased attention to recruitment and marketing (Jabbar, 2015; Loeb et al., 2011; Lubienski, 2005). Others, too, have generated questions on the robustness of charter school programming. While some research has suggested that charters can implement innovative and responsive pedagogical models (Gross & Pochop, 2008; Neumann, 2008; Smith et al., 2011), others have provided counterevidence that suggests that some charters reproduce traditional teaching and learning approaches and/or implement harsh discipline practices (e.g., pervasive adult monitoring of students, disciplinary action for behaviors unassociated with learning), which can contribute to teacher turnover (Torres, 2014) and quell student motivation and personal agency (Golann, 2015; Goodman, 2013; Sondel, 2015).

**Summary.** With the prevalence of market logics in the field of education, scholars seeking to understand policies that advance educational equity continue to keep an analytic eye on the implementation of market-oriented policies and their impact on vulnerable student groups. The research surrounding the range of market-oriented reforms remains inconclusive—some studies show positive effects and outcomes for students while the preponderance of evidence suggests that decision makers remain cautious in relying on market solutions to propel learning and change. This is particularly true in the case of charter schools, which remain the primary focus of this literature. While studies show that some charters propel learning among student subgroups under certain circumstances, others come to more inconclusive findings and even point to problematic practices that shed doubt on their ability to advance equity for the many marginalized groups that comprise their student populations.

### **Evidence of New Accountability Regimes?**

Because of the codification of high-stakes accountability policies in various states and ultimately in federal law with NCLB, researchers have long investigated their development, enactment, and impact since their emergence in the 1990s. While these policies have fallen out of favor for many over the last 15 years, scholarship on equitable education policy has continued this line of inquiry, with more recent work interrogating the legacy of high-stakes accountability and considering its implications for the development of more holistic accountability regimes.

Because NCLB was recently replaced by ESSA in 2015, much of the research has continued to examine the felt impact of NCLB's theory of action. For example, scholars considered the implications of the law's unprecedented federal oversight of U.S. school systems on the development and implementation of equitable accountability systems (DeBray-Pelot & McGuinn, 2009; McDermott, 2007; McDonnell, 2005; Wong & Sunderman, 2007). Researchers have also investigated the intended and unintended consequences of the law's laser-like focus on standardized tests as a primary measure of school and student progress, demonstrating how NCLB's use of sanctions towards underperforming schools negatively affected teaching and learning conditions for students of color and students from low-income families (Booher-Jennings, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2007; Kim & Sunderman, 2005; Schoen & Fusarelli, 2008; Sunderman, 2008). Others have examined how the federal law fueled anti-democratic practices through the growth of privatization in the education sector (Burch, 2006; Burch et al., 2007), how the law's "test and punish philosophy" negatively affected teacher working conditions (Barrett, 2009; Finnigan & Gross, 2007; Lewis & Young, 2013; Murnane & Papay, 2010; Rubin, 2011; Schoen & Fusarelli, 2008; Smith & Kovacs, 2011), and how NCLB furthered inequity under the guise of serving as a race-conscious policy (Au, 2016; Leonardo, 2007). While some scholars found evidence that suggests that the negative



consequences of NCLB were overstated (Dee & Jacob, 2011; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010), the body of research generally exposes the law's flawed logic and detrimental impact on educational opportunities for nondominant groups.

While many continued to investigate the problematic impact of NCLB, others have turned to examine its legacy. For example, scholars have investigated the spawn of related reforms that perpetuate punitive logics in the pursuit of improving achievement and school quality that have proliferated in its wake. These include the impact and efficacy of state takeovers of local school districts (Arsen & Mason, 2013; Mintrop & Trujillo, 2005; Morel, 2018) and school closures (Johnson, 2013; Kirshner, Gaertner, & Pozzoboni, 2010; Trujillo & Renée, 2015)—two policies that have been disproportionately implemented in low-income communities of color. Studies suggest that these efforts, which are often justified on the grounds of persistent underperformance or fiscal mismanagement, have failed to bring about improvements in schooling while facilitating the systemic disempowerment of disenfranchised communities and local democracy. Others point to how high-stakes accountability has impacted the public's perception of what makes a quality school. For instance, Jacobsen et al. (2013) investigated how parents in New York City responded to public accountability data, noting that parent dissatisfaction rose as achievement scores dropped in the face of more rigorous examinations and standards. These findings suggest that the focus on test scores as the primary measure of school quality under NCLB and other high-stakes accountability policies may still color public opinion, which has implications for developing public support and political will for newer equity-oriented policies that have more holistic measures of school quality and progress.

With NCLB's sunset and the growing questions around the efficacy of high-stakes accountability as a mechanism to mitigate educational inequities, many have turned their attention to examining the possibilities and potential pitfalls of ESSA, which became federal law in 2015. Because of the law's recency, the research base has primarily raised important questions surrounding its implementation. For example, in light of the increased autonomy that ESSA offers states to refine their accountability systems, policy scholars have questioned if state education officials will be able to reinvent their systems in ways that help schools continuously improve along multiple outcome measures or if they will fall back on high-stakes accountability logics, systems, and singular measures (Egalite et al., 2017; Mathis & Trujillo, 2016; McGuinn, 2016). At the same time, there is optimism about the policy opportunities that ESSA affords. Researchers have suggested that ESSA's mandate to incorporate multiple measures of school quality into accountability systems may elevate "whole child education" that advances equity by attending to students' varied needs through policies such as investments in social-emotional learning (SEL) and community schools (Cook-Harvey et al., 2016; Gregory & Fergus, 2017; Kostyo et al., 2018; Maier et al., 2017; Melnick, Cook-Harvey, & Darling-Hammond, 2017;

Penuel, Meyer, & Valladares, 2016). In addition, scholars have argued that ESSA provides a policy opportunity to enhance student learning by better supporting teachers and school leaders. These researchers point to the federal law's emphasis on ensuring the equitable distribution of highly effective teachers, states' ability to more broadly define teacher quality, and allocations for investments in leadership development as promising practices that can improve equity across the sector (Saultz et al., 2017; Young, Winn, & Reedy, 2017)

**Summary.** Over the past 15 years, policy scholars have continued to examine the impact of NCLB, typically exposing the many inequities perpetuated in its wake. With the sunset of NCLB and other high-stakes accountability policies, researchers have increasingly turned to investigating their legacy, noting if and how punitive logics are embedded in reform initiatives and understanding if or how the public understanding of school quality fostered under high-stakes accountability regimes remains. Scholars also maintain a healthy balance of skepticism and optimism as states refine their accountability systems under new federal mandates that in theory, seek to spur more equitable, holistic approaches to schooling and achievement. While the research base is still emerging, scholars should continue to investigate ESSA and broader accountability shifts to assess if or how new accountability regimes align to enhance equity for all students, particularly those from disenfranchised groups. This analytic attention is consequential for the enactment of equity-oriented reform that seek to address the many inequities that have been perpetuated or exacerbated under high-stakes accountability in the last two and half decades.

## Creating Equitable Learning Environments Through Policy

---

<sup>1</sup>See Malin et al. (2017) for research demonstrating some initial tensions between the intent and implementation of holistic measures of student success and equity.

Given the challenges that emerged around teaching and learning under high-stakes accountability, researchers have investigated policy efforts that seek to counteract these patterns through the advancement of quality instruction and the development of supportive school environments. Much of this scholarship has focused on the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), which were released in 2010 and aimed to create a set of national standards that more explicitly promoted higher-level thinking than the standards established by states under NCLB. The research has compared CCSS to its predecessors and considered its potential impact on student learning, particularly with relation to teachers and school leaders' willingness and ability to support CCSS-aligned instruction and materials (Cobb & Jackson, 2011; Gamson, Lu, & Eckert, 2013; Kober & Rentner, 2011; Mathis, 2010; Porter, McMaken, Hwang, & Yang, 2011a, 2011b; Schmidt & Houang, 2012). With these key questions, researchers have typically used surveys or interview data to examine practitioner perspectives on the rigor and equity claims put forth by CCSS advocates (Ajayi, 2016; Burks et al., 2015; Matlock et al., 2016; Nadelson et al., 2014) and to interrogate the relationship between the implementation of CCSS and instructional change (Hodge, Salloum, & Benko, 2016; Opfer, Kaufman, & Thompson, 2016; Supovitz, Fink, & Newman, 2016). Given the complexity of assessing outcomes, few studies have examined if CCSS has improved student outcomes and in these few instances, have generated inconclusive results regarding its ability to mitigate achievement and opportunity gaps for marginalized groups (Loveless, 2016; Schmidt & Houang, 2012; Song et al., 2019; Xu & Cepa, 2015).

---

<sup>2</sup>Researchers assessing Common Core's impact encounter array of research challenges, including states' uneven adoption of the standards and the use of National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) scores, which are not fully aligned with CCSS and are administered in select grades and is non-consecutive years, as comparison data (Polikoff, 2017).

A smaller subset of studies examines the enactment of state and local curricular policies that seek to increase access to rigorous learning environments. For example, scholars have investigated policy efforts to expand access to Advanced Placement courses (Hallett & Venegas, 2011; Long et al., 2019; Parker et al., 2013) and course sequences aligned with university admission requirements (Alvarez & Mehan, 2006; Farmer-Hinton, 2011; Mazzeo et al., 2010), typically finding that these reforms have fallen short in expanding opportunities for historically underserved student groups because of technical, political, and normative reasons. Another line of scholarship examines the expansion and impact of deeper learning (e.g., linked learning, project-based learning, performance assessments), which

advances an interdisciplinary approach to teaching and learning coupled with opportunities for students to apply their learning to relevant situations and complex problems (Daniel, Quartz, & Oakes, 2019; Huberman et al., 2014; Mehta & Fine, 2015; Noguera, Darling-Hammond, & Friedlaender, 2015; Rodriguez, Bellanca, & Esparza, 2016). Studies have indicated that students who experience deeper learning, including those from historically marginalized groups, have higher test scores and postsecondary outcomes and demonstrate greater interpersonal and intrapersonal skills when compared to their peer counterparts (Rickles et al., 2016; Zeiser et al., 2014). At the same time, scholars have noted that systematic and sustained access to deeper learning has been stifled by the array of institutional obstacles that policymakers and practitioners face as they seek to change the "grammar of schooling" (Tyack & Cuban, 1995) that governs student learning and school organization (Cohen & Mehta, 2017; Hernández et al., 2019; Mehta & Fine, 2019).

Scholars also look outside of policies that target the technical core of teaching and learning to another critical element of school quality that shapes student learning: school climate (Cohen, 2010; Thapa, Cohen, Guffey, & Higgins-D'Alessandro, 2013). Scholarly attention to school climate, which is typically investigated through an examination of school discipline policies, is motivated by the extensive body of research elucidating the disproportionality in suspension and expulsion rates between privileged socioeconomic students and students from nondominant populations, including students of color, students from low-income families, and LGBTQ+ youth (Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network, 2016; Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera, 2010; Losen, 2014; Ritter & Anderson, 2018; Skiba, Arredondo, & Williams, 2014; Skiba, Rausch, & Rausch, 2013). These studies have included critical investigations of how discipline policies (e.g., zero-tolerance laws, willful defiance infractions) exacerbate existing inequities for nondominant student populations (Curran, 2019; Hines-Datiri & Carter Andrews, 2017; Hoffman, 2014; Skiba et al., 2013) and elucidated how the discipline gap parallels and reinforces research-identified gaps in achievement (Anderson et al., 2019; Gregory et al., 2010; Morris & Perry, 2016).

The identified discipline gap and its association with student achievement have prompted scholars to examine state and district policies such as the elimination of zero-tolerance policies and the implementation of nonpunitive behavioral programs (e.g., restorative justice, positive behavioral support systems) to assess their impact on student learning and school climate (Anderson, 2018, 2019; Flannery et al., 2014; Freeman et al., 2016; Hashim et al., 2018; Lcoe & Steinberg, 2018; Losen, 2014; Ritter, 2018). Through this work, scholars elevate some promising effects of these reforms and programs (e.g., reductions in absenteeism and disciplinary incidents, increased student perception of school safety and inclusiveness) while elucidating evidence of on-the-ground resistance to these reforms that undermine their enactment.

While studies of school discipline reform are the most prevalent in the research on school climate and equity, researchers have investigated other policies that intend to systemically cultivate more inclusive school environments. For instance, with the evidence that demonstrates that having a teacher of color can generate academic, social, and emotional benefits for all students (Achinstein et al., 2010; Boser, 2011; Dee, 2004; Fox, 2016; Guarino, Santibañez, & Daley, 2006; Villegas & Irvine, 2010), scholars have suggested that policies that support retention and recruitment among teachers of color, including easing access barriers to teacher preparation programs (e.g., loan forgiveness programs, teacher residencies), hold the potential to improve school climates and learning conditions for students (Carver-Thomas, 2018; Guha et al., 2017; Henry et al., 2012; Solomon, 2009). In other studies, researchers have considered the possibilities and impact of policies that would further social-emotional learning (SEL) and trauma-informed practice in schools (Dorado et al., 2016; Gregory & Fergus, 2017; Hamedani & Darling-Hammond, 2015; Perry & Daniels, 2016; Rutledge et al., 2015), but inquiries remain limited as these policies are typically studied at the school level or are not widely adopted. In fewer instances, scholars have investigated the development or implementation of policies that seek to expand access to culturally relevant curriculum such as ethnic studies programs (Dee & Penner, 2017; Griner & Stewart, 2013; Moon, 2011; Tintiangco-Cubales et al., 2015), which can increase investment in learning and nurture healthy identity development and inclusion for students from nondominant groups (Darling-Hammond et al., 2019; Hammond, 2014). Here, too, investigations and evidence remain limited in the policy research field due to the limited adoption and implementation of these curricular policy strategies.

**Summary.** Questions as to how education policy can advance educational equity have driven many scholars to investigate policies that seek to transform classrooms and schools into rich learning environments. Cumulatively, these studies have found inconclusive evidence for national, state, and local policy initiatives delivering on their promise of increasing access to rigorous instruction and curriculum or improving outcomes for students. Some of this inconclusiveness may be attributed to the relative newness of reform initiatives or the research barriers that inhibit their systematic analysis. At the same time, early evidence suggests that institutional and normative barriers may be a factor in preventing systemic and robust implementation of more promising reforms. In addition to instruction, scholars have increasingly grappled with policies related to discipline and school climate that aim to alleviate entrenched opportunity and discipline gaps. Studies of policies related to school climate remain ongoing, particularly in light of the public and policy attention given to whole child educational practices. This emerging research can continue to shed light on the breadth and depth of adoption and implementation of reforms seeking to create inclusive school environments as well as their ability to enrich student learning and advance educational equity for

student groups who have been disproportionately harmed by more punitive practices and policies.

## Policy Processes and their Equity Implications

As researchers examining the intersection of education policy and equity have investigated if prominent reforms are meeting their espoused equity promise, others have focused their examinations on their surrounding policy processes. Often falling within the politics of education or policy implementation fields, this body of research primarily focuses on the following dynamics and interrogates their equitable and democratic character: 1) how *actors and coalitions* engage in policy development and adoption; 2) how *idea circulation* undergirds policy processes; and 3) how *actors support or undermine implementation* of adopted reforms. While each of these areas is discussed in turn below, this literature collectively exposes how the use of knowledge, resources, power, and collective action affects the process of implementing reforms seeking to mitigate opportunity gaps among student groups. In turn, this scholarship raises important questions as to how equity is or is not advanced in policy processes and demonstrates how equity-oriented policies may fall short in fulfilling their espoused aims by furthering normative, socioeconomic, and educational interests of dominant groups.

### Actors and Idea Circulation in Policy Development and Enactment

**Coalitions Advancing and Resisting Policy.** In investigating the equitable character of policy processes, many scholars trace the actors and interest groups that have agitated for and influenced the adoption of prominent education initiatives. For example, policy researchers have identified the factions supporting and resisting the adoption and implementation of Common Core, a reform that aimed to increase the rigor and quality of teaching and learning. While noting that Common Core enjoyed broad coalition support at the onset, scholars have demonstrated how the coalition fractured and in turn, undermined the depth or breadth of CCSS implementation across the country (Jochim & Lavery, 2015; Polikoff et al., 2016; Supovitz & Spillane, 2015; Supovitz, Daly, & Del Fresno, 2018). Others have considered the politics and actors surrounding additional policies related to teaching and learning. These include studies of the advocacy efforts and often waning levels of influence of teachers unions in securing labor rights in the face of lawsuits within a broader political climate that has systematically minimized and/or dismantled the power of collective bargaining (Mariano, 2015; Moe, 2011; Strunk & Grissom, 2010; Superfine & Thompson, 2016; Young, 2011). In fewer instances, researchers have examined the groups mobilizing for school discipline reform, noting how coalition dynamics determined policy agendas that often minimized more radical, transformative practices to improve school climate (Koon, 2019).

Another body of research shines the analytic spotlight on the growing influence of market reformers, commonly referred to as “edu-preneurs,” and describes their research, policy, and advocacy efforts to proliferate market-oriented education policies, such as charter schools, alternative teacher certification (e.g., TFA), and portfolio management models (Bulkley & Henig, 2015; DeBray-Pelot & McGuinn, 2009; Kirst, 2007; Kretchmar, Sondel, & Ferrare, 2014; Scott, 2009; Vergari, 2007). Through this research, scholars have elucidated the array of actors who comprise edu-preneur reform coalitions (e.g., foundations, think tanks, advocacy groups, business sector, entrepreneurial educators and leaders) and demonstrated how they have mobilized their networks and resources to influence the adoption of market-oriented reforms that align with their ideological and economic interests, even in the face of community resistance (Baker & Miron, 2015; Bulkley & Henig, 2015; Buras, 2011; Ferrare & Setari, 2018; Scott et al., 2016; Scott, 2009, 2011). This subfield of research underscores the importance of investigating the equitable and democratic character of policy processes, as it uncovers how these dynamics can further sociopolitical or economic interests for dominant groups and undermine community voice and empowerment.

While much of the research draws critical attention to the powerful actors and forces that influence education without democratic input or accountability, some scholars shed light on the active role of local actors and communities in affecting policy. For instance, researchers have drawn attention to how communities of color and grassroots organizations agitate for equitable reform and more democratic processes in the face of market-oriented reforms, which have been proposed and adopted with minimal community input and leadership (Buras, 2014; Horsford et al., 2018; Lipman, 2011b; Scott & Fruchter, 2009). Others, too, reveal how local actors, particular Black youth and other youth of color, have played significant roles in policymaking campaigns (Holquist, 2019) and have been key actors in resisting pathologizing narratives and the onset of paternalistic reforms that aim to “fix” communities of color rather than build upon their assets and desire for self-determination (Baldrige, 2014). Finally, others have demonstrated how practitioners navigate policy demands and partner with communities to ensure that educational policies and reforms are more community responsive (Ishimaru, 2013; Jenkins, 2018). Overall, this scholarship demonstrates how local actors can serve as key mediators that help enhance the equitable character of a given reform. Yet, it is important to note that some recent studies advance a more cautionary lesson as they reveal how local efforts can be undermined by gentrification and other local dynamics that enable the influx and mobilization of privileged and predominantly white families who assert their own interests in neighborhood advocacy (Cucchiara & Horvat, 2009; Posey-Maddox, 2014).

The power of communities and locally developed efforts is also apparent in the body of research investigating the emerging social movements in education, many of which are agitating for democratic and multifaceted reforms that can counteract the inequities perpetuated on marginalized communities vis-a-vis ineffective and narrow education policies (Anyon, 2014). For instance, studies have examined how grassroots organizations joined forces to build political support for the enactment of California’s landmark Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF)—a multipronged reform that sought to redistribute state funds to districts with concentrations of students with intensive learning needs while empowering local communities to invest these funds in ways that align with locally and collectively established goals (Furger et al., 2019). In addition, a growing number of scholarly inquiries have focused on the #RedforEd movement, with researchers seeking to trace the policies and tactics of educators and activists who have engaged in this movement in blue, red, and purple states and to consider the equity implications of their demands (Blanc, 2019; Shelton, 2017; Slocum et al., 2018). Additionally, scholars have investigated the role and presence of grassroots organizations, including parent advocacy organizations, in spurring equity-oriented educational policy at the state and local levels. While some studies demonstrate how community-based organizations (CBO) enable grassroots movements that strive for policies that empower local communities and equity causes (Fennimore, 2017; Ferman, 2017; Oakes et al., 2008; Renée et al., 2010; Warren, 2005), others point to the growing influence of market-oriented groups in grassroots organizations and the ways they may be undermining community empowerment and self-determination by influencing CBO policy agendas (Barkan, 2013; Chong, 2018; Scott, 2013; Smith & Rowland, 2014).

**Idea Circulation in Policy Processes.** In addition to describing the coalitions agitating for policies, scholars interrogate the ways these actors have circulated ideas to build support for and foundational knowledge of their reforms. For instance, some scholars have elevated the strategic and selective use of research in growing support for or resistance to policy ideas, showing how coalitions advance reforms (e.g., charter schools, Common Core) by disseminating research that selectively elevates or obscures evidence to support their positions (McDonnell & Weatherford, 2012; Scott et al., 2016). Others, too, have demonstrated how market-oriented reformers often engage in a form of “idea orchestration” (Lubienski, Brewer, & La Londe, 2016), wherein foundations or other wealthy donors provide resources to produce and disseminate think tank-generated research in order to advance policy processes and political support (Lubienski et al., 2016; Scott & Jabbar, 2014). While this research suggests skepticism around research use and circulation in educational policy processes, there is some evidence of effectual information use in the sector. In particular, some studies demonstrate that key decision makers use an array of data sources (e.g., administrative data, expert testimony, parent and community input) to inform policy decisions, minimizing the effects of selectively

mined or politically motivated research that can undermine the equity impact of reforms (Asen et al., 2011; Honig & Coburn, 2008). Scholars have also found that research-practice partnerships, which facilitate cross-sector learning through sustained structures that allow for the productive examination and application of research to policy and practice, have also been promising forums for the exchange and use of evidence-based ideas that attend to community and student needs (Bryk et al., 2015; Coburn, Penuel, & Geil, 2013; Farrell, Coburn, & Chong, 2019; Penuel et al., 2011; Tseng & Coburn, 2019).

In addition to research use and circulation, some studies have delineated how policy advocates circulate narratives that include problematic or hegemonic subtexts to generate support from policymakers, communities, and the broader public (Dumas, 2016; Gottlieb, Hutt, & Superfine, 2018; Hernández, 2016). For example, scholars have examined marketing practices in U.S. schools that have increased with the growing competitive pressures of privatization (DiMartino & Jessen, 2014; Jennings, 2010). In this work, researchers have revealed how leaders in both traditional public and charter school sectors employ deficit-laden, racialized representations to attract public support in their outreach, which has had the added effect of reifying racial and economic hierarchies that maintain systems of oppression built on negative social understandings of marginalized groups (Hernández, 2017; Lipman, 2011; Lubinski, 2007; McWilliams, 2017; Turner, 2017).

**Summary.** Scholars have investigated the actors that have supported the adoption and implementation of prominent education policies and the ideational and discursive practices they have deployed to build sociopolitical support. In doing so, researchers elevate important insights into how power, influence, and equity can be inhibited or propelled in policy processes. In particular, they reveal how inequities can be perpetuated through and by policy processes when powerful actors disproportionately influence reform efforts and propagate the circulation of ideas that impede the implementation of research-based and assets-driven policies that can enrich opportunity. At the same time, scholars have illustrated the power of community efforts and grassroots movements that seek to advance community empowerment and equity-oriented reforms that address systemic inequities. In doing so, scholars push the field to consider the possibilities that community-based counter-movements hold and the potential challenges they may face as they agitate for equitable change and justice.

## The Challenges and Opportunities of Policy Implementation

As scholars investigate education policy processes and their equitable character, they have also paid analytic attention to how actors implement adopted reforms and how their behaviors support or undermine equity-oriented policies. Much of this research investigates policy implementation by tracing if policies evolve as they are enacted and suggests that political and normative dynamics at the local level are consequential in this process (Honig, 2006; McDonnell & Weatherford, 2016). For instance, researchers have demonstrated how local histories, particularly surrounding education reform and race relations, have often created a climate of mistrust that influences the degree to which community members support the implementation of district or citywide policies that claim to advance equity for nondominant groups (Buras, 2011; Dumas, 2011; Lipman, 2011; Trujillo et al., 2014). Studies of instructional and disciplinary reforms at the school level also reveal the challenging micro-politics of advancing equity-oriented policies. Specifically, this research has elucidated how some practitioners and communities resist equity-oriented reforms (e.g., de-tracking, discipline reform) or implement them in watered down ways, often justifying their hesitations with arguments that reveal deficit-laden understandings of students from disenfranchised populations or the desire to protect opportunities for privileged groups (DeMatthews et al., 2017; DeMatthews & Mawhinney, 2014; Holme, Diem, & Welton, 2014; Payne & Smith, 2018; Trujillo, 2012; Turner & Spain, 2016). Because policy developers of equity-oriented reforms often fail to anticipate and attend to the technical, political, and normative dimensions of change (Oakes, 1992), some scholars have demonstrated how school leaders, who work as unofficial policy analysts on a daily basis (Malen, 2005), play a critically important role in mediating and translating policy so that it is justly implemented and promotes the learning of students from marginalized racial, linguistic, and economic groups (Mavrogordato & White, 2019).

Researchers also trace the implementation of reforms that intend to generate more inclusive decision-making and stakeholder responsiveness. In seeking to understand how traditionally underrepresented groups are engaged or neglected in district- and site-level governance, scholars have attended to promising policies that mandate parental and community participation in educational decision making, including school-based budgeting and the development of local accountability plans. These studies have revealed how insufficient district and school capacity hampers outreach to and consistent inclusion of families from marginalized groups, allowing for privileged groups to continue to exercise greater influence in these arenas and undermining the democratic and equity aims of these policies (Marsh & Hall, 2018; Marsh et al., 2015; Sinclair & Malen, 2019). Researchers have also examined the issue of inclusive governance and involvement in the charter sector—schools that were theorized as more responsive spaces to students, families, and communities (Budde,

1988; Shanker, 1988). While some scholars found evidence that families were more deeply engaged in charter settings (Smith & Wohlstetter, 2009; Smith et al., 2011; Wilson, 2016), others have provided counterevidence, which shows that some charters operate with limited transparency and create obstacles that inhibit them from being democratically accountable to local communities (Dixson, Buras, & Jeffers, 2015; Hamlin, 2017; Koyama & Kania, 2016; Lay & Bauman, 2017; Scott, 2011).

While many bring scholarly attention to how inequities are maintained or exacerbated through the implementation of equity-oriented policies, others highlight how schools and districts can create conditions that enable policy implementation in ways that fulfill, not abandon, promises of equity. For instance, many scholars have demonstrated how instructional reforms are better implemented when there is ongoing and targeted capacity building that support educator sense-making. Specifically, professional development has been shown to be most impactful when it builds practitioners' foundational understanding of a respective policy, fosters an appropriate mindset to mitigate bias, and develops the technical pedagogical expertise needed to enact pedagogical improvements (Cobb & Jackson, 2012; Coburn, 2005, 2006; Mayer, Woulfin, & Warhol, 2015; Penuel et al., 2009; Spillane, 2009). In this work, scholars have also illustrated the influential role of organizational routines in policy implementation (Peurach, 2016; Spillane et al., 2011), suggesting routines require change and differentiation by grade and subject level to progress beyond the logics of previous reforms to embrace new approaches (Coburn, 2016; Hopkins, Lowenhaupt, & Sweet, 2015; Hopkins et al., 2013; Penuel, 2019; Spillane & Hopkins, 2013).

**Summary.** Despite the espoused equity aims of many education policies, researchers have empirically demonstrated how implementation of these very same reforms at the district and school level can undermine the advancement of opportunity for students and families. Whether through normative and political resistance to equity-oriented policies or the infrastructural issues that inhibit local institutions from creating more inclusive spaces and practices, research indicates that individuals from marginalized communities continue to face micro- and institutional-level barriers that prevent the advancement of educational equity. While these studies underscore the need for equity-oriented policies to anticipate and address the technical, normative, and political dimensions of change (Oakes, 1992), some scholars have identified concrete structures and practices (e.g., ongoing capacity building, organizational routines, investments in principal development) that policymakers and practitioners can use to overcome implementation obstacles.

## Targeted Policies to Support Opportunities for Nondominant Groups

As scholars trace the equitable impact and implementation of education policies, many researchers engage in analyses that specify how prominent reforms uniquely affect the learning and well-being of students in specific subgroups. Over the last 15 years, this work has most frequently focused on how policies are felt and experienced along racial lines. For example, scholars have demonstrated the effects of prominent reforms (e.g., NCLB, zero-tolerance discipline, choice) on Black and Brown communities, often drawing attention to the need to adopt new or more robust policies that further opportunities for these nondominant racial groups (Carter & Welner, 2013; Darling-Hammond, 2007; Frankenberg et al., 2010; Gregory et al., 2010; Orfield & Frankenberg, 2013). Studies investigating how racist ideologies are perpetuated in policy development and implementation also bring critical attention to the racism that undergirds policy processes and the need to more comprehensively anticipate and address normative dimensions of change (Au, 2016; Dumas, 2016; Flores, 2016; Kohli et al., 2017; Wells, 2014).

While racial analyses compose much of the scholarship examining education policy for equity and its impact on subgroups, scholars also consider the effects and implementation of policies intended to support the needs and persistent inequities faced by other vulnerable student populations. Specifically, scholarly attention to the effectiveness and inadequacies of universal and targeted reforms aimed to support English learners, students from rural communities, and students with special needs are prevalent in the research base. An overview of these research subfields is described below and is followed by a brief discussion of the other subgroups—indigenous communities and LGBTQ+ youth—that are less represented in the field.

### Policies to Increase Opportunities for Marginalized Student Subgroups

**English learners.** The teaching and learning experiences of English learners (ELs) have often been the focus of research on equity-oriented education policy. Much of the scholarship in this area interrogates the continued inequities perpetuated by EL policies related to reclassification (Mahoney & MacSwan, 2005; Saunders & Marcellitti, 2013) and standardized, monolingual accountability measures (DelliCarpini, Ortiz-Marrero, & Sumaryono, 2010; Li et al., 2018; Menken, 2008; Shohamy & Menken, 2015), demonstrating how these policies restrict access and inclusion of ELs in rich learning environments and promote practices that undermine effective language development (Gándara & Hopkins, 2010; Gándara & Rumberger, 2009; Johnson, 2019). Other studies have investigated the effectiveness of locally-adopted or state-sanctioned instructional programs for ELs, including statistical

evaluations that denote the negative effects of English-only programs and the positive effects of those that support bilingual language development (MacSwan & Pray, 2005; Marian, Shook, & Schroeder, 2013; Rolstad, Mahoney, & Glass, 2005; Slavin & Cheung, 2005; Steele et al., 2017; Tong et al., 2008; Valentino & Reardon, 2015).

As the research base converges to demonstrate how decades of “subtractive schooling” policies and practices (Valenzuela, 1999) have not advanced opportunities for ELs, scholars are assessing the possibilities and potential obstacles to systematically supporting ELs under federal and state policies, including ESSA and LCFF (Cook-Harvey et al., 2016; Hopkins et al., 2013; Olsen, Armas, & Lavadenz, 2016; Robinson-Cimpian, Thompson, & Umansky, 2016; Vasquez Heilig, Romero, & Hopkins, 2017). These studies suggest that prioritizing investments in capacity building that foster effective instructional practices and necessary mindset shifts among educators and leaders would allow states and districts to best leverage the opportunities and resources available under these new policy frameworks.

**Students in Rural Communities.** A growing body of research attends to the unique needs of students in rural communities—a student population that researchers argue has been underexamined and overlooked in policy efforts and research. Policy scholars seeking to elevate the inequities in rural communities have engaged in defining the extent of the “rural problem” or the educational and socioeconomic challenges faced by stakeholders in these regions (Biddle & Azano, 2016; Schafft, 2016). Researchers have described the severity of socioeconomic challenges experienced by youth in rural areas, often noting how job scarcity, low income levels, and racial discrimination shape rural living and intergenerational disadvantage (Duncan & Blackwell, 2015; Edin & Shaefer, 2016; Thiede, Lichter, & Slack, 2018; Thiede, Kim, & Valasik, 2018; Tickamyer, Sherman, & Warlick, 2017). Building on the research that explores the contextual factors that can affect student learning and well-being, other researchers specifically investigate the learning outcomes of students in these regions and the factors that affect academic success. Their work has revealed the varying levels of student achievement among students in rural schools when compared to their urban peers (DePaoli, Balfanz, & Bridgeland, 2016; Economic Research Service, 2017; Johnson, Showalter, Klein, & Lester, 2014; Witherspoon & Ennett, 2011) and the circumstances precipitating or mitigating early school exit and academic challenges (Dupéré et al., 2019; Irvin et al., 2011).

Scholars also interrogate the failure of educational policies to anticipate obstacles and needs in rural regions given that the much of the research uplifts the complexity and interconnectedness of challenges for youth in rural communities. For instance, some studies examined how rural districts were administratively disadvantaged in implementing the mandates outlined in federal laws, including NCLB and its reauthorization, which aimed to close disparities in academic outcomes between

marginalized groups and their more advantaged peers (Brenner, 2016; Hodge & Krumm, 2009; Johnson & Howley, 2015; Yettick et al., 2014). The lack of responsiveness in federal and state policy to support rural schools has also been well-documented in regional efforts to address one prevalent issue facing rural schools: the recruitment and retention of well-prepared educators and school leaders that can nurture rich learning environments for rural learners (Brownell, Bishop, & Sindelar, 2005; Duncan & Stock, 2010; Eppley, 2009; Malloy & Allen, 2007; Monk, 2007; VanTuyle & Reeves, 2014; Wood, Finch, & Mirecki, 2013). A small number of researchers have considered how market-oriented policies, including the growth of virtual charter schools, have affected rural communities (Cervone, 2018; Mann et al., 2016; Stuit & Doan, 2012). In this subset of research, scholars have demonstrated the increased likelihood of students living in rural areas to attend virtual charter schools, which have been shown to have questionable effects on student learning (Barbour & Reeves, 2009; Miron & Gulosino, 2016; Waters et al., 2014). Taken collectively, this research examining the intersection of education policy, equity, and rural schools has generated important questions about the ability and inability of prominent education reforms to foster rich learning environments in rural communities.

**Students with Special Needs.** Researchers examining equity and education policy also frequently assess the impact of reforms on students with special needs, considering if and how reforms have inhibited or advanced equity by increasing opportunities and outcomes for youth receiving special education services. Like those investigating English learners and other subgroups, scholars have interrogated how prominent reform waves acknowledge and address the academic and social-emotional needs of students receiving special education services (Dudley-Marling & Baker, 2012; Ferri & Ashby, 2017; McLaughlin & Rhim, 2007; Stern et al., 2015). For example, researchers have found that students with special needs are often underrepresented in charter schools and face impediments to service provision in these settings, suggesting that these institutions, which claim to advance equity for all learners, have struggled to include this student population (Drame, 2011; Estes, 2009; Furgeson et al., 2012; Winters, 2015; Wolf, 2011).

Scholars have also pointed to the potential pitfalls and unintended consequences of federal accountability policies (i.e., NCLB) on students with special needs (Hardman & Dawson, 2008; Katsiyannis et al., 2007; McLaughlin et al., 2005). Here, studies have not only highlighted the inconclusive impact of high-stakes accountability on the academic progress of students with special needs (Thurlow et al., 2008; Wei, 2012), but also demonstrated how the attention to test scores often translated into inequitable learning opportunities for this subgroup, including selective attention to “bubble students,” limited curricula, and insufficient accommodations on standardized tests (Bowen & Rude, 2006; Cole, 2006; Katsiyannis et al., 2007; Smith, 2007). Finally, many of the studies investigating

the potential and felt impact of federal and state accountability policies on students with special needs often interrogate the alignment or misalignment of said policies with the reauthorized Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), signed into law in 2004. Scholars investigating the intersection of accountability policies and IDEA often highlight the underlying tension between the standardization and uniform progress levels mandated under high-stakes accountability and the individualization that lies at the heart of special education (Cole, 2006; Hope, 2009; Karger, 2005; McLaughlin, 2010; Moores, 2011)

While scholars investigate if and how policies address the learning needs of special needs students, others continue to delineate a well-documented inequity in the realm of special education: the disproportionate identification of students from nondominant groups. Studies have demonstrated that students of color, English learners, and LGBTQ++ youth are among the student populations that are over-identified for special education services (De Valenzuela et al., 2006; Ferri & Connor, 2005; Skiba et al., 2008; Sullivan, 2011), and have, at times, used intersectional analyses to demonstrate how the identity markers of race, culture, and language coalesce as compounding factors in special education identification (Artiles, 2019; Blanchett et al., 2009; Liasidou, 2013; Shifrer et al., 2011). With these over-identification patterns, many scholars have empirically investigated how this overrepresentation occurs, and found that biases embedded in the technical and interpersonal processes around identification and service provision can lead to prolonged classification and ineffectual learning opportunities (Ahram et al., 2011; Artiles, 2011; Blanchett, 2006; Cavendish et al., 2015; Kramarczuk Voulgarides et al., 2017; Macswan & Rolstad, 2006; Skiba et al., 2008). Overall, the body of research focused on education policy and students with special needs underscores the shortcomings of prominent reforms to address entrenched inequities in special education and further elevates the need for policies and policy research to elucidate how special education and its surrounding processes can be implemented in culturally responsive and just ways.

### **Lesser-Examined Subgroups in the Research Base**

While there is a strong research base on the impact of policies for English learners, special needs students, and youth living in rural communities, the effects of policies on other vulnerable populations who face acute disadvantages and discrimination have been comparatively underexplored in the scholarship on policy and educational equity. These populations notably include indigenous students and LGBTQ+ youth, though some scholars have undertaken investigations of the ways education policy uniquely affects these communities. Through these research subfields, researchers expose ongoing inequities and underscore the imperative of increased scholarly and policy attention to these disenfranchised communities.

**Youth in Indigenous Communities.** While much of the research on indigenous education policy over the past 15 years considers its development in international settings (e.g., Burke & Milewski, 2011; Cottrell, 2010; Ellinghaus, 2006; Gray & Beresford, 2008; Schwab, 2018), some scholars elucidate the ways that targeted and universal reforms have shaped learning experiences for indigenous youth and communities in the U.S. Most of the scholarship in this subfield has investigated community-driven movements that advance policies that emphasize culturally sustaining pedagogy and indigenous language development as a means of creating more equitable and responsive learning opportunities in Native American communities (Beaulieu, 2008; McCarty, 2013; McCarty & Lee, 2014; Warhol, 2010, 2012; Yazzie-Mintz, 2011). Yet, as some examine the possibilities and challenges surrounding these community-rooted policies, others interrogate how prominent reform waves have intersected with these localized efforts. For example, scholars have employed interpretative analyses of No Child Left Behind and other standardization initiatives to consider its impact on Native groups, often noting how these federal laws further limit tribal sovereignty and the development of linguistically and culturally responsive schools (Brayboy et al., 2015; Cohen & Allen, 2013; Mackey, 2017; Winstead et al., 2008). In fewer instances, researchers have considered if school choice and charter school policy have supported the learning needs and rights of indigenous youth. While some studies have demonstrated how charter autonomies can be leveraged to create schools that are more responsive to indigenous communities (Fenimore-Smith, 2009; Fox & Buchanan, 2014; Goodyear-Ka'opua, 2013), others have demonstrated how equitable practices can be limited in local education marketplaces or curtailed by high-stakes accountability (Anthony-Stevens, 2017a, 2017b; Castagno et al., 2016; Combs & Nicholas, 2012). Overall, scholars examining indigenous education reform and its equity implications elevate important tensions in U.S. educational policymaking—the challenge of enacting universal policies that can advance outcomes and opportunities for all students while recognizing and adhering to Native peoples' right to self-determination and well-being.

**LGBTQ+ Youth.** Studies of education policy and its impact on LGBTQ+ youth also constitute an important research subfield, which calls attention to the inequities faced by queer and gender-nonconforming students and the emerging, systemic efforts to ameliorate their learning challenges. To date, much of this research has centered on the need to create or better implement policies related to school climate (Biegel & Kuehl, 2010; McGuire et al., 2010; Russell & McGuire, 2008; Sears, 2005; Wright & Smith, 2013)—a strategy to address the high levels of harassment and disproportionate discipline LGBTQ+ face which negatively affects their well-being and progress (Mitchum & Moodie-Mills, 2014; Mueller et al., 2015; Snapp & Russell, 2016). Many of these studies have examined district or school-based policies and supports (i.e., gay-straight alliance clubs, anti-bullying laws, mental/social services, professional development, LGBTQ+ curriculum)



to consider if the presence of these programs advances student outcomes, identity development, and well-being (Gower et al., 2018; Heck et al., 2014; Kosciw, Palmer, Kull, & Greytak, 2013; Kull et al., 2016; Smith, 2014). Other studies of LGBTQ+ related supports and their implementation have also suggested how these programs might be improved so that they are more identity-affirming and counteract discriminatory forces that inhibit their implementation (Formby, 2015; Kolbert et al., 2015; Swanson & Gettinger, 2016). In fewer instances, scholars have considered how states have instituted policies that allow for the growth of LGBTQ-inclusive policies at the district and school levels, often finding that most states fall short in providing civil protections (Russo, 2006). With the current political climate and the growing attacks on the civil liberties of LGBTQ+ communities, future research should continue to assess the presence and impact of education policies serving queer and gender-nonconforming youth so that reforms can support healthy identity development and academic success among LGBTQ+ youth (Russell & Horn, 2017).

**Summary.** Despite varying levels of scholarly attention, researchers have investigated how prominent reforms uniquely affect vulnerable student groups, and in doing so, elucidate how policies like school choice and accountability have yet to consistently increase learning outcomes and opportunities for students with unique academic, social, and emotional needs. Similarly, researchers examining the effects of targeted policies that affect teaching and learning conditions for specific student populations (i.e., IDEA, EL reclassification, LGBTQ+ supports) have also suggested how these policies fall short in their implementation despite their intended aims. Overall, this body of research has generated critical findings that expose how inequities persist for specific student populations and in turn, elevates the importance of ongoing scholarly inquiry related to the potential and felt effects of policies on student groups who experience discrimination and disadvantages in distinct ways. At the same time, the scholarship suggests that researchers should consider using intersectional frameworks more frequently to understand if and how policies uniquely impact individuals with multiple identity markers and to support the development of reforms that attend to students' academic needs and whole selves.

## Investigating the Intersection of Education Policy and Equity: Future Directions

With the political shifts and growing calls for justice in U.S. schools and beyond over the last 15 years, this research synthesis sought to understand how scholars have engaged in analyses of education policy and equity amid the changing sociopolitical and policy context. To this end, this examination aimed to uncover how policy scholars have sought to understand if or how reforms have enabled the advancement of educational equity for disenfranchised groups and how they have investigated lines of power and oppression within and surrounding policy processes. This analysis revealed that researchers have primarily examined prominent policy waves and/or those intended to support specific student subgroups to consider if or how they have generated improved outcomes and schooling experiences. Furthermore, studies have often surfaced the technical challenges, politics, and norms that have circumscribed reform processes in ways that undermine policy and equity aims, and in fewer occasions, elevated how systems and practices can support deep and powerful implementation. While providing comprehensive and diverse assessments of education policies and their equity potential, this review points to important areas that warrant further inquiry. Some of these are topical, wherein scholars should remain vigilant of ongoing policy developments and their impact. Other suggestions point to newer and bolder research directions for the policy field that can enable robust and multifaceted investigations as to how policy can support the transformation and sustainability of equitable schooling systems.

### Lines of Inquiry to Pursue

This research syntheses suggests that there are topical areas that scholars should attend to in their investigations of education policy and its equitable potential and impact. A key area for continued investigation pertains to the U.S. accountability context and its ongoing evolution. On one level, researchers should continue to understand the implementation and impact of ESSA and seek to can assess if increased state autonomy and the law's emphasis on multiple measures of success translates to improved outcomes and the development of more whole child centered learning environments. This could be pursued quantitatively as scholars seek to detect changes in traditional outcome measures and discipline rates to a shed light on ESSA's impact, and/or engage in studies that more systematically include climate survey data, which can yield important insights on equity and inclusion in schools while elevating the perspectives of students, teachers, and families who are immersed in these settings. Mixed methods and qualitative studies that investigate if and how states and districts implement policies that improve rigor and instruction, support inclusive school climates and culturally responsive programming, and accelerate college and career readiness would also be of critical importance

to the ESSA-related future research base. At the same time, lines of inquiry into the evolution of accountability structures beyond ESSA are also necessary for the field. With COVID-19 spurring the temporary suspension of many accountability structures and laying bare the need for schooling systems grounded in relationships and whole child practices, it is imperative that scholars pursue investigations that capture if or how emerging accountability structures support approaches that spur learning and well-being for disenfranchised youth.

In addition to accountability, scholars should remain vigilant of continued attempts to further marketize in the education sector. Education policy scholars have comprehensively delineated the translation of market systems and logic into U.S. schools, suggesting that market policies have become characteristic features of school systems despite the inconclusive evidence of their impact and the research that reveals how these reforms can perpetuate discriminatory and undemocratic practices and ideologies. The entrenchment and proliferation of market-oriented reforms has even further potential to accelerate with the Trump administration's preferences for choice and privatization and in the face of potential "disaster capitalists" (Klein, 2008) who may seek new or expanded markets and influence in the education sector in the wake of COVID-19. While the potential for increased marketization remains, there is evidence of growing resistance to market-oriented reforms at the state and local levels. For instance, market advocates, particularly those who support the growth of charter schools, have increasingly come under fire by teachers unions, civil rights organizations, and equity activists, suggesting that the broad coalitional support they once maintained is now waning in the face of critical challenges that competitive and constrained schooling environments have fostered. Given these tensions in the landscape, scholarly attention should continue to be paid to the political tactics that reformers use as they seek to maintain favorable policy contexts and/or create new avenues to expand their influence—efforts that the capitalistic logic underpinning their theories of action would suggest they would do.

The growth of grassroots educational movements, which often espouse resistance to privatization and advance multifaceted reform platforms, is also an important area of inquiry for scholars investigating the intersection of equity, policy, and community empowerment. While exemplified by the Black Lives Matter and #RedforEd movement, numerous movements across the country are emerging as counterforces to entrenched coalitions that have perpetuated the onset of policies that have had questionable and often inequitable effects. These movements often ground their efforts in justice-oriented critiques and elevate anti-racist and community responsive reforms as potential remedies for systemic inequities. Researchers should further examine the emergence and growth of these movements, the political tactics and agendas they employ to move the public and decision making bodies to action, and the ultimate success of their

efforts to enact and implement equity-oriented policy. Given the research that demonstrates how more radical educational transformations can be distilled through implementation processes or appropriation by reformist groups, scholars should consider designing studies that can conceptually and methodologically trace the normative and political dimensions of change in their investigations.

As researchers investigate policies and the movements that undergird them, studies should continue to include targeted and intersectional analyses that surface the ways that student subgroups are uniquely affected by broader state and federal policies as well as initiatives generated for their communities. This is particularly true for student groups that are less examined in the research base including LGBTQ+ youth and students from indigenous communities, who have acute social, emotional, and academic needs and have tended to be over-looked in the development and implementation of prominent reform waves. In addition, while a substantial number of research studies has investigated how English learners are affected by policy, future research should consider how equity and learning is promoted for undocumented students, whose learning experiences have primarily been investigated in the realm of higher education. (See Rodriguez & Monreal [2017].) In surfacing how students experience education policy in unique or compounding ways based on their identity markers, scholars can provide research and guidance to decision makers to better understand the complexity and depth of the challenges that need to be acknowledged and addressed in policy development and implementation.

A final topical area for increased scholarship pertains to school leaders and the policies that support their development, placement, and retention. Much of the research on education policy and equity points to the importance of growing and sustaining culturally responsive, equity-oriented leaders, who are critically situated in school systems to serve as policy mediators and to support the conditions that would support its equitable implementation. While there is a robust body of literature on leadership preparation and effective school administration, there is a dearth of studies on administrator-focused policy and how it can systematically support equity-oriented reform implementation. Some exceptions include studies that examine if and how policy changes related to administration accreditation (Galloway & Ishimaru, 2015) and preparation program curricula (Brown, 2004; Pazy & Cole, 2013; Roach et al., 2011) have spurred tangible and systematic changes in leadership practice. Despite these contributions, the field remains nascent, thus suggesting that more explicit scholarly attention to policy supporting effective and responsive school leadership is needed.

## Bolder Frontiers for the Research Field

While the aforementioned topics and lines of inquiry will support ongoing investigations into education policy and its ability to further equity, this synthesis also suggests additional and bolder paths forward that can propel the field. Taken collectively, the body of research on education policy for equity exposes the depth of challenge decision makers and practitioners face in advancing equitable and transformative change for nondominant groups in U.S. schools. While these challenges are related to many education policy processes, they also stem from a fundamental fact: education policy is fundamentally limited in addressing and remedying inequities due to the powerful and compounding systems of power and oppression that permeate all aspects of daily life. This reality should not discourage scholars from advancing queries into the effectiveness and equitable character of education policy, but rather compel the field in different directions to consider how reforms can actually spur and sustain equitable change. For instance, researchers can formulate investigations that more deliberately consider their interplay of education policy with other economic and social policies that necessarily affect young peoples' opportunities to learn and develop. Attending to the multiple and compounding policies that affect young people and their communities can advance a *whole child research agenda* for the field—one that builds upon the growing scholarship on the development of holistic and inclusive schooling environments to acknowledge how broader systems and policies can support healthy development, well-being, and success. Awareness of the interconnectedness of policy systems and structures has been amplified by the coronavirus pandemic and the ongoing displays of racial violence; scholars investigating education policy and equity advancement should seize this opportunity to propel the field in ways that more thoroughly investigate and attend to this reality.

The field would also benefit from further scholarship into another factor limiting the equitable impact of education policy: the fractured nature of U.S. schooling systems that has led to challenges in addressing inequity. The loosely coupled structure of U.S. schools, wherein federal, state, and local institutions hold varying influence in policy making, has not only led to significant differences in how equity-oriented policies are implemented, but also to a fragmented policy agenda that suggests reforms related to areas like funding, accountability, and educator capacity building are competing rather than reinforcing policies (Bishop & Noguera, 2019). While it remains imperative to interrogate the equitable character of individual policies at differing institutional levels, policy scholars should consider engaging in investigations of systems-building, wherein they push against the tendency of viewing policies as piece-meal and provide windows into how schooling systems can effectively and creatively braid varying policy streams to build equitable and community responsive schools and systems.

In addition to these critical areas for research, policy scholars should consider how they engage policy critiques as well as policy solutions. In the face of the documented, multidimensional challenges that impede transformational and equitable change in schools, scholars in the education policy field have tended to maintain healthy skepticism around the ability of more recent initiatives to fulfill their equity promises to all students, noting the potential pitfalls and flawed logics embedded in policy trends and efforts. While some have demonstrated how particular structures and practices can facilitate greater progress, the field is more definitive in delineating the severity and complexity of the obstacles that lay ahead rather than identifying the policy and research-based solutions that can better support decision makers in making equitable transformation and improvement. Looking ahead, policy scholars should consider how they might better complement the rich and important policy critiques they present with discussions of concrete and evidence-based systems and practices that might serve as remedies that mitigate anticipated and emerging inequities.

Education policy scholars investigating equity advancement will also have to continue grappling with a fundamental question: what is equity and how can it be realized? Equity has become a ubiquitous and often appropriated term that can translate to anything from securing individual freedoms for all to the redistribution of opportunities to remedy centuries-long systems of oppression. With the diversity of perspectives and approaches in the education policy field, these differing conceptualizations—as well as abstract definitions of equity—are undoubtedly reflected in the literature base and hold methodological and conceptual implications. While this diversity of thought is a staple of empirical inquiry and scholarship, the current moment compels policy scholars seeking to investigate the equitable impact and potential of reforms to incorporate robust equity definitions into their research—particularly those that articulate how equity-oriented policies can address and ameliorate systemic racism and other oppressive structures. Many researchers, particularly many Black scholars and other scholars of color, have long set an example of how to engage in rigorous inquiry while employing equity-explicit and socially conscious frameworks. A scholarly field dedicated to understanding the intersection of equity and policy should consistently follow suit to enable analyses that advance compelling, nuanced, and impactful scholarship for the research and policy fields.

# References

- Achinstein, B., Ogawa, R. T., Sexton, D., & Freitas, C. (2010). Retaining Teachers of Color: A Pressing Problem and a Potential Strategy for "Hard-to-Staff" Schools. *Review of Educational Research, 80*(1), 71–107. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654309355994>
- Adamson, F., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2012). Funding Disparities and the Inequitable Distribution of Teachers: Evaluating Sources and Solutions. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 20*(0), 37. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v20n37.2012>
- Ahram, R., Fergus, E., & Noguera, P. (2011). Addressing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: Case Studies of Suburban School Districts. *Teachers College Record, 113*(10), 34.
- Ajayi, L. (2016). High school teachers' perspectives on the English language arts Common Core State Standards: An exploratory study. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 15*(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-015-9174-3>
- Alvarez, D., & Mehan, H. (2006). Whole-School Detracking: A Strategy for Equity and Excellence. *Theory Into Practice, 45*(1), 82–89. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4501\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4501_11)
- Anderson, K. P. (2018). Inequitable Compliance: Implementation Failure of a Statewide Student Discipline Reform. *Peabody Journal of Education, 93*(2), 244–263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2018.1435052>
- Anderson, K. P. (2019). Academic, Attendance, and Behavioral Outcomes of a Suspension Reduction Policy: Lessons for School Leaders and Policy Makers. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 0013161X1986113*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X19861138>
- Anderson, K. P., Ritter, G. W., & Zamarro, G. (2019). Understanding a Vicious Cycle: The Relationship Between Student Discipline and Student Academic Outcomes. *Educational Researcher, 48*(5), 251–262. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X19848720>
- Anthony-Stevens, V. (2017a). Indigenous Parents Navigating School Choice in Constrained Landscapes. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education, 11*(2), 92–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15595692.2017.1280780>
- Anthony-Stevens, V. (2017b). When High-Stakes Accountability Measures Impact Promising Practices in an Indigenous-Serving Charter School. In G. Q. Conchas, M. Gottfried, B. M. Hinga, & L. Oseguera (Eds.), *Educational Policy Goes to School*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315558721-6>
- Anyon, J. (1995). Race, Social Class, and Educational Reform in an Inner-City School. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1), 69–94.
- Anyon, J. (2005). What "counts" as educational policy? Notes toward a new paradigm. *Harvard Educational Review, 75*(1), 65–88.
- Anyon, J. (2014). *Radical Possibilities: Public Policy, Urban Education, and A New Social Movement*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203092965>
- Arsen, D., & Mason, M. L. (2013). Seeking Accountability Through State-Appointed Emergency District Management. *Educational Policy, 27*(2), 248–278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904813475711>
- Arsen, David, & Ni, Y. (2008). *The competitive effect of school choice policies on performance in traditional public schools*. Education and the Public Interest Center.
- Artiles, A. J. (2011). Toward an Interdisciplinary Understanding of Educational Equity and Difference: The Case of the Racialization of Ability. *Educational Researcher, 40*(9), 431–445. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11429391>
- Artiles, A. J. (2019). Fourteenth Annual Brown Lecture in Education Research: Reenvisioning Equity Research: Disability Identification Disparities as a Case in Point. *Educational Researcher, 48*(6), 325–335. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X19871949>
- Asen, R., Curke, D., Solomon, R., Conners, P., & Gumm, E. (2011). "The Research Says": Definitions and Uses of a Key Policy Term in Federal Law and Local School Board Deliberations. *Argumentation and Advocacy, 47*(4), 195–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00028533.2011.11821747>
- Au, W. (2016). Meritocracy 2.0: High-Stakes, Standardized Testing as a Racial Project of Neoliberal Multiculturalism. *Educational Policy, 30*(1), 39–62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904815614916>
- Baker, B. D., & Elmer, D. R. (2009). The Politics of Off-the-Shelf School Finance Reform. *Educational Policy, 23*(1), 66–105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904808328512>
- Baker, B., & Weber, M. (2016). Beyond the Echo-Chamber: State Investments and Student Outcomes in U.S. Elementary and Secondary Education. *Journal of Education Finance, 42*(1), 1–27.
- Baker, Bruce D. (2014). Evaluating the Recession's Impact on State School Finance Systems. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n91.2014>
- Baker, Bruce D. (2017). *How Money Matters for Schools* (p. 29). Learning Policy Institute.
- Baker, Bruce D., Libby, K., & Wiley, K. (2015). Charter School Expansion and Within-District Equity: Confluence or Conflict? *Education Finance and Policy*. [https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP\\_a\\_00169](https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP_a_00169)
- Baker, Bruce D., & Miron, G. (2015). *The Business of Charter Schooling: Understanding the Policies that Charter Operators Use for Financial Benefit*. National Education Policy Center. <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/charter-revenue>
- Baldrige, B. J. (2014). Relocating the Deficit: Reimagining Black Youth in Neoliberal Times. *American Educational Research Journal, 51*(3), 440–472. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831214532514>
- Ball, S. J. (1993). What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 13*(2), 10–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0159630930130203>
- Barbour, M. K., & Reeves, T. C. (2009). The reality of virtual schools: A review of the literature. *Computers & Education, 52*(2), 402–416. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2008.09.009>
- Barkan, J. (2013). Plutocrats at Work: How Big Philanthropy Undermines Democracy. *Social Research, 80*(2), 635–652. JSTOR.
- Barnett, W. S. (2011). Effectiveness of Early Educational Intervention. *Science, 333*(6045), 975–978. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1204534>
- Barr, J. M., Sadovnik, A. R., & Visconti, L. (2006). Charter schools and urban education improvement: A comparison of Newark's district and charter schools. *The Urban Review, 38*(4), 291–311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-006-0037-3>
- Barrett, B. D. (2009). No Child Left Behind and the assault on teachers' professional practices and identities. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(8), 1018–1025. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.03.021>
- Beaulieu, D. (2008). Native American Education Research and Policy Development in an Era of No Child Left Behind: Native Language and Culture during the Administrations of Presidents Clinton and Bush. *Journal of American Indian Education, 47*(1), 10–45.

- Biasi, B. (2015). School Finance Equalization and Intergenerational Mobility: Does Equal Spending Lead to Equal Opportunities? *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 9, 1–69. <https://doi.org/doi:10.2139/ssrn.2846490>.
- Biddle, C., & Azano, A. P. (2016). Constructing and Reconstructing the “Rural School Problem”: A Century of Rural Education Research. *Review of Research in Education*, 40(1), 298–325. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X16667700>
- Biegel, S., & Kuehl, S. J. (2010). *Safe at School: Addressing the School Environment and LGBT Safety through Policy and Legislation*. National Education Policy Center. <https://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/safe-at-school>
- Bifulco, R., & Ladd, H. F. (2006). Institutional change and coproduction of public services: The effect of charter schools on parental involvement. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(4), 553–576. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muj001>
- Bifulco, R., & Reback, R. (2013). Fiscal Impacts of Charter Schools: Lessons from New York. *Education Finance and Policy*, 9(1), 86–107. [https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP\\_a\\_00121](https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP_a_00121)
- Bishop, J. P., & Noguera, P. A. (2019). The Ecology of Educational Equity: Implications for Policy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 94(2), 122–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2019.1598108>
- Blanc, E. (2019). *Red State Revolt: The Teachers’ Strike Wave and Working-Class Politics*. Verso Books.
- Blanchett, W. J. (2006). Disproportionate Representation of African American Students in Special Education: Acknowledging the Role of White Privilege and Racism. *Educational Researcher*, 35(6), 24–28. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X035006024>
- Blanchett, W. J., Klingner, J. K., & Harry, B. (2009). The Intersection of Race, Culture, Language, and Disability: Implications for Urban Education. *Urban Education*, 44(4), 389–409. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085909338686>
- Booher-Jennings, J. (2005). Below the bubble: “Educational triage” and the Texas Accountability System. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42(2), 231–268. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312042002231>
- Booker, K., Gilpatric, S. M., Gronberg, T., & Jansen, D. (2008). The effect of charter schools on traditional public school students in Texas: Are children who stay behind left behind? *Journal of Urban Economics*, 64(1), 123–145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2007.10.003>
- Boser, U. (2011). *Teacher Diversity Matters* (p. 28). Center for American Progress.
- Bowen, S. K., & Rude, H. A. (2006). Assessment and Students with Disabilities: Issues and Challenges with Educational Reform. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 25(3), 24–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875687050602500304>
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. Basic Books.
- Brayboy, B. M. J., Faircloth, S. C., Lee, T. S., Maaka, M. J., & Richardson, T. A. (2015). Sovereignty and Education: An Overview of the Unique Nature of Indigenous Education. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 54(1), 1–9.
- Brenner, D. (2016). Rural Educator Policy Brief: Rural Education and the Every Student Succeeds Act. *The Rural Educator*, 37(2). <http://epubs.library.msstate.edu/index.php/ruraleducator/article/view/336>
- Brown, K. M. (2004). Leadership for Social Justice and Equity: Weaving a Transformative Framework and Pedagogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 77–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X03259147>
- Brownell, M. T., Bishop, A. M., & Sindelar, P. T. (2005). NCLB and the Demand for Highly Qualified Teachers: Challenges and Solutions for Rural Schools. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 24(1), 9–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875687050502400103>
- Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., & LeMahieu, P. G. (2015). *Learning to Improve: How America’s Schools Can Get Better at Getting Better*. Harvard Education Press.
- Budde, R. (1988). *Education by charter: Restructuring school districts. Key to long-term continuing improvement in American education*. Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement of the Northeast & Islands.
- Buddin, R., & Zimmer, R. (2005). Student achievement in charter schools: A complex picture. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 24(2), 351–371. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.20093>
- Bulkley, K. E., & Burch, P. (2011). The Changing Nature of Private Engagement in Public Education: For-Profit and Nonprofit Organizations and Educational Reform. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 86(3), 236–251. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2011.578963>
- Bulkley, K. E., & Henig, J. R. (2015). Local Politics and Portfolio Management Models: National Reform Ideas and Local Control. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 90(1), 53–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2015.988528>
- Bulkley, K. E., Henig, J. R., & Levin, H. M. (2010). *Between Public and Private: Politics, Governance, and the New Portfolio Models for Urban School Reform*. Harvard Education Press.
- Buras, K. L. (2011). Race, charter schools, and conscious capitalism: On the spatial politics of whiteness as property (and the unconscionable assault on black New Orleans). *Harvard Educational Review*, 81(2), 296–331.
- Buras, K. L. (2014). *Charter Schools, Race, and Urban Space: Where the Market Meets Grassroots Resistance*. Routledge.
- Burch, P. (2006). The new educational privatization: Educational contracting and high stakes accountability. *Teachers College Record*, 108(12), 2582–2610.
- Burch, P., Steinberg, M., & Donovan, J. (2007). Supplemental Educational Services and NCLB: Policy Assumptions, Market Practices, Emerging Issues. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 29(2), 115–133. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373707302035>
- Burke, S. Z., & Milewski, P. (2011). *Schooling in Transition: Readings in Canadian History of Education*. University of Toronto Press.
- Burks, B. A., Beziat, T. L. R., Danley, S., Davis, K., Lowery, H., & Lucas, J. (2015, Winter). *Adapting to Change: Teacher Perceptions of Implementing the Common Core State Standards* [Text]. <https://www.ingentaconnect.com/contentone/prin/ed/2015/00000136/00000002/art00013>
- Candelaria, C. A., & Shores, K. A. (2019). Court-Ordered Finance Reforms in the Adequacy Era: Heterogeneous Causal Effects and Sensitivity. *Education Finance and Policy*, 14(1), 31–60. [https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp\\_a\\_00236](https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp_a_00236)
- Carnoy, M., Jacobsen, R., Mishel, L., & Rothstein, R. (2005). *The charter school dust-up: Examining the evidence on enrollment and achievement*. Economic Policy Institute. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/47433431/DB80E91FCCED4C25PQ/1?accountid=14496>
- Carr, M., & Ritter, G. (2007). *Measuring the competitive effect of charter schools on student achievement in Ohio’s traditional public schools* (No. 146). National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education.
- Carter, P. L., & Welner, K. G. (Eds.). (2013). *Closing the Opportunity Gap: What America Must Do to Give Every Child an Even Chance* (1 edition). Oxford University Press.
- Carver-Thomas, D. (2018). *Diversifying the Teaching Profession: How to Recruit and Retain Teachers of Color* (p. 54). Learning Policy Institute.
- Cascio, E. U., Gordon, N., & Reber, S. (2013). Local Responses to Federal Grants: Evidence from the Introduction of Title I in the South. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 5(3), 126–159. <https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.5.3.126>

- Castagno, A. E., Garcia, D. R., & Blalock, N. (2016). Rethinking School Choice: Educational Options, Control, and Sovereignty in Indian Country. *Journal of School Choice, 10*(2), 227–248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15582159.2016.1153379>
- Cavendish, W., Artiles, A. J., & Harry, B. (2015). Tracking Inequality 60 Years After Brown: Does Policy Legitimize the Racialization of Disability? *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners, 14*(2), 30–40.
- Center for Research on Education Outcomes. (2013). *Multiple choice: Charter school performance in 16 states*. Author.
- Cervone, J. A. (2018). *Corporatizing Rural Education—Neoliberal Globalization and Reaction in the United States*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://www.palgrave.com/gp/book/9783319644615>
- Chambers, J. G., Levin, J. D., & Shambaugh, L. (2010). Exploring weighted student formulas as a policy for improving equity for distributing resources to schools: A case study of two California school districts. *Economics of Education Review, 29*(2), 283–300. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2009.09.005>
- Chong, S. (2018). Resource and Remaking: Organizational Mediation of Parent-School Relationships [UC Berkeley]. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0m45z3zx>
- Cobb, P., & Jackson, K. (2011). Assessing the Quality of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics. *Educational Researcher, 40*(4), 183–185. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11409928>
- Cobb, P., & Jackson, K. (2012). Analyzing Educational Policies: A Learning Design Perspective. *Journal of the Learning Sciences, 21*(4), 487–521. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508406.2011.630849>
- Coburn, C. E. (2006). Framing the problem of reading instruction: Using frame analysis to uncover the microprocesses of policy implementation. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*(3), 343–379.
- Coburn, Cynthia E. (2005). Shaping Teacher Sensemaking: School Leaders and the Enactment of Reading Policy. *Educational Policy, 19*(3), 476–509. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904805276143>
- Coburn, Cynthia E. (2016). What's Policy Got to Do with It? How the Structure-Agency Debate Can Illuminate Policy Implementation. *American Journal of Education, 122*(3), 465–475. <https://doi.org/10.1086/685847>
- Coburn, Cynthia E., Penuel, W. R., & Geil, K. E. (2013). *Research-Practice Partnerships: A Strategy for Leveraging Research for Educational Improvement in School Districts*. William T Grant Foundation. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED568396>
- Cohen, D. K., & Mehta, J. D. (2017). Why Reform Sometimes Succeeds: Understanding the Conditions That Produce Reforms That Last. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(4), 644–690. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831217700078>
- Cohen, E., & Allen, A. (2013). Toward an Ideal Democracy: The Impact of Standardization Policies on the American Indian/Alaska Native Community and Language Revitalization Efforts. *Educational Policy, 27*(5), 743–769. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904811429284>
- Cohen, J. L. (2010). Teachers in the news: A critical analysis of one US newspaper's discourse on education, 2006–2007. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 31*(1), 105–119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596300903465450>
- Cole, C. (2006). Closing the Achievement Gap Series: Part III. What Is the Impact of NCLB on the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities? Education Policy Brief. Volume 4, Number 11, Fall 2006. Center for Evaluation and Education Policy. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED495750>
- Combs, M. C., & Nicholas, S. E. (2012). The effect of Arizona language policies on Arizona Indigenous students. *Language Policy, 11*(1), 101–118. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-011-9230-7>
- Conlin, M., & Thompson, P. N. (2017). Impacts of new school facility construction: An analysis of a state-financed capital subsidy program in Ohio. *Economics of Education Review, 59*, 13–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2017.05.002>
- Cook-Harvey, C. M., Darling-Hammond, L., Lam, L., Mercer, C., & Roc, M. (2016). *Equity and ESSA: Leveraging Educational Opportunity Through the Every Student Succeeds Act* (p. 36). Learning Policy Institute.
- Cottrell, M. (2010). Indigenous Education in Comparative Perspective: Global Opportunities for Reimagining Schools. *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education, 1*(4), 223–227. <https://doi.org/10.20533/ijcdse.2042.6364.2010.0031>
- Cucchiara, M. B., & Horvat, E. M. (2009). Perils and Promises: Middle-Class Parental Involvement in Urban Schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 46*(4), 974–1004. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831209345791>
- Curran, F. C. (2019). The Law, Policy, and Portrayal of Zero Tolerance School Discipline: Examining Prevalence and Characteristics Across Levels of Governance and School Districts. *Educational Policy, 33*(2), 319–349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904817691840>
- Daniel, J., Quartz, K. H., & Oakes, J. (2019). Teaching in Community Schools: Creating Conditions for Deeper Learning. *Review of Research in Education, 43*(1), 453–480. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X18821126>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2007). Race, inequality and educational accountability: The irony of 'No Child Left Behind.' *Race Ethnicity and Education, 10*(3), 245–260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320701503207>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2019). *Investing for Student Success* (p. 42). Learning Policy Institute.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2019). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science, 0*(0), 1–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/010888691.2018.1537791>
- De Valenzuela, J. S., Copeland, S. R., Qi, C. H., & Park, M. (2006). Examining Educational Equity: Revisiting the Disproportionate Representation of Minority Students in Special Education. *Exceptional Children, 72*(4), 425–441. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290607200403>
- DeBray-Pelot, E., & McGuinn, P. (2009). The new politics of education: Analyzing the federal education policy landscape in the post-NCLB era. *Educational Policy, 23*(1), 15–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904808328524>
- Dee, T. S. (2004). Teachers, Race and Student Achievement in a Randomized Experiment. *The Review of Economics and Statistics, 195*–210.
- Dee, T. S., & Jacob, B. (2011). The impact of no Child Left Behind on student achievement. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 30*(3), 418–446. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.20586>
- Dee, T. S., & Penner, E. K. (2017). The Causal Effects of Cultural Relevance: Evidence From an Ethnic Studies Curriculum. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(1), 127–166. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216677002>
- DelliCarpini, M., Ortiz-Marrero, F. W., & Sumaryono, K. (2010). Success with ELLs: ELLs at the Center: Rethinking High-Stakes Testing. *The English Journal, 99*(6), 93–96. JSTOR.
- DeMatthews, D. E., Carey, R. L., Olivarez, A., & Moussavi Saeedi, K. (2017). Guilty as Charged? Principals' Perspectives on Disciplinary Practices and the Racial Discipline Gap. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 53*(4), 519–555. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X17714844>
- DeMatthews, D., & Mawhinney, H. (2014). Social Justice Leadership and Inclusion: Exploring Challenges in an Urban District Struggling to Address Inequities. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 50*(5), 844–881. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X13514440>

- DePaoli, J. L., Balfanz, R., & Bridgeland, J. (2016). *Building a Grad Nation: Progress and Challenge in Raising High School Graduation Rates. Annual Update 2016*. Civic Enterprises and Everyone Graduates Center. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED572731>
- DiMartino, C., & Jessen, S. B. (2014). School Brand Management The Policies, Practices, and Perceptions of Branding and Marketing in New York City's Public High Schools. *Urban Education*, 0042085914543112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085914543112>
- Dorado, J. S., Martinez, M., McArthur, L. E., & Leibovitz, T. (2016). Healthy Environments and Response to Trauma in Schools (HEARTS): A Whole-School, Multi-level, Prevention and Intervention Program for Creating Trauma-Informed, Safe and Supportive Schools. *School Mental Health*, 8(1), 163–176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-016-9177-0>
- Drame, E. R. (2011). An Analysis of the Capacity of Charter Schools to Address the Needs of Students With Disabilities in Wisconsin. *Remedial and Special Education*, 32(1), 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932510361259>
- Dudley-Marling, C., & Baker, D. (2012). The Effects of Market-based School Reforms on Students with Disabilities. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 32(2). <https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v32i2.3187>
- Dumas, M., & Anderson, G. L. (2014). Qualitative research as policy knowledge: Framing policy problems and transforming education from the ground up. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22(0), 11. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n1.2014>
- Dumas, M. J. (2011). A cultural political economy of school desegregation in Seattle. *Teachers College Record*, 113(4), 703–734.
- Dumas, M. J. (2016). Against the Dark: Antiracism in Education Policy and Discourse. *Theory Into Practice*, 55(1), 11–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1116852>
- Duncan, C. M., & Blackwell, A. (2015). *Worlds Apart: Poverty and Politics in Rural America, Second Edition* (2 edition). Yale University Press.
- Duncan, H. E., & Stock, M. J. (2010). Mentoring and Coaching Rural School Leaders: What Do They Need? *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 18(3), 293–311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13611267.2010.492947>
- Dupéré, V., Goulet, M., Archambault, I., Leventhal, T., Dion, E., & Crosnoe, R. (2019). Circumstances Preceding Dropout Among Rural High School Students: A Comparison with Urban Peers. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 35(3), 20.
- Dynarski, S., Hyman, J., & Schanzenbach, D. W. (2013). Experimental Evidence on the Effect of Childhood Investments on Postsecondary Attainment and Degree Completion. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 32(4), 692–717. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.21715>
- Economic Research Service. (2017). *Rural Education At A Glance, 2017* (p. 6). United States Department of Agriculture, Economic Information Bulletin 171.
- Edin, K., & Shaefer, H. L. (2016). *\$2.00 a Day: Living on Almost Nothing in America* (Reprint edition). Mariner Books.
- Egalite, A. J. (2013). Measuring Competitive Effects From School Voucher Programs: A Systematic Review. *Journal of School Choice*, 7(4), 443–464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15582159.2013.837759>
- Egalite, A. J., Fusarelli, L. D., & Fusarelli, B. C. (2017). Will Decentralization Affect Educational Inequity? The Every Student Succeeds Act. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 53(5), 757–781. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X17735869>
- Ellinghaus, K. (2006). Indigenous Assimilation and Absorption in the United States and Australia. *Pacific Historical Review*, 75(4), 563–585. <https://doi.org/10.1525/phr.2006.75.4.563>
- Epple, D., Romano, R., & Zimmer, R. (2016). Chapter 3 - Charter Schools: A Survey of Research on Their Characteristics and Effectiveness. In E. A. Hanushek, S. Machin, & L. Woessmann (Eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Education* (Vol. 5, pp. 139–208). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-63459-7.00003-8>
- Eppley, K. (2009). Rural Schools and the Highly Qualified Teacher Provision of No Child Left Behind: A Critical Policy Analysis. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 24(4), 1–11.
- Estes, M. B. (2009). Charter Schools and Students With Disabilities: How Far Have We Come? *Remedial and Special Education*, 30(4), 216–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932508315647>
- Evans, W. N., Schwab, R. M., & Wagner, K. L. (2017). The Great Recession and Public Education. *Education Finance and Policy*, 14(2), 298–326. [https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp\\_a\\_00245](https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp_a_00245)
- Farmer-Hinton, R. (2011). On Being College Prep: Examining the Implementation of a "College for All" Mission in an Urban Charter School. *The Urban Review*, 43(5), 567–596. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-010-0168-4>
- Farrell, C. C., Coburn, C. E., & Chong, S. (2019). Under What Conditions Do School Districts Learn From External Partners? The Role of Absorptive Capacity. *American Educational Research Journal*, 56(3), 955–994. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831218808219>
- Fenimore-Smith, J. K. (2009). The power of place: Creating an Indigenous charter school. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 48(2), 1–17.
- Fennimore, B. S. (2017). Permission Not Required: The Power of Parents to Disrupt Educational Hypocrisy. *Review of Research in Education*, 41(1), 159–181. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X16687974>
- Ferman, B. (Ed.). (2017). *The Fight for America's Schools: Grassroots Organizing in Education*. Harvard Education Press.
- Ferrare, J. J., & Setari, R. R. (2018). Converging on Choice: The Interstate Flow of Foundation Dollars to Charter School Organizations. *Educational Researcher*, 47(1), 34–45. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X17736524>
- Ferri, B. A., & Ashby, C. (2017). U.S. Inclusion in the Era of Neoliberal Educational Reforms. *Special Educational Needs and Inclusive Practices*, 21–31. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789463008570\\_003](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789463008570_003)
- Ferri, B. A., & Connor, D. J. (2005). In the Shadow of Brown: Special Education and Overrepresentation of Students of Color. *Remedial and Special Education*, 26(2), 93–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07419325050260020401>
- Finn, J. D., & Achilles, C. M. (1999). Tennessee's Class Size Study: Findings, Implications, Misconceptions. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 21(2), 97–109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/01623737021002097>
- Finnigan, K. S., & Gross, B. (2007). Do Accountability Policy Sanctions Influence Teacher Motivation? Lessons From Chicago's Low-Performing Schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(3), 594–630. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831207306767>
- Flannery, K. B., Fenning, P., Kato, M. M., & McIntosh, K. L. (2014). Effects of school-wide positive behavioral interventions and supports and fidelity of implementation on problem behavior in high schools. *School Psychology Quarterly: The Official Journal of the Division of School Psychology, American Psychological Association*, 29(2), 111–124. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000039>
- Flores, N. (2016). A tale of two visions: Hegemonic whiteness and bilingual education. *Educational Policy*, 30(1), 13–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904815616482>
- Formby, E. (2015). Limitations of focussing on homophobic, biphobic and transphobic 'bullying' to understand and address LGBT young people's experiences within and beyond school. *Sex Education*, 15(6), 626–640. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681811.2015.1054024>



- Fox, L. (2016). Seeing Potential: The Effects of Student-Teacher Demographic Congruence on Teacher Expectations and Recommendations. *AERA Open*, 2(1), 2332858415623758. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858415623758>
- Fox, R. A., & Buchanan, N. K. (2014). *Proud to be Different: Ethnocentric Niche Charter Schools in America*. R&L Education.
- Frankenberg, E., Siegel-Hawley, G., & Wang, J. (2010). *Choice without equity: Charter school segregation and the need for civil rights standards*. Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED509773.pdf>
- Freeman, J., Simonsen, B., McCoach, D. B., Sugai, G., Lombardi, A., & Horner, R. (2016). Relationship Between School-Wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports and Academic, Attendance, and Behavior Outcomes in High Schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 18(1), 41–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300715580992>
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed, 30th Anniversary Edition* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.; 30th Anniversary edition). Continuum.
- Furger, R. C., Hernández, L. E., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2019). *The Golden State's Quest to Build an Equitable and Excellent Education System* (p. 110). Learning Policy Institute.
- Furgeson, J., Gill, B., Haimson, J., Killewald, A., McCullough, M., Nichols-Barrer, I., Verbitsky-Savitz, N., Teh, B., Bowen, M., & Demeritt, A. (2012). Charter-school management organizations: *Diverse strategies and diverse student impacts*. Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED528536.pdf>
- Galloway, M. K., & Ishimaru, A. M. (2015). Radical Recentering: Equity in Educational Leadership Standards. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 51(3), 372–408. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X15590658>
- Gamson, D. A., Lu, X., & Eckert, S. A. (2013). Challenging the Research Base of the Common Core State Standards: A Historical Reanalysis of Text Complexity. *Educational Researcher*, 42(7), 381–391. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X13505684>
- Gándara, P., & Hopkins, M. (Eds.). (2010). *Forbidden Language: English Learners and Restrictive Language Policies*. Teachers College Press.
- Gandara, P., & Rumberger, R. W. (2009). Immigration, Language, and Education: How Does Language Policy Structure Opportunity? *Teachers College Record*, 111(3), 750–782.
- Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network. (2016). *Educational Exclusion: Drop Out, Push Out, and the School-to-Prison Pipeline among LGBTQ Youth*. GLSEN.
- Golann, J. W. (2015). The paradox of success at a no-excuses school. *Sociology of Education*, 88(2), 103–119. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040714567866>
- Gooden, M. A., Jabbar, H., & Mario S. Torres, Jr. (2016). Race and School Vouchers: Legal, Historical, and Political Contexts. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 91(4), 522–536. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2016.1207445>
- Goodman, J. F. (2013). Charter Management Organizations and the regulated environment: Is it worth the price? *Educational Researcher*, 42(2), 89–96. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12470856>
- Goodyear-Ka'opua, N. (2013). *The Seeds We Planted: Portraits of a Native Hawaiian Charter School*. U of Minnesota Press.
- Gottlieb, J. J., Hutt, E. L., & Superfine, B. M. (2018). Causal Stories in *Vergara v. California*. *Educational Policy*, 089590481880211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904818802110>
- Gower, A. L., Forster, M., Gloppen, K., Johnson, A. Z., Eisenberg, M. E., Connett, J. E., & Borowsky, I. W. (2018). School Practices to Foster LGBT-Supportive Climate: Associations with Adolescent Bullying Involvement. *Prevention Science*, 19(6), 813–821. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s1121-017-0847-4>
- Gray, J., & Beresford, Q. (2008). A 'Formidable Challenge': Australia's Quest for Equity in Indigenous Education. *Australian Journal of Education*, 52(2), 197–223. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000494410805200207>
- Gregory, A., & Fergus, E. (2017). Social and Emotional Learning and Equity in School Discipline. *The Future of Children*, 27(1), 117–136. JSTOR.
- Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The Achievement Gap and the Discipline Gap. *Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09357621>
- Griner, A. C., & Stewart, M. L. (2013). Addressing the Achievement Gap and Disproportionality Through the Use of Culturally Responsive Teaching Practices. *Urban Education*, 48(4), 585–621. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085912456847>
- Gross, B., & Pochop, K. M. (2008). How charter schools organize for instruction. *In Hopes, fears, & reality: A balanced look at American charter schools in 2008* (pp. 9–22). Center on Reinventing Public Education.
- Grubb, W. N. (2009). *Money Myth, The: School Resources, Outcomes, and Equity*. Russell Sage Foundation; JSTOR. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7758/9781610446372>
- Guarino, C. M., Santibañez, L., & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher Recruitment and Retention: A Review of the Recent Empirical Literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(2), 173–208. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543076002173>
- Guha, R., Hylar, M. E., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). The teacher residency: A Practical Path to Recruitment and Retention. *American Educator*, 41(1), 31–44.
- Hallett, R. E., & Venegas, K. M. (2011). Is Increased Access Enough? Advanced Placement Courses, Quality, and Success in Low-Income Urban Schools. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 34(3), 468–487. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016235321103400305>
- Halverson, T. J., & Plecki, M. L. (2015). Exploring the Politics of Differential Resource Allocation: Implications for Policy Design and Leadership Practice. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 14(1), 42–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2014.983129>
- Hamedani, M. G., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2015). *Social Emotional Learning in High School: How Three Urban High Schools Engage, Educate, and Empower Youth* (p. 15). Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education. <https://edpolicy.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/scope-pub-social-emotional-learning-research-brief.pdf>
- Hamlin, D. (2017). Parental Involvement in High Choice Deindustrialized Cities: A Comparison of Charter and Public Schools in Detroit. *Urban Education*, 004208591769720. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085917697201>
- Hammond, Z. L. (2014). *Culturally Responsive Teaching and The Brain: Promoting Authentic Engagement and Rigor Among Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students* (1st Edition edition). Corwin.
- Hanushek, E. A. (2006). Chapter 14 School Resources. In E. Hanushek & F. Welch (Eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Education* (Vol. 2, pp. 865–908). Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0692\(06\)02014-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0692(06)02014-9)
- Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2010). The Quality and Distribution of Teachers under the No Child Left Behind Act. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 24(3), 133–150. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.24.3.133>
- Hardman, M. L., & Dawson, S. (2008). The Impact of Federal Public Policy on Curriculum and Instruction for Students With Disabilities in the General Classroom. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, 52(2), 5–11. <https://doi.org/10.3200/PSFL.52.2.5-11>
- Harris, D. N., & Larsen, M. F. (2015). *The Effects of the New Orleans Post-Katrina School Reforms on Student Academic Outcomes*. <http://educationresearchalliancenaola.org/files/publications/The-Effects-of-the-New-Orleans-Post-Katrina-School-Reforms-on-Student-Academic-Outcomes.pdf>

- Hashim, A. K., Strunk, K. O., & Dhaliwal, T. K. (2018). Justice for All? Suspension Bans and Restorative Justice Programs in the Los Angeles Unified School District. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 93(2), 174–189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2018.1435040>
- Heck, N. C., Livingston, N. A., Flentje, A., Oost, K., Stewart, B. T., & Cochran, B. N. (2014). Reducing risk for illicit drug use and prescription drug misuse: High school gay-straight alliances and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth. *Addictive Behaviors*, 39(4), 824–828. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2014.01.007>
- Hedges, L. V., Pigott, T. D., Polanin, J. R., Ryan, A. M., Tocci, C., & Williams, R. T. (2016). The Question of School Resources and Student Achievement: A History and Reconsideration. *Review of Research in Education*, 40(1), 143–168. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X16667070>
- Henry, G. T., Bastian, K. C., & Smith, A. A. (2012). Scholarships to Recruit the “Best and Brightest” Into Teaching: Who Is Recruited, Where Do They Teach, How Effective Are They, and How Long Do They Stay? *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 83–92.
- Hernández, L. E. (2016). Race and racelessness in CMO marketing: Exploring Charter Management Organizations’ racial construction and its implications. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 91(1), 47–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2016.1119566>
- Hernández, Laura E, Darling-Hammon, L., Adams, J., Bradley, K., (with Duncan Grand, D., Roc, M., & Ross, P. ). (2019). *Deeper Learning Networks: Taking Student-Centered Learning and Equity to Scale* (p. 102). Learning Policy Institute.
- Hernández, Laura Elena. (2017). *Managing the Brand: Racial Politics, Strategic Messaging, and Coalition-Building Efforts of Charter Management Organizations* [UC Berkeley]. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2wr7q0wt>
- Hines-Datiri, D., & Carter Andrews, D. J. (2017). The Effects of Zero Tolerance Policies on Black Girls: Using Critical Race Feminism and Figured Worlds to Examine School Discipline. *Urban Education*, 0042085917690204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085917690204>
- Hodge, C. L., & Krumm, B. L. (2009). NCLB: A Study of Its Effect on Rural Schools—School Administrators Rate Service Options for Students with Disabilities. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 28(1), 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875687050902800104>
- Hodge, E. M., Salloum, S. J., & Benko, S. L. (2016). (Un)Commonly Connected: A Social Network Analysis of State Standards Resources for English/Language Arts. *AERA Open*, 2(4), 2332858416674901. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858416674901>
- Hoffman, S. (2014). Zero Benefit: Estimating the Effect of Zero Tolerance Discipline Polices on Racial Disparities in School Discipline. *Educational Policy*, 28(1), 69–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904812453999>
- Holden, K. L. (2016). Buy the Book? Evidence on the Effect of Textbook Funding on School-Level Achievement. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 8(4), 100–127. <https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20150112>
- Holme, J. J., Diem, S., & Welton, A. (2014). Suburban School Districts and Demographic Change: The Technical, Normative, and Political Dimensions of Response. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(1), 34–66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X13484038>
- Holquist, S. (2019). *Student Voice in Education Policy: Understanding student participation in state-level K-12 education policy making*. <http://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/11299/206658>
- Hong, K., & Zimmer, R. (2016). Does Investing in School Capital Infrastructure Improve Student Achievement? *Economics of Education Review*, 53, 143–158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2016.05.007>
- Honig, M. I. (Ed.). (2006). *New Directions in Education Policy Implementation*. SUNY Press.
- Honig, M. I., & Coburn, C. (2008). Evidence-Based Decision Making in School District Central Offices: Toward a Policy and Research Agenda. *Educational Policy*, 22(4), 578–608. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904807307067>
- Hope, R. G. (2009). IDEA & (and) NCLB: Is There a Fix to Make Them Compatible. *Children’s Legal Rights Journal*, 29, 1.
- Hopkins, M., Lowenhaupt, R., & Sweet, T. M. (2015). Organizing English Learner Instruction in New Immigrant Destinations: District Infrastructure and Subject-Specific School Practice. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52(3), 408–439. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831215584780>
- Hopkins, M., Spillane, J. P., Jakopovic, P., & Heaton, R. M. (2013). Infrastructure Redesign and Instructional Reform in Mathematics: Formal Structure and Teacher Leadership. *The Elementary School Journal*, 114(2), 200–224. <https://doi.org/10.1086/671935>
- Hopkins, M., Thompson, K. D., Linquanti, R., Hakuta, K., & August, D. (2013). Fully Accounting for English Learner Performance: A Key Issue in ESEA Reauthorization. *Educational Researcher*, 42(2), 101–108. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12471426>
- Horsford, S. D., Scott, J. T., & Anderson, G. L. (2018). *The Politics of Education Policy in an Era of Inequality: Possibilities for Democratic Schooling* (1 edition). Routledge.
- Huberman, M., Bitter, C., Anthony, J., & O’Day, J. (2014). *The Shape of Deeper Learning: Strategies, Structures, and Cultures in Deeper Learning Network High Schools* (p. 46). American Institutes for Research.
- Hyman, J. (2017). Does Money Matter in the Long Run? Effects of School Spending on Educational Attainment. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 9(4), 256–280. <https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20150249>
- Imberman, S. A. (2008). *The effect of charter schools on non-charter students: An instrumental variables approach* (No. 149). National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education.
- Irvin, M. J., Meece, J. L., Byun, S., Farmer, T. W., & Hutchins, B. C. (2011). Relationship of School Context to Rural Youth’s Educational Achievement and Aspirations. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 40(9), 1225. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-011-9628-8>
- Ishimaru, A. (2013). From Heroes to Organizers: Principals and Education Organizing in Urban School Reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(1), 3–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X12448250>
- Jabbar, H. (2015). “Every kid is money”: Market-like competition and school leader strategies in New Orleans. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 37(4), 638–659. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373715577447>
- Jabbar, H., Fong, C. J., Germain, E., Li, D., Sanchez, J., Sun, W.-L., & Devall, M. (2019). The Competitive Effects of School Choice on Student Achievement: A Systematic Review. *Educational Policy*, 0895904819874756. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904819874756>
- Jackson, C. K. (2018). *Does School Spending Matter? The New Literature on an Old Question* (Working Paper No. 25368). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w25368>
- Jackson, C. K., Johnson, R. C., & Persico, C. (2016). The Effects of School Spending on Educational and Economic Outcomes: Evidence from School Finance Reforms. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(1), 157–218. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjv036>

- Jacobsen, R., Saultz, A., & Snyder, J. W. (2013). When Accountability Strategies Collide: Do Policy Changes That Raise Accountability Standards Also Erode Public Satisfaction? *Educational Policy*, 27(2), 360–389. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904813475712>
- Jenkins, D. A. (2018). *From Segregation to Congregation: A Case Study of Community Engaged Urban School Reform* [UCLA]. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8td070vn>
- Jennings, J. L. (2010). School Choice or Schools' Choice? Managing in an Era of Accountability. *Sociology of Education*, 83(3), 227–247. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038040710375688>
- Jochim, A., & Lavery, L. (2015). The Evolving Politics of the Common Core: Policy Implementation and Conflict Expansion. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 45(3), 380–404. <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjv015>
- Johnson, A. (2019). The Impact of English Learner Reclassification on High School Reading and Academic Progress. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 0162373719877197. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373719877197>
- Johnson, A. W. (2013). "Turnaround" as Shock Therapy Race, Neoliberalism, and School Reform. *Urban Education*, 48(2), 232–256. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085912441941>
- Johnson, J., & Howley, C. B. (2015). Contemporary Federal Education Policy and Rural Schools: A Critical Policy Analysis. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 90(2), 224–241. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2015.1022112>
- Johnson, J., Showalter, D., Klein, R., & Lester, C. (2014). *Why Rural Matters 2013-2014: The Condition of Rural Education in the 50 States*. Rural School and Community Trust. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED556045>
- Karger, J. (2005). *Access to the General Curriculum for Students with Disabilities: A Discussion of the Interrelationship between IDEA '04 and NCLB*. National Center on Accessing the General Curriculum. <http://aem.cast.org/about/publications/2005/ncac-curriculum-access-idea04-nclb.html>
- Katsiyannis, A., Zhang, D., Ryan, J. B., & Jones, J. (2007). High-Stakes Testing and Students With Disabilities: Challenges and Promises. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 18(3), 160–167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10442073070180030401>
- Kemple, J. J. (2011). Children first and student outcomes: 2003–2010. In J. A. O'Day, C. S. Bitter, & L. M. Gomez (Eds.), *Education Reform in New York City: Ambitious Change in the Nation's Most Complex School System* (pp. 255–292). Harvard Education Press.
- Kim, J. S. (2006). The Relative Influence of Research on Class-Size Policy. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*, 9, 273–295. JSTOR.
- Kim, J. S., & Sunderman, G. L. (2005). Measuring Academic Proficiency Under the No Child Left Behind Act: Implications for Educational Equity. *Educational Researcher*, 34(8), 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X034008003>
- Kingdon, J. W. (2010). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies, Update Edition, with an Epilogue on Health Care* (2 edition). Pearson.
- Kirshner, B., Gaertner, M., & Pozzoboni, K. (2010). Tracing Transitions: The Effect of High School Closure on Displaced Students. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 32(3), 407–429. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373710376823>
- Kirst, M. W. (2007). Politics of charter schools: Competing national advocacy coalitions meet local politics. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82(2–3), 184–203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01619560701312939>
- Klein, N. (2008). *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. Picador.
- Knight, D. S. (2017). Are High-Poverty School Districts Disproportionately Impacted by State Funding Cuts?: School Finance Equity Following the Great Recession. *Journal of Education Finance*, 43(2), 169–194.
- Kober, N., & Rentner, D. S. (2011). *Common Core State Standards: Progress and Challenges in School Districts' Implementation*. Center on Education Policy. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED523957.pdf>
- Kohli, R., Pizarro, M., & Nevárez, A. (2017). The "New Racism" of K–12 Schools: Centering Critical Research on Racism. *Review of Research in Education*, 41(1), 182–202. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X16686949>
- Kolbert, J. B., Crothers, L. M., Bundick, M. J., Wells, D. S., Buzgon, J., Berbari, C., Simpson, J., & Senko, K. (2015). Teachers' Perceptions of Bullying of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Questioning (LGBTQ) Students in a Southwestern Pennsylvania Sample. *Behavioral Sciences*, 5(2), 247–263. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs5020247>
- Koon, D. S.-V. (2019). Education Policy Networks: The Co-Optation, Coordination, and Commodification of the School-to-Prison Pipeline Critique. *American Educational Research Journal*, 000283121985533. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831219855338>
- Koppich, J. E., & Humphrey, D. C. (2018). *The Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF): What Have We Learned After Four Years of Implementation?* (p. 70). Stanford University, PACE.
- Kosciw, J. G., Palmer, N. A., Kull, R. M., & Greytak, E. A. (2013). The Effect of Negative School Climate on Academic Outcomes for LGBT Youth and the Role of In-School Supports. *Journal of School Violence*, 12(1), 45–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2012.732546>
- Kostyo, S., Cardichon, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2018). *Making ESSA's Equity Promise Real: State Strategies to Close the Opportunity Gap* (p. 42). Learning Policy Institute.
- Koyama, J., & Kania, B. (2016). Seeing through transparency in education reform: Illuminating the "local." *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24, 90. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.24.2379>
- Kramarczuk Voulgarides, C., Fergus, E., & King Thorius, K. A. (2017). Pursuing Equity: Disproportionality in Special Education and the Reframing of Technical Solutions to Address Systemic Inequities. *Review of Research in Education*, 41(1), 61–87. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X16686947>
- Kretchmar, K., Sondel, B., & Ferrare, J. J. (2014). Mapping the terrain: Teach For America, charter school reform, and corporate sponsorship. *Journal of Education Policy*, 29(6), 742–759. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2014.880812>
- Kull, R. M., Greytak, E. A., Kosciw, J. G., & Villenas, C. (2016). Effectiveness of school district antibullying policies in improving LGBT youths' school climate. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity*, 3(4), 407–415. <https://doi.org/10.1037/sgd0000196>
- Lacoe, J., & Steinberg, M. P. (2018). Rolling Back Zero Tolerance: The Effect of Discipline Policy Reform on Suspension Usage and Student Outcomes. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 93(2), 207–227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2018.1435047>
- Ladd, H. F. (2008). Reflections on Equity, Adequacy, and Weighted Student Funding. *Education Finance and Policy*, 3(4), 402–423. <https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp.2008.3.4.402>
- Ladd, H. F., Muschkin, C. G., & Dodge, K. A. (2014). From Birth to School: Early Childhood Initiatives and Third-Grade Outcomes in North Carolina. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 33(1), 162–187. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.21734>
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in US schools. *Educational Researcher*, 35(7), 3–12.
- Lafortune, J., Rothstein, J., & Schanzenbach, D. W. (2016). *School Finance Reform and the Distribution of Student Achievement* (Working Paper No. 22011). National Bureau of Economic Research. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w22011>

- Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life* (1st ed.). University of California Press.
- Lay, J. C., & Bauman, A. (2017). Private Governance of Public Schools: Representation, Priorities, and Compliance in New Orleans Charter School Boards. *Urban Affairs Review*, 1078087417748783. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087417748783>
- Leonardo, Z. (2007). The war on schools: NCLB, nation creation and the educational construction of whiteness. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 10(3), 261–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320701503249>
- Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, Whiteness, and Education*. Routledge.
- Levin, H. M., Belfield, C., Muennig, P., & Rouse, C. (2007). The public returns to public educational investments in African-American males. *Economics of Education Review*, 26(6), 699–708. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2007.09.004>
- Lewis, W. D., & Young, T. V. (2013). The Politics of Accountability: Teacher Education Policy. *Educational Policy*, 27(2), 190–216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904812472725>
- Li, C., Kruger, L. J., Beneville, M., Kimble, E., & Krishnan, K. (2018). The Unintended Consequences of High-Stakes Testing on English-Language Learners: Implications for the Practice of School Psychology. *School Psychology Forum*, 12(3), 79–90.
- Liasidou, A. (2013). Intersectional understandings of disability and implications for a social justice reform agenda in education policy and practice. *Disability & Society*, 28(3), 299–312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2012.710012>
- Lipman, P. (2011a). *The new political economy of urban education: Neoliberalism, race, and the right to the city*. Routledge.
- Lipman, P. (2011b). Contesting the city: Neoliberal urbanism and the cultural politics of education reform in Chicago. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 32(2), 217–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2011.562667>
- Loeb, S., Valant, J., & Kasman, M. (2011). Increasing choice in the market for schools: Recent reforms and their effects on student achievement. *National Tax Journal*, 64(1), 141–164.
- Long, M. C., Conger, D., & McGhee, R. (2019). Life on the Frontier of AP Expansion: Can Schools in Less-Resourced Communities Successfully Implement Advanced Placement Science Courses? *Educational Researcher*, 48(6), 356–368. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X19859593>
- Losen, D. J. (Ed.). (2014). *Closing the School Discipline Gap: Equitable Remedies for Excessive Exclusion*. Teachers College Press.
- Loveless, T. (2016). *How Well are American Students Learning?* The Brown Center on Education Policy Brookings Institute. <https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Brown-Center-Report-2016.pdf>
- Lubienski, C. (2005). Public schools in marketized environments: Shifting incentives and unintended consequences of competition-based educational reforms. *American Journal of Education*, 111(4), 464–486. <https://doi.org/10.1086/aje.2005.111.issue-4>
- Lubienski, Christopher. (2007). Marketing Schools Consumer Goods and Competitive Incentives for Consumer Information. *Education and Urban Society*, 40(1), 118–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124507303994>
- Lubienski, Christopher, Brewer, T. J., & La Londe, P. G. (2016). Orchestrating policy ideas: Philanthropies and think tanks in US education policy advocacy networks. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 43(1), 55–73. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-015-0187-y>
- Mackey, H. J. (2017). The ESSA in Indian Country: Problematizing Self-Determination Through the Relationships Between Federal, State, and Tribal Governments. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 53(5), 782–808. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X17735870>
- MacSwan, J., & Pray, L. (2005). Learning English Bilingually: Age of Onset of Exposure and Rate of Acquisition Among English Language Learners in a Bilingual Education Program. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(3), 653–678. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2005.10162857>
- Macswan, J., & Rolstad, K. (2006). How Language Proficiency Tests Mislead Us About Ability: Implications for English Language Learner Placement in Special Education. *Teachers College Record*, 108(11), 2304–2328. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00783.x>
- Mahoney, K. S., & MacSwan, J. (2005). Reexamining Identification and Reclassification of English Language Learners: A Critical Discussion of Select State Practices. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 29(1), 31–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2005.10162822>
- Maier, A., Daniel, J., Oakes, J., & Lam, L. (2017). *Community Schools as an Effective School Improvement Strategy: A Review of the Evidence* (p. 159). Learning Policy Institute.
- Malen, B. (2005). Educational leaders as policy analysts. In F. W. English & G. L. Anderson (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Educational Leadership: Advances in Theory, Research, and Practice* (pp. 191-215). SAGE Publications.
- Malen, B., Dayhoff, J., Egan, L., & Croninger, R. G. (2017). The Challenges of Advancing Fiscal Equity in a Resource-Strained Context. *Educational Policy*, 31(5), 615–642. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904815613445>
- Malin, J. R., Bragg, D. D., & Hackmann, D. G. (2017). College and Career Readiness and the Every Student Succeeds Act. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 53(5), 809–838. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X17714845>
- Malloy, W. W., & Allen, T. (2007). Teacher Retention in a Teacher Resiliency-Building Rural School. *Rural Educator*, 28(2), 19–27.
- Mann, B., Kotok, S., Frankenberg, E., Fuller, E., & Schafft, K. (2016). Choice, Cyber Charter Schools, and the Educational Marketplace for Rural School Districts. *The Rural Educator*, 37(3). <http://epubs.library.msstate.edu/index.php/ruraleducator/article/view/368>
- Marian, V., Shook, A., & Schroeder, S. R. (2013). Bilingual Two-Way Immersion Programs Benefit Academic Achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 36(2), 167–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2013.818075>
- Mariano, B. D. (2015). Teachers' Unions on the Defensive?: How Recent Collective Bargaining Laws Reformed the Rights of Teachers. *Journal of School Choice*, 9(4), 551–577. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15582159.2015.1079470>
- Marsh, J. A., & Hall, M. (2018). Challenges and Choices: A Multidistrict Analysis of Statewide Mandated Democratic Engagement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 55(2), 243–286. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831217734803>
- Marsh, J. A., Strunk, K. O., & Bush, S. (2013). Portfolio district reform meets school turnaround: Early implementation findings from the Los Angeles Public School Choice Initiative. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(4), 498–527. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231311325677>
- Marsh, J. A., Strunk, K. O., Bush-Mecenas, S. C., & Huguet, A. (2015). Democratic Engagement in District Reform: The Evolving Role of Parents in the Los Angeles Public School Choice Initiative. *Educational Policy*, 29(1), 51–84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904814563204>
- Mathis, W. J. (2010). *The "Common Core" Standards Initiative: An Effective Reform Tool?* National Education Policy Center. <https://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/common-core-standards>

- Mathis, W. J., & Trujillo, T. M. (2016). *Lessons from NCLB for the Every Student Succeeds Act* (p. 26). National Education Policy Center.
- Matlock, K. L., Goering, C. Z., Endacott, J., Collet, V. S., Denny, G. S., Jennings-Davis, J., & Wright, G. P. (2016). Teachers' views of the Common Core State Standards and its implementation. *Educational Review*, 68(3), 291–305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2015.1070333>
- Mavrogordato, M., & White, R. S. (2019). Leveraging Policy Implementation for Social Justice: How School Leaders Shape Educational Opportunity When Implementing Policy for English Learners. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 0013161X1882136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X18821364>
- Mayer, A., Woulfin, S., & Warhol, L. (2015). Moving the center of expertise: Applying a communities of practice framework to understand coaching in urban school reform. *Journal of Educational Change*, 16(1), 101–123. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-014-9236-y>
- Mazzeo, C., Allensworth, E., Nomi, T., Montgomery, N., & Lee, V. (2010). *What We've Learned from Chicago's Efforts* (p. 17). Consortium on Chicago School Research.
- McCarty, T. L. (2013). *Language Planning and Policy in Native America: History, Theory, Praxis*. Multilingual Matters.
- McCarty, T., & Lee, T. (2014). Critical Culturally Sustaining/Revitalizing Pedagogy and Indigenous Education Sovereignty. *Harvard Educational Review*, 84(1), 101–124. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.1.q83746n15pj34216>
- McDermott, K. A. (2007). "Expanding the Moral Community" or "Blaming the Victim"? The Politics of State Education Accountability Policy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(1), 77–111. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831206299010>
- McDonnell, L. M. (2005). No Child Left Behind and the Federal Role in Education: Evolution or Revolution? *Peabody Journal of Education*, 80(2), 19–38. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327930pje8002\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327930pje8002_2)
- McDonnell, L. M., & Weatherford, M. S. (2012). *Evidence use and stages of the Common Core State Standards movement*. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Vancouver, BC.
- McDonnell, L. M., & Weatherford, M. S. (2016). Recognizing the Political in Implementation Research. *Educational Researcher*, 45(4), 233–242. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16649945>
- McEachin, A. J., Welsh, R. O., & Brewer, D. J. (2016). The Variation in Student Achievement and Behavior Within a Portfolio Management Model: Early Results From New Orleans. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 38(4), 669–691. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373716659928>
- McGuinn, P. (2016). 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(3), 392–415. <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjw014>
- McGuire, J. K., Anderson, C. R., Toomey, R. B., & Russell, S. T. (2010). School Climate for Transgender Youth: A Mixed Method Investigation of Student Experiences and School Responses. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39(10), 1175–1188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-010-9540-7>
- McLaughlin, M. J. (2010). Evolving Interpretations of Educational Equity and Students with Disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 76(3), 265–278. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440291007600302>
- McLaughlin, M. J., Emblar, S., Hernandez, G., & Caron, E. (2005). No Child Left behind and Students with Disabilities in Rural and Small Schools. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 24(1), 32–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/875687050502400107>
- McLaughlin, M. J., & Rhim, L. M. (2007). Accountability Frameworks and Children with Disabilities: A test of assumptions about improving public education for all students. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 54(1), 25–49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10349120601149698>
- McWilliams, J. A. (2017). The neighborhood school stigma: School choice, stratification, and shame. *Policy Futures in Education*, 15(2), 221–238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210317705740>
- Mehta, J. (2019, February 14). Why Equity Has Been a Conservative Force in American Education—And How That Could Change. *Education Week - Next Gen Learning in Action*. [http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/next\\_gen\\_learning/2019/02/why\\_equity\\_conservative\\_force\\_American\\_education.html?cmp=SOC-SHR-FB](http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/next_gen_learning/2019/02/why_equity_conservative_force_American_education.html?cmp=SOC-SHR-FB)
- Mehta, J., & Fine, S. (2015). *The Why, What, Where, and How of Deeper Learning in American Secondary Schools—Students at the Center: Deeper Learning Research Series* (p. 32). Jobs for the Future.
- Mehta, J., & Fine, S. (2019). *In Search of Deeper Learning: The Quest to Remake the American High School*. Harvard University Press. <https://www.amazon.com/Search-Deeper-Learning-Remake-American/dp/0674988396>
- Melnick, H., Cook-Harvey, C., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Encouraging Social and Emotional Learning In the Context of New Accountability* (p. 61). Learning Policy Institute.
- Menken, K. (2008). *English Learners Left Behind: Standardized Testing as Language Policy*. Multilingual Matters.
- Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2005). Corrective action in low performing schools: Lessons for NCLB implementation from first-generation accountability systems. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13(48). <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v13n48.2005>
- Miron, G., & Gulosino, C. (2016). *Virtual Schools Report 2016: Directory and Performance Review*. National Education Policy Center. <https://scholar.colorado.edu/nepc/76>
- Miron, G., Urschel, J. L., & Saxton, N. (2011). *What makes KIPP work?: A study of student characteristics, attrition, and school finance*. National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education. [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Gary\\_Miron/publication/228581036\\_What\\_Makes\\_KIPP\\_Work\\_A\\_Study\\_of\\_Student\\_Characteristics\\_Attrition\\_and\\_School\\_Finance/links/0deec5273f1b8c35ed000000.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Gary_Miron/publication/228581036_What_Makes_KIPP_Work_A_Study_of_Student_Characteristics_Attrition_and_School_Finance/links/0deec5273f1b8c35ed000000.pdf)
- Mitchum, P., & Moodie-Mills, A. C. (2014). *How Hostile School Climate Perpetuates the School-to-Prison Pipeline for LGBT Youth* (p. 39). Center for American Progress. <https://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/BeyondBullying.pdf>
- Moe, T. M. (2011). *Special Interest: Teachers Unions and America's Public Schools* (Reprint edition). Brookings Institution Press.
- Monk, D. H. (2007). Recruiting and Retaining High-Quality Teachers in Rural Areas. *The Future of Children*, 17(1), 155–174. JSTOR.
- Moon, S. (2011). Rethinking Culturally Responsive Teaching: Toward New (Im) Possibilities of Curriculum Studies and Policy. *Multicultural Education Review*, 3(2), 69–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23770031.2009.11102884>
- Moores, D. F. (2011). Waist Deep in the Big Muddy The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and No Child Left Behind (NCLB). *American Annals of the Deaf*, 155(5), 523–525. JSTOR.
- Morel, D. (2018). *Takeover: Race, Education, and American Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Morris, E. W., & Perry, B. L. (2016). The Punishment Gap: School Suspension and Racial Disparities in Achievement. *Social Problems*, 63(1), 68–86. <https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spv026>

- Mueller, A. S., James, W., Abrutyn, S., & Levin, M. L. (2015). Suicide Ideation and Bullying Among US Adolescents: Examining the Intersections of Sexual Orientation, Gender, and Race/Ethnicity. *American Journal of Public Health, 105*(5), 980–985. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.302391>
- Murnane, R. J., & Papay, J. P. (2010). Teachers' Views on No Child Left Behind: Support for the Principles, Concerns about the Practices. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 24*(3), 151–166. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.24.3.151>
- Nadelson, L. S., Pluska, H., Moorcroft, S., Jeffrey, A., & Woodard, S. (2014). *Educators' Perceptions and Knowledge of the Common Core State Standards. 22*(2), 20.
- Neumann, R. (2008). Charter schools and innovation: The High Tech High model. *American Secondary Education, 36*(3), 51–69.
- Nichols-Barrer, I., Gleason, P., Gill, B., & Tuttle, C. C. (2016). Student Selection, Attrition, and Replacement in KIPP Middle Schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 38*(1), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373714564215>
- Noguera, P., Darling-Hammond, L., & Friedlaender, D. (2015). *Equal Opportunity for Deeper Learning. Students at the Center: Deeper Learning Research Series* (p. 30). Jobs for the Future.
- Oakes, J. (1992). Can tracking research inform practice? Technical, normative, and political considerations. *Educational Researcher, 21*(4), 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X021004012>
- Oakes, J. (2005). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality* (2nd ed.). Yale University Press.
- Oakes, J., Rogers, J., Blasi, G., & Lipton, M. (2008). Grassroots Organizing, Social Movements, and the Right to High-Quality Education. 4 *STAN. J. C.R. & C.L.*, 339, 35.
- Olsen, L., Armas, E., & Lavadenz, M. (2016). *A Review of Year Two LCAPs: A Weak Response to California's English Learners*. The Center for Equity for English Learners and Loyola Marymount University. <http://www.ciclt.net/ul/calto/LCAPSReview2016Web.pdf>
- Opfer, V. D., Kaufman, J. H., & Thompson, L. E. (2016). *Implementation of K-12 state standards for mathematics and English language arts and literacy: Findings from the American teacher panel*. RAND Corporation.
- Orfield, G., & Frankenberg, E. (2013). *Educational Delusions?: Why Choice Can Deepen Inequality and How to Make Schools Fair*. University of California Press.
- Orfield, G., Kucsera, J., & Siegel-Hawley, G. (2012). *E pluribus...separation: Deepening double segregation for our students*. The Civil Rights Project/ Proyecto Derechos Civiles. [http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/mlk-national/e-pluribus...separation-deepening-double-segregation-for-more-students/orfield\\_epluribus\\_revised\\_complete\\_2012.pdf](http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/mlk-national/e-pluribus...separation-deepening-double-segregation-for-more-students/orfield_epluribus_revised_complete_2012.pdf)
- Parker, W. C., Lo, J., Yeo, A. J., Valencia, S. W., Nguyen, D., Abbott, R. D., Nolen, S. B., Bransford, J. D., & Vye, N. J. (2013). Beyond Breadth-Speed-Test: Toward Deeper Knowing and Engagement in an Advanced Placement Course. *American Educational Research Journal, 50*(6), 1424–1459. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831213504237>
- Pascoe, C. J. (2007). *Dude, You're a Fag: Masculinity and Sexuality in High School* (1st ed.). University of California Press.
- Payne, E. C., & Smith, M. J. (2018). Refusing Relevance: School Administrator Resistance to Offering Professional Development Addressing LGBTQ Issues in Schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 54*(2), 183–215. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X17723426>
- Pazey, B. L., & Cole, H. A. (2013). The Role of Special Education Training in the Development of Socially Just Leaders: Building an Equity Consciousness in Educational Leadership Programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(2), 243–271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X12463934>
- Penuel, W., Fishman, B. J., Gallagher, L. P., Korbak, C., & Lopez-Prado, B. (2009). Is alignment enough? Investigating the effects of state policies and professional development on science curriculum implementation. *Science Education, 93*(4), 656–677. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20321>
- Penuel, W., Meyer, E., & Valladares, M. R. (2016). *Making the Most of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)—Helping States Focus on School Equity, Quality and Climate* (p. 12). National Education Policy Center.
- Moon, S. (2011). Rethinking Culturally Responsive Teaching: Toward New (Im) Possibilities of Curriculum Studies and Policy. *Multicultural Education Review, 3*(2), 69–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23770031.2009.11102884>
- Moore, D. F. (2011). Waist Deep in the Big Muddy The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and No Child Left Behind (NCLB). *American Annals of the Deaf, 155*(5), 523–525. JSTOR.
- Morel, D. (2018). *Takeover: Race, Education, and American Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Morris, E. W., & Perry, B. L. (2016). The Punishment Gap: School Suspension and Racial Disparities in Achievement. *Social Problems, 63*(1), 68–86. <https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spv026>
- Mueller, A. S., James, W., Abrutyn, S., & Levin, M. L. (2015). Suicide Ideation and Bullying Among US Adolescents: Examining the Intersections of Sexual Orientation, Gender, and Race/Ethnicity. *American Journal of Public Health, 105*(5), 980–985. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.302391>
- Murnane, R. J., & Papay, J. P. (2010). Teachers' Views on No Child Left Behind: Support for the Principles, Concerns about the Practices. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 24*(3), 151–166. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.24.3.151>
- Nadelson, L. S., Pluska, H., Moorcroft, S., Jeffrey, A., & Woodard, S. (2014). *Educators' Perceptions and Knowledge of the Common Core State Standards. 22*(2), 20.
- Neumann, R. (2008). Charter schools and innovation: The High Tech High model. *American Secondary Education, 36*(3), 51–69.
- Nichols-Barrer, I., Gleason, P., Gill, B., & Tuttle, C. C. (2016). Student Selection, Attrition, and Replacement in KIPP Middle Schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 38*(1), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373714564215>
- Noguera, P., Darling-Hammond, L., & Friedlaender, D. (2015). *Equal Opportunity for Deeper Learning. Students at the Center: Deeper Learning Research Series* (p. 30). Jobs for the Future.
- Oakes, J. (1992). Can tracking research inform practice? Technical, normative, and political considerations. *Educational Researcher, 21*(4), 12–21. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X021004012>
- Oakes, J. (2005). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality* (2nd ed.). Yale University Press.
- Oakes, J., Rogers, J., Blasi, G., & Lipton, M. (2008). Grassroots Organizing, Social Movements, and the Right to High-Quality Education. 4 *STAN. J. C.R. & C.L.*, 339, 35.
- Olsen, L., Armas, E., & Lavadenz, M. (2016). *A Review of Year Two LCAPs: A Weak Response to California's English Learners*. The Center for Equity for English Learners and Loyola Marymount University. <http://www.ciclt.net/ul/calto/LCAPSReview2016Web.pdf>

- Opfer, V. D., Kaufman, J. H., & Thompson, L. E. (2016). *Implementation of K-12 state standards for mathematics and English language arts and literacy: Findings from the American teacher panel*. RAND Corporation.
- Orfield, G., & Frankenberg, E. (2013). *Educational Delusions?: Why Choice Can Deepen Inequality and How to Make Schools Fair*. University of California Press.
- Orfield, G., Kucsera, J., & Siegel-Hawley, G. (2012). *E pluribus...separation: Deepening double segregation for our students*. The Civil Rights Project/ Proyecto Derechos Civiles. [http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/mlk-national/e-pluribus...separation-deepening-double-segregation-for-more-students/orfield\\_epluribus\\_revised\\_complete\\_2012.pdf](http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/mlk-national/e-pluribus...separation-deepening-double-segregation-for-more-students/orfield_epluribus_revised_complete_2012.pdf)
- Parker, W. C., Lo, J., Yeo, A. J., Valencia, S. W., Nguyen, D., Abbott, R. D., Nolen, S. B., Bransford, J. D., & Vye, N. J. (2013). Beyond Breadth-Speed-Test: Toward Deeper Knowing and Engagement in an Advanced Placement Course. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(6), 1424–1459. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831213504237>
- Pascoe, C. J. (2007). *Dude, You're a Fag: Masculinity and Sexuality in High School* (1st ed.). University of California Press.
- Payne, E. C., & Smith, M. J. (2018). Refusing Relevance: School Administrator Resistance to Offering Professional Development Addressing LGBTQ Issues in Schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 54(2), 183–215. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X17723426>
- Pazey, B. L., & Cole, H. A. (2013). The Role of Special Education Training in the Development of Socially Just Leaders: Building an Equity Consciousness in Educational Leadership Programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(2), 243–271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X12463934>
- Penuel, W., Fishman, B. J., Gallagher, L. P., Korbak, C., & Lopez-Prado, B. (2009). Is alignment enough? Investigating the effects of state policies and professional development on science curriculum implementation. *Science Education*, 93(4), 656–677. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20321>
- Penuel, W., Meyer, E., & Valladares, M. R. (2016). *Making the Most of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)—Helping States Focus on School Equity, Quality and Climate* (p. 12). National Education Policy Center.
- Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B. J., Haugan Cheng, B., & Sabelli, N. (2011). Organizing Research and Development at the Intersection of Learning, Implementation, and Design. *Educational Researcher*, 40(7), 331–337. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11421826>
- Perry, D. L., & Daniels, M. L. (2016). Implementing Trauma—Informed Practices in the School Setting: A Pilot Study. *School Mental Health*, 8(1), 177–188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-016-9182-3>
- Peurach, D. J. (2016). Innovating at the Nexus of Impact and Improvement: Leading Educational Improvement Networks. *Educational Researcher*, 45(7), 421–429. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16670898>
- Polikoff, M. S. (2017). Is Common Core “Working”? And Where Does Common Core Research Go From Here? *AERA Open*, 3(1), 2332858417691749. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858417691749>
- Polikoff, M. S., Hardaway, T., Marsh, J. A., & Plank, D. N. (2016). Who Is Opposed to Common Core and Why? *Educational Researcher*, 45(4), 263–266. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16651087>
- Porter, A., McMaken, J., Hwang, J., & Yang, R. (2011a). Common Core Standards: The New U.S. Intended Curriculum. *Educational Researcher*, 40(3), 103–116. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11405038>
- Porter, A., McMaken, J., Hwang, J., & Yang, R. (2011b). Assessing the Common Core Standards: Opportunities for Improving Measures of Instruction. *Educational Researcher*, 40(4), 186–188. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11410232>
- Posey-Maddox, L. (2014). When Middle-Class Parents Choose Urban Schools. University Of Chicago Press. <https://www.press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/W/bo17508026.html>
- Renée, M., Welner, K., & Oakes, J. (2010). Social Movement Organizing and Equity-Focused Educational Change: Shifting the Zone of Mediation. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *Second International Handbook of Educational Change* (pp. 153–168). Springer Netherlands. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2660-6\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2660-6_9)
- Rickles, J., Zeiser, K. L., Mason, J., & Garet, M. S. (2016). *Deeper Learning and High School Graduation: Is There a Relationship? Findings from the Study of Deeper Learning Opportunities and Outcomes: Report 4* (p. 32). American Institutes for Research.
- Ritter, G. W. (2018). Reviewing the Progress of School Discipline Reform. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 93(2), 133–138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2018.1435034>
- Ritter, G. W., & Anderson, K. P. (2018). Examining Disparities in Student Discipline: Mapping Inequities from Infractions to Consequences. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 93(2), 161–173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2018.1435038>
- Roach, V., Smith, L. W., & Boutin, J. (2011). School Leadership Policy Trends and Developments: Policy Expediency or Policy Excellence? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 71–113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000010378611>
- Robinson-Cimpian, J. P., Thompson, K. D., & Umansky, I. M. (2016). Research and Policy Considerations for English Learner Equity. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 3(1), 129–137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732215623553>
- Rodriguez, E. R., Bellanca, J., & Esparza, D. R. (2016). *What Is It About Me You Can't Teach?: Culturally Responsive Instruction in Deeper Learning Classrooms*. Corwin Press.
- Rodriguez, S., & Monreal, T. (2017). “This State Is Racist . . .”: Policy Problematicization and Undocumented Youth Experiences in the New Latino South. *Educational Policy*, 31(6), 764–800. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904817719525>
- Rolle, A., Houck, E. A., & McColl, A. (2008). And Poor Children Continue to Wait: An Analysis of Horizontal and Vertical Equity among North Carolina School Districts in the Face of Judicially Mandated Policy Restraints 1996-2006. *Journal of Education Finance*, 34(1), 75–102. JSTOR.
- Rolstad, K., Mahoney, K., & Glass, G. V. (2005). The Big Picture: A Meta-Analysis of Program Effectiveness Research on English Language Learners. *Educational Policy*, 19(4), 572–594. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904805278067>
- Roy, J. (2011). Impact of School Finance Reform on Resource Equalization and Academic Performance: Evidence from Michigan. *Education Finance and Policy*, 6(2), 137–167. [https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP\\_a\\_00030](https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP_a_00030)
- Roza, M., Coughlin, T., & Anderson, L. (2017). *Taking stock of California's weighted student funding overhaul: What have districts done with their spending flexibility?* (p. 19). Edunomics Lab at Georgetown University. [https://edunomicslab.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Paper-1\\_R8.pdf](https://edunomicslab.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Paper-1_R8.pdf)
- Rubin, D. I. (2011). The Disheartened Teacher: Living in the Age of Standardisation, High-stakes Assessments, and No Child Left Behind (NCLB). *Changing English*, 18(4), 407–416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2011.630197>
- Russell, Stephen T., & McGuire, J. K. (2008). The school climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students. In M. Shinn & H. Yoshikawa (Eds.), *Toward Positive Youth Development: Transforming Schools and Community Programs* (pp. 133–149). Oxford University Press.

- Russell, Stephen Thomas, & Horn, S. S. (2017). *Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and Schooling: The Nexus of Research, Practice, and Policy*. Oxford University Press.
- Russo, R. G. (2006). The Extent of Public Education Nondiscrimination Policy Protections for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Students: A National Study. *Urban Education*, 41(2), 115–150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085905284957>
- Rutledge, S. A., Cohen-Vogel, L., Osborne-Lampkin, L., & Roberts, R. L. (2015). Understanding Effective High Schools: Evidence for Personalization for Academic and Social Emotional Learning. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52(6), 1060–1092. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831215602328>
- Saultz, A., White, R. S., Mceachin, A., Fusarelli, L. D., & Fusarelli, B. C. (2017). Teacher Quality, Distribution, and Equity in ESSA. *Journal of School Leadership*, 27(5), 652–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105268461702700503>
- Saunders, W. M., & Marcelletti, D. J. (2013). The Gap That Can't Go Away: The Catch-22 of Reclassification in Monitoring the Progress of English Learners. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 35(2), 139–156. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373712461849>
- Schafft, K. A. (2016). Rural Education As Rural Development: Understanding the Rural School–Community Well-Being Linkage in a 21st-Century Policy Context. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 91(2), 137–154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2016.1151734>
- Schmidt, W. H., & Houang, R. T. (2012). Curricular Coherence and the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics. *Educational Researcher*, 41(8), 294–308. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12464517>
- Schoen, L., & Fusarelli, L. D. (2008). Innovation, NCLB, and the Fear Factor: The Challenge of Leading 21st-Century Schools in an Era of Accountability. *Educational Policy*, 22(1), 181–203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904807311291>
- Schwab, R. (2018). Twenty years of policy recommendations for Indigenous education: Overview and research implications. Canberra, ACT: Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research (CAEPR), The Australian National University. <https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/handle/1885/145522>
- Scott, J., DeBray, E., Lubienski, C., Londe, P. G. L., Castillo, E., & Owens, S. (2016). Urban Regimes, Intermediary Organization Networks, and Research Use: Patterns Across Three School Districts. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 0(0), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2016.1264800>
- Scott, J. T. (2009). The politics of venture philanthropy in charter school policy and advocacy. *Educational Policy*, 23(1), 106–136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904808328531>
- Scott, J. T. (2011). Market-driven education reform and the racial politics of advocacy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 86(5), 580–599. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2011.616445>
- Scott, J. T., & Fruchter, N. (2009). Community resistance to privatization: The case of New York City. In R. Fisher (Ed.), *The People Shall Rule: ACORN, Community Organizing, and the Struggle for Economic Justice* (pp. 180–205). Vanderbilt University Press.
- Scott, J. T., & Holme, J. J. (2016). The Political Economy of Market-Based Educational Policies: Race and Reform in Urban School Districts, 1915 to 2016. *Review of Research in Education*, 40(1), 250–297. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X16681001>
- Scott, J. T., & Jabbar, H. (2014). The hub and the spokes: Foundations, intermediary organizations, incentivist reforms, and the politics of research evidence. *Educational Policy*, 28(2), 233–257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904813515327>
- Scott, Janelle T. (2013). School choice and the empowerment imperative. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 88(1), 60–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2013.752635>
- Sears, J. T. (2005). *Gay, Lesbian, and Transgender Issues in Education: Programs, Policies, and Practices*. Routledge.
- Shanker, A. (1988). Restructuring our schools. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 65(3), 88–100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01619568809538615>
- Shelton, J. (2017). *Teacher Strike!: Public Education and the Making of a New American Political Order*. University of Illinois Press.
- Shifrer, D., Muller, C., & Callahan, R. (2011). Disproportionality and Learning Disabilities: Parsing Apart Race, Socioeconomic Status, and Language. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 44(3), 246–257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219410374236>
- Shohamy, E., & Menken, K. (2015). Language Assessment. In *The Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education* (pp. 253–269). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118533406.ch15>
- Sinclair, K., & Malen, B. (2019). Student-Based Budgeting as a Mechanism for Promoting Democratic Decision Making: Testing the Theory of Action. *Educational Policy*, 0895904819843601. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904819843601>
- Skiba, R. J., Arredondo, M. I., & Williams, N. T. (2014). More Than a Metaphor: The Contribution of Exclusionary Discipline to a School-to-Prison Pipeline. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 47(4), 546–564. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2014.958965>
- Russell, Stephen Thomas, & Horn, S. S. (2017). *Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and Schooling: The Nexus of Research, Practice, and Policy*. Oxford University Press.
- Russo, R. G. (2006). The Extent of Public Education Nondiscrimination Policy Protections for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Students: A National Study. *Urban Education*, 41(2), 115–150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085905284957>
- Rutledge, S. A., Cohen-Vogel, L., Osborne-Lampkin, L., & Roberts, R. L. (2015). Understanding Effective High Schools: Evidence for Personalization for Academic and Social Emotional Learning. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52(6), 1060–1092. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831215602328>
- Saultz, A., White, R. S., Mceachin, A., Fusarelli, L. D., & Fusarelli, B. C. (2017). Teacher Quality, Distribution, and Equity in ESSA. *Journal of School Leadership*, 27(5), 652–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105268461702700503>
- Saunders, W. M., & Marcelletti, D. J. (2013). The Gap That Can't Go Away: The Catch-22 of Reclassification in Monitoring the Progress of English Learners. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 35(2), 139–156. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373712461849>
- Schafft, K. A. (2016). Rural Education As Rural Development: Understanding the Rural School–Community Well-Being Linkage in a 21st-Century Policy Context. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 91(2), 137–154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2016.1151734>
- Schmidt, W. H., & Houang, R. T. (2012). Curricular Coherence and the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics. *Educational Researcher*, 41(8), 294–308. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X12464517>
- Schoen, L., & Fusarelli, L. D. (2008). Innovation, NCLB, and the Fear Factor: The Challenge of Leading 21st-Century Schools in an Era of Accountability. *Educational Policy*, 22(1), 181–203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904807311291>
- Schwab, R. (2018). Twenty years of policy recommendations for Indigenous education: Overview and research implications. Canberra, ACT: Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research (CAEPR), The Australian National University. <https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/handle/1885/145522>
- Scott, J., DeBray, E., Lubienski, C., Londe, P. G. L., Castillo, E., & Owens, S. (2016). Urban Regimes, Intermediary Organization Networks, and Research Use: Patterns Across Three School Districts. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 0(0), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2016.1264800>



- Scott, J. T. (2009). The politics of venture philanthropy in charter school policy and advocacy. *Educational Policy*, 23(1), 106–136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904808328531>
- Scott, J. T. (2011). Market-driven education reform and the racial politics of advocacy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 86(5), 580–599. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2011.616445>
- Scott, J. T., & Fruchter, N. (2009). Community resistance to privatization: The case of New York City. In R. Fisher (Ed.), *The People Shall Rule: ACORN, Community Organizing, and the Struggle for Economic Justice* (pp. 180–205). Vanderbilt University Press.
- Scott, J. T., & Holme, J. J. (2016). The Political Economy of Market-Based Educational Policies: Race and Reform in Urban School Districts, 1915 to 2016. *Review of Research in Education*, 40(1), 250–297. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X16681001>
- Scott, J. T., & Jabbar, H. (2014). The hub and the spokes: Foundations, intermediary organizations, incentivist reforms, and the politics of research evidence. *Educational Policy*, 28(2), 233–257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904813515327>
- Scott, Janelle T. (2013). School choice and the empowerment imperative. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 88(1), 60–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2013.752635>
- Sears, J. T. (2005). *Gay, Lesbian, and Transgender Issues in Education: Programs, Policies, and Practices*. Routledge.
- Shanker, A. (1988). Restructuring our schools. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 65(3), 88–100. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01619568809538615>
- Shelton, J. (2017). *Teacher Strike!: Public Education and the Making of a New American Political Order*. University of Illinois Press.
- Shifrer, D., Muller, C., & Callahan, R. (2011). Disproportionality and Learning Disabilities: Parsing Apart Race, Socioeconomic Status, and Language. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 44(3), 246–257. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219410374236>
- Shohamy, E., & Menken, K. (2015). Language Assessment. In *The Handbook of Bilingual and Multilingual Education* (pp. 253–269). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118533406.ch15>
- Sinclair, K., & Malen, B. (2019). Student-Based Budgeting as a Mechanism for Promoting Democratic Decision Making: Testing the Theory of Action. *Educational Policy*, 0895904819843601. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904819843601>
- Skiba, R. J., Arredondo, M. I., & Williams, N. T. (2014). More Than a Metaphor: The Contribution of Exclusionary Discipline to a School-to-Prison Pipeline. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 47(4), 546–564. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2014.958965>
- Skiba, R. J., Rausch, M. K., & Rausch, M. K. (2013). Zero Tolerance, Suspension, and Expulsion: Questions of Equity and Effectiveness. In C. M. Evertson & C. S. Weinstein (Eds.), *Handbook of Classroom Management* (pp. 1073–1100). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203874783-54>
- Skiba, R. J., Simmons, A. B., Ritter, S., Gibb, A. C., Rausch, M. K., Cuadrado, J., & Chung, C.-G. (2008). Achieving Equity in Special Education: History, Status, and Current Challenges. *Exceptional Children*, 74(3), 264–288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290807400301>
- Slavin, R. E., & Cheung, A. (2005). A Synthesis of Research on Language of Reading Instruction for English Language Learners. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(2), 247–284. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543075002247>
- Slocum, A., Hathaway, R., & Bernstein, M. (2018). Striking Signs: The Diverse Discourse of the 2018 West Virginia Teachers' Strike. *English Education*, 10.
- Smith, J. M., & Kovacs, P. E. (2011). The impact of standards-based reform on teachers: The case of 'No Child Left Behind.' *Teachers and Teaching*, 17(2), 201–225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2011.539802>
- Smith, J., & Wohlstetter, P. (2009). *Parent involvement in urban charter schools: A new paradigm or the status quo?* National Center on School Choice.
- Smith, J., Wohlstetter, P., Kuzin, C. A., & Pedro, K. D. (2011). Parent Involvement in Urban Charter Schools: New Strategies for Increasing Participation. *The School Community Journal*, 21(1), 71–94.
- Smith, N. H. (2014). *Queer Dynamics: The Policies and Politics of LGBT-Inclusive Anti-Bullying Laws* [Thesis, Johns Hopkins University]. <http://dspace-prod.mse.jhu.edu:8080/handle/1774.2/37248>
- Smith, P. (2007). Have We Made Any Progress? Including Students With Intellectual Disabilities in Regular Education Classrooms. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 45(5), 297–309. [https://doi.org/10.1352/0047-6765\(2007\)45\[297:HWMAP\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1352/0047-6765(2007)45[297:HWMAP]2.0.CO;2)
- Smith, W. C., & Rowland, J. (2014). Parent Trigger Laws and the Promise of Parental Voice. *Journal of School Choice*, 8(1), 94–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15582159.2014.875415>
- Snapp, S. D., & Russell, S. T. (2016). Discipline Disparities for LGBTQ Youth: Challenges that Perpetuate Disparities and Strategies to Overcome Them. In R. J. Skiba, K. Mediratta, & M. K. Rausch (Eds.), *Inequality in School Discipline: Research and Practice to Reduce Disparities* (pp. 207–223). Palgrave Macmillan US. [https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-51257-4\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-51257-4_12)
- Solomon, J. (2009). The Boston Teacher Residency: District-Based Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 478–488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109349915>
- Sondel, B. (2015). Raising citizens or raising test scores? Teach For America, "no excuses" charters, and the development of the neoliberal citizen. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 43(3), 289–313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2015.1064505>
- Song, M., Yang, R., & Garet, M. (2019). *Effects of States' Implementation of College- and Career-Ready Standards on Student Achievement* (p. 35). Center on Standards, Alignment, Instruction, and Learning.
- Spillane, J. P. (2009). *Standards Deviation: How Schools Misunderstand Education Policy*. Harvard University Press.
- Spillane, J. P., & Hopkins, M. (2013). Organizing for instruction in education systems and school organizations: How the subject matters. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 45(6), 721–747. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2013.810783>
- Spillane, J. P., Parise, L. M., & Sherer, J. Z. (2011). Organizational Routines as Coupling Mechanisms: Policy, School Administration, and the Technical Core. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(3), 586–619. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831210385102>
- Steele, J. L., Slater, R. O., Zamarro, G., Miller, T., Li, J., Burkhauser, S., & Bacon, M. (2017). Effects of Dual-Language Immersion Programs on Student Achievement: Evidence From Lottery Data. *American Educational Research Journal*, 54(1\_suppl), 282S–306S. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216634463>
- Steinberg, M. P., & Quinn, R. (2015). A Tale of Two Decades: New Evidence on Adequacy and Equity in Pennsylvania. *Journal of Education Finance*, 40(3), 273–299.
- Stern, M., Clonan, S., Jaffee, L., & Lee, A. (2015). The Normative Limits of Choice: Charter Schools, Disability Studies, and Questions of Inclusion. *Educational Policy*, 29(3), 448–477. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904813510779>

- Strunk, K. O., & Grissom, J. A. (2010). Do Strong Unions Shape District Policies?: Collective Bargaining, Teacher Contract Restrictiveness, and the Political Power of Teachers' Unions. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 32(3), 389–406. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373710376665>
- Strunk, K. O., & Marianno, B. D. (2019). Negotiating the Great Recession: How Teacher Collective Bargaining Outcomes Change in Times of Financial Duress. *AERA Open*, 5(2), 2332858419855089. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858419855089>
- Strunk, K. O., Marsh, J. A., Hashim, A. K., Bush-Mecenas, S., & Weinstein, T. (2016). The Impact of Turnaround Reform on Student Outcomes: Evidence and Insights from the Los Angeles Unified School District. *Education Finance and Policy*, 11(3), 251–282. [https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP\\_a\\_00188](https://doi.org/10.1162/EDFP_a_00188)
- Stuit, D., & Doan, S. (2012). *Beyond City Limits: Expanding Public Charter Schools in Rural America. Issue Brief*. National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED535211>
- Sude, Y., DeAngelis, C. A., & Wolf, P. J. (2018). Supplying Choice: An Analysis of School Participation Decisions in Voucher Programs in Washington, DC, Indiana, and Louisiana. *Journal of School Choice*, 12(1), 8–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15582159.2017.1345232>
- Sullivan, A. L. (2011). Disproportionality in Special Education Identification and Placement of English Language Learners. *Exceptional Children*, 77(3), 317–334. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440291107700304>
- Sunderman, G. L. (2008). *Holding NCLB Accountable: Achieving Accountability, Equity, & School Reform*. Corwin Press.
- Superfine, Benjamin M. (2013). *Equality in education law and policy, 1954-2010*. Cambridge University Press.
- Superfine, Benjamin Michael, & Thompson, A. R. (2016). Interest Groups, the Courts, and Educational Equality A Policy Regimes Approach to Vergara v. California. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(3), 573–604. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216645906>
- Supovitz, J. A., & Spillane, J. F. (Eds.). (2015). *Challenging Standards: Navigating Conflict and Building Capacity in the Era of the Common Core*. RI.
- Supovitz, J., Daly, A. J., & Del Fresno, M. (2018). The Common Core debate on Twitter and the rise of the activist public. *Journal of Educational Change*, 19(4), 419–440. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-018-9327-2>
- Supovitz, J., Fink, R., & Newman, B. (2016). From the Inside In: Common Core Knowledge and Communication Within Schools. *AERA Open*, 2(3), 2332858416653757. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858416653757>
- Swanson, K., & Gettinger, M. (2016). Teachers' knowledge, attitudes, and supportive behaviors toward LGBT students: Relationship to Gay-Straight Alliances, antibullying policy, and teacher training. *Journal of LGBT Youth*, 13(4), 326–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2016.1185765>
- Sweetland, S. R. (2014). An Exploratory Analysis of the Equity of Ohio School Funding. *Journal of Education Finance*, 40(1), 80–100. JSTOR.
- Thapa, A., Cohen, J., Guffey, S., & Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. (2013). A Review of School Climate Research. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 357–385. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313483907>
- Thiede, B. C., Lichter, D. T., & Slack, T. (2018). Working, but poor: The good life in rural America? *Journal of Rural Studies*, 59, 183–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.02.007>
- Thiede, B., Kim, H., & Valasik, M. (2018). The Spatial Concentration of America's Rural Poor Population: A Postrecession Update. *Rural Sociology*, 83(1), 109–144. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ruso.12166>
- Thurlow, M., Quenemoen, R., Altman, J., & Cuthbert, M. (2008). *Trends in the Participation and Performance of Students with Disabilities*. National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Tickamyer, A., Sherman, J., & Warlick, J. (Eds.). (2017). *Rural Poverty in the United States*. Columbia University Press.
- Tintiangco-Cubales, A., Kohli, R., Sacramento, J., Henning, N., Agarwal-Rangnath, R., & Sleeter, C. (2015). Toward an Ethnic Studies Pedagogy: Implications for K-12 Schools from the Research. *The Urban Review*, 47(1), 104–125. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-014-0280-y>
- Tong, F., Lara-Alecio, R., Irby, B., Mathes, P., & Kwok, O. (2008). Accelerating Early Academic Oral English Development in Transitional Bilingual and Structured English Immersion Programs. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(4), 1011–1044. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831208320790>
- Torres, A. C. (2014). Is this work sustainable? Teacher turnover and perceptions of workload in Charter Management Organizations. *Urban Education*, 51(8), 891–914. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085914549367>
- Trujillo, T. M. (2012). The politics of district instructional policy formation: Compromising equity and rigor. *Educational Policy*, 27(3), 531–559. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904812454000>
- Trujillo, T. M., Hernández, L. E., Jarrell, T., & Kissell, R. (2014). Community schools as urban district reform: Analyzing Oakland's policy landscape through oral histories. *Urban Education*, 49(8), 895–929. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085914557644>
- Trujillo, T., & Renée, M. (2015). Irrational Exuberance for Market-based Reform: How Federal Turnaround Policies Thwart Democratic Schooling. *Teachers College Record*, 34.
- Tseng, V., & Coburn, C. (2019). Introduction to evidence use in the US. In A. Boaz, H. Davies, A. Fraser, & S. Nutley (Eds.), *What Works Now? Evidence-Informed Policy and Practice* (pp. 351–368). Policy Press.
- Turner, E. O. (2017). Marketing diversity: Selling school districts in a racialized marketplace. *Journal of Education Policy*, 0(0), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1386327>
- Turner, E. O., & Spain, A. K. (2016). The Multiple Meanings of (In)Equity: Remaking School District Tracking Policy in an Era of Budget Cuts and Accountability. *Urban Education*, 004208591667406. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916674060>
- Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform*. Harvard University Press. <https://www.amazon.com/Tinkering-toward-Utopia-Century-Public/dp/0674892836>
- Valentino, R. A., & Reardon, S. F. (2015). Effectiveness of Four Instructional Programs Designed to Serve English Learners: Variation by Ethnicity and Initial English Proficiency. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 37(4), 612–637. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373715573310>
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive Schooling: U.S.-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*. SUNY Series, *The Social Context of Education*. State University of New York Press; c/o CUP Services, Box 6525, Ithaca, NY 14851 (\$21.95). <http://search.proquest.com/>
- VanTuyle, V., & Reeves, A. (2014). "Forgottonia"? The Status of Rural Schools in Illinois' Principal Preparation Reform. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 9(2), 111–127.
- Vasquez Heilig, J., Romero, L. S., & Hopkins, M. (2017). Coign of vantage and action: Considering California' local accountability and school finance plans for English learners. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 25, 15. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.25.2818>
- Vasquez Heilig, J., Williams, A., McNeil, L. M., & Lee, C. (2011). Is choice a panacea? An analysis of Black secondary student attrition from KIPP, other private charters, and urban districts. *Berkeley Review of Education*, 2(2). <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/0vs9d4fr>

- Vergari, S. (2007). The politics of charter schools. *Educational Policy*, 21(1), 15–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904806296508>
- Verstegen, D. A. (2013). Leaving Equity Behind? A Quantitative Analysis of Fiscal Equity in Nevada's Public Education Finance System. *Journal of Education Finance*, 39(2), 132–149. JSTOR.
- Villegas, A. M., & Irvine, J. J. (2010). Diversifying the Teaching Force: An Examination of Major Arguments. *The Urban Review*, 42(3), 175–192. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-010-0150-1>
- Warhol, L. (2010). Native American language education as policy-in-practice: An interpretative policy analysis of the Native American Languages Act of 1990/1992. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(3), 279–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2010.486849>
- Warhol, L. (2012). Legacies of NALA: The Esther Martinez Native American Languages Preservation Act and Implications for Language Revitalization Policy and Practice. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 51(3), 70–91.
- Warren, M. R. (2005). Communities and schools: A new view of urban education reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 75(2), 133–173.
- Waters, L. H., Barbour, M. K., & Menchaca, M. P. (2014). The Nature of Online Charter Schools: Evolution and Emerging Concerns. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 17(4), 379–389. JSTOR.
- Wei, X. (2012). Does NCLB Improve the Achievement of Students With Disabilities? A Regression Discontinuity Design. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 5(1), 18–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2011.604900>
- Wells, A. S. (2014). *Seeing past the "colorblind" myth of education policy: Addressing racial and ethnic inequality and supporting culturally diverse schools*. National Education Policy Center. [http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/pb-colorblind\\_0.pdf](http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/pb-colorblind_0.pdf)
- Welner, K. G. (2013). The dirty dozen: How charter schools influence student enrollment. *Teachers College Record*.
- Wilson, T. S. (2016). Contesting the Public School: Reconsidering Charter Schools as Counterpublics. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(4), 919–952. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216658972>
- Winstead, T., Lawrence, A., Brantmeier, E. J., & Frey, C. J. (2008). Language, Sovereignty, Cultural Contestation, and American Indian Schools: No Child Left Behind and a Navajo Test Case. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 47(1), 46–64.
- Winters, M. A. (2015). Understanding the Gap in Special Education Enrollments Between Charter and Traditional Public Schools: Evidence From Denver, Colorado. *Educational Researcher*, 44(4), 228–236. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X15584772>
- Witherspoon, D., & Ennett, S. (2011). Stability and Change in Rural Youths' Educational Outcomes Through the Middle and High School Years. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 40(9), 1077–1090. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-010-9614-6>
- Wolf, N. L. (2011). A Case Study Comparison of Charter and Traditional Schools in New Orleans Recovery School District: Selection Criteria and Service Provision for Students With Disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 32(5), 382–392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932510362220>
- Wolf, P. J. (2008). School Voucher Programs: What the Research Says About Parental School Choice Symposium: Educational Choice: Emergency Legal and Policy Issues. *Brigham Young University Law Review*, 2, 415–446.
- Wong, K., & Sunderman, G. (2007). Education accountability as a presidential priority: No Child Left Behind and the Bush presidency. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 37(3), 333–350. <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjm011>
- Wood, J. N., Finch, K., & Mirecki, R. M. (2013). If We Get You, How Can We Keep You? *Problems with Recruiting and Retaining Rural Administrators. The Rural Educator*, 34(2). <http://epubs.library.msstate.edu/index.php/ruraleducator/article/view/106>
- Wright, D. T. E., & Smith, D. N. (2013). Bullying Of LGBT Youth And School Climate For LGBT Educators. *GEMS (Gender, Education, Music, and Society), the on-Line Journal of GRIME (Gender Research in Music Education)*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.5561/5010>
- Xu, Z., & Cepa, K. (2015). *Getting College- and Career-Ready During State*
- Warhol, L. (2010). Native American language education as policy-in-practice: An interpretative policy analysis of the Native American Languages Act of 1990/1992. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(3), 279–299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2010.486849>
- Warhol, L. (2012). Legacies of NALA: The Esther Martinez Native American Languages Preservation Act and Implications for Language Revitalization Policy and Practice. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 51(3), 70–91.
- Warren, M. R. (2005). Communities and schools: A new view of urban education reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 75(2), 133–173.
- Waters, L. H., Barbour, M. K., & Menchaca, M. P. (2014). The Nature of Online Charter Schools: Evolution and Emerging Concerns. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 17(4), 379–389. JSTOR.
- Wei, X. (2012). Does NCLB Improve the Achievement of Students With Disabilities? A Regression Discontinuity Design. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 5(1), 18–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2011.604900>
- Wells, A. S. (2014). *Seeing past the "colorblind" myth of education policy: Addressing racial and ethnic inequality and supporting culturally diverse schools*. National Education Policy Center. [http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/pb-colorblind\\_0.pdf](http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/pb-colorblind_0.pdf)
- Welner, K. G. (2013). The dirty dozen: How charter schools influence student enrollment. *Teachers College Record*.
- Wilson, T. S. (2016). Contesting the Public School: Reconsidering Charter Schools as Counterpublics. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(4), 919–952. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216658972>
- Winstead, T., Lawrence, A., Brantmeier, E. J., & Frey, C. J. (2008). Language, Sovereignty, Cultural Contestation, and American Indian Schools: No Child Left Behind and a Navajo Test Case. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 47(1), 46–64.
- Winters, M. A. (2015). Understanding the Gap in Special Education Enrollments Between Charter and Traditional Public Schools: Evidence From Denver, Colorado. *Educational Researcher*, 44(4), 228–236. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X15584772>
- Witherspoon, D., & Ennett, S. (2011). Stability and Change in Rural Youths' Educational Outcomes Through the Middle and High School Years. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 40(9), 1077–1090. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-010-9614-6>
- Wolf, N. L. (2011). A Case Study Comparison of Charter and Traditional Schools in New Orleans Recovery School District: Selection Criteria and Service Provision for Students With Disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 32(5), 382–392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932510362220>
- Wolf, P. J. (2008). School Voucher Programs: What the Research Says About Parental School Choice Symposium: Educational Choice: Emergency Legal and Policy Issues. *Brigham Young University Law Review*, 2, 415–446.

Wong, K., & Sunderman, G. (2007). Education accountability as a presidential priority: No Child Left Behind and the Bush presidency. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 37(3), 333–350. <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjm011>

Wood, J. N., Finch, K., & Mirecki, R. M. (2013). If We Get You, How Can We Keep You? *Problems with Recruiting and Retaining Rural Administrators. The Rural Educator*, 34(2). <http://epubs.library.msstate.edu/index.php/ruraleducator/article/view/106>

Wright, D. T. E., & Smith, D. N. (2013). Bullying Of LGBT Youth And School Climate For LGBT Educators. *GEMS (Gender, Education, Music, and Society), the on-Line Journal of GRIME (Gender Research in Music Education)*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.5561/5010>

Xu, Z., & Cepa, K. (2015). *Getting College- and Career-Ready During State Transition Toward the Common Core State Standards* (p. 36). National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.

Yazzie-Mintz, T. (2011). Native Teachers' Beliefs and Practices: Choosing Language and Cultural Revitalization over Uniformity and Standardization. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 12(4), 315–326. <https://doi.org/10.2304/ciec.2011.12.4.315>

Yettick, H., Baker, R., Wickersham, M., & Hupfeld, K. (2014). Rural Districts Left Behind? Rural Districts and the Challenges of Administering the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 29(13), 1–15.

Young, M. D., Winn, K. M., & Reedy, M. A. (2017). The Every Student Succeeds Act: Strengthening the Focus on Educational Leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 53(5), 705–726. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X17735871>

Young, T. V. (2011). Teachers Unions in Turbulent Times: Maintaining Their Niche. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 86(3), 338–351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2011.579019>

Zeiser, K. L., Taylor, J., Rickles, J., Garet, M. S., & Segeritz, M. (2014). *Evidence of Deeper Learning Outcomes* (p. 38). American Institutes for Research. [https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Report\\_3\\_Evidence\\_of\\_Deeper\\_Learning\\_Outcomes.pdf](https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/Report_3_Evidence_of_Deeper_Learning_Outcomes.pdf).

Zimmer, R. W., & Guarino, C. M. (2013). Is There Empirical Evidence That Charter Schools “Push Out” Low-Performing Students? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 35(4), 461–480. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373713498465>

