Many factors complicate the education of urban students. Among them are issues related to population density; racial, ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity; poverty; racism (individual and institutional); and funding levels. Although urban educators have been addressing these issues for decades, to place them under the umbrella of "urban education" and treat them as a specific area of practice and inquiry is relatively recent. Despite the wide adoption of the term, a consensus about its meaning exists only at the broadest of levels. In short, urban education remains an ill-defined concept.

This comprehensive volume addresses this definitional challenge and provides a three-part conceptual model in which the achievement of equity for all—regardless of race, gender, or ethnicity—is an ideal that is central to urban education. The model also posits that effective urban education requires attention to the three central issues that confront all education systems: (a) accountability of individuals and the institutions in which they work, (b) leadership, which occurs in multiple ways and at multiple levels, and (c) learning, which is the raison d'être of education. Just as a three-legged stool would fall if any one leg were weak or missing, each of these areas is essential to effective urban education and affects the other issues. Key features of this exciting new book include the following:

- **Conceptual Model**—A three-part model of urban education built around the concepts of accountability, leadership, and learning helps to define and organize this sprawling and loosely coupled field of study. Further definition is provided by threading the theme of educational equity through each of these organizing concepts.
- **Comprehensive**—The book covers all aspects of urban education and, unlike most books in the field, covers PreK–16 education.
- **Integrates Research and Practice**—All chapters are grounded in the relevant research, while also providing implications for practice.
- **Interdisciplinary and Global**—Chapters cover a wide range of perspectives from leading national and international scholars, and practitioners whose expertise spans diverse settings, student populations, educational systems, and academic fields.
- **Accessible Style**—Although grounded in the latest research, the book's style and tone make it accessible to the textbook, professional development, and reference book markets.

This book is appropriate for university researchers, instructors, and graduate students in schools with an urban education program and as a resource for policymakers at the district, state, and national levels.
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Transformative Leaders and Urban Education

Gilberto Arriaza and Rosemary Henze

In this chapter we posit that to successfully engage the challenges of today’s urban public schools, a new type of education leadership will be in high demand. First, leadership must shift from charismatic, positional, and transactional approaches to an approach grounded on a twin vision that includes both equity and adequacy. We argue that, for our emerging multiethnic democracy, a floor condition must be present in all schools: the unequivocal provision of a basic, high-quality education for all youth and children. Specifically, fully adequate education must be put in place for youth and children who—owing to racialized conditions, economic poverty, and gender, linguistic, and cultural discrimination—have been rendered disadvantaged in today’s school systems.

Second, as our society moves forward in the 21st century, issues that have not been entirely resolved, such as those mentioned above, coupled with entirely new ones, have come to take central stage in the national debates on the future of education. Globalized trade and production of goods and services, new communication and transportation technologies, the ever-expanding production of scientific knowledge, and a fragile natural environment have created tremendous opportunities and unfathomable challenges for our society’s entire education system.

The state of today’s health system, international conflicts, and the sorry state of party politics pale in comparison with the centrality of the U.S. economy and economic progress. More importantly, the social consensus that the economy of a society very much depends on the quality of its citizens’ formal education could not be more relevant. The task before educational reformers may be daunting or even impossible unless it is viewed as a synergy of key elements. In this chapter we attempt to address one of the most significant of these elements: education leadership.

As stated above, the U.S. historical debt to Native Americans, African American, Latinos, and women—owing to discriminatory practices that have systematically placed these populations at a disadvantage—must be resolved. This debt has been amply documented by historians of education (e.g., Brown, 2005; Kozol, 1991; Lieberson, 1980; Tyack, 1974). According to Lieberson (1980), provisions for free elementary education in the South were nonexistent at the time of the Civil War, yet they had been widespread in northern and western states for quite a long time. High schools in the South began their expansion only in the first decade of the 20th century, whereas in the North this process had taken place much earlier.
Along the same lines, in the North, compulsory school attendance laws and their strict enforcement were fully in place by 1900, "but the enactment and enforcement of this type of legislation took place considerably later in the South" (Lieberson, 1980, p. 122). In historical terms, certain regions of the country have not provided adequate education. These substandard conditions gave rise to the five legal cases consolidated under Brown v. Board of Education (Kluger, 1977).

The remedies created by the Brown decision have ameliorated some of the most egregious manifestations of deep societal inequities. Yet vexing educational imbalances continue to this day. School reform efforts of late have focused on closing the achievement gap, gauging its closing mostly through standardized test scores. However, we argue that this narrow focus, which defines equity/adequacy only in terms of closing the academic achievement gap, may render schools incapable of making the advances required to deliver equitable education for all children, thus making it impossible to improve their life chances.

The narrow focus misguides resources and may have the unintended effect of supporting historic and present-day injustices. Add to this picture newer layers of context—such as the deep interdependencies brought about by a global economy, the lamentable state of our natural environment, and rapidly advancing communication technologies and scientific knowledge—and we have a situation in which each new factor can multiply the effects of inequality ad infinitum. For example, as globalization continues and expands, it can create more opportunities for those who are "global citizens"; but it can also restrict global citizenship to the elite and leave the urban poor even more marginalized.

In the next section of this chapter, we define equity and adequacy and their relation to a multi-ethnic democracy. After that, we focus on four approaches for urban leadership in these new times:

1. debunking deficit approaches and instead building social, cultural, and intellectual capital;
2. building healthy, positive intergroup relations;
3. committing to a simultaneous focus on both the local and the global; and
4. integrating academic and applied preparation.

**Equity, Adequacy, and Multiethnic Democracy**

**Equity**

Equity in the United States traces its roots to the English legal tradition, which describes it as a system that attempts to supplement the ordinary legal rules where their application would operate harshly in a particular case (Keigwin, 1930). In rendering decisions, judges are instructed to apply both the rules of strict law and the principle of equity in reaching their decisions (Legal Information Institute, 2005). The Random House Dictionary (1983) refers to equity as a "particular set of remedies and associated procedures" (pp. 656–657) established to amend social disparities.

For important segments of the education community, equity has primarily come to mean closing the achievement gap. Advocates for equity understand that closing the achievement gap necessarily implies the allocation of money, time, and teacher talent and skill where most needed. The reduction or, as some proponents argue, the elimination of the achievement gap is considered a benchmark of a higher egalitarian system, captured in the aphorism, "equity is the strategy; equality is the goal."

The focus on equity as allocation of resources where most needed suggests a radical departure from equality as the framing concept of reform. Equality has usually meant the equal treatment of students regardless of their background. This way, disadvantaged children will have the same access to knowledge, skills, and resources as children from privileged backgrounds. To close the gap, though, it is now understood that the former have accumulated academic deficits that, for instance, make it impossible for them to benefit from free access to coursework such as advanced placement
physics or honors English in high school. Additionally, equity-oriented educators critique the education system for having preemptively closed these children's access by subjecting them to substandard education from early elementary school onward.

Equity actions may lead, notwithstanding, to a paradoxical treatment: while purporting to create a more equal society, these actions could provide some students with a different and unequal service—more or different resources (monetary, material, and human) where most needed—which goes directly against the meritocratic ideal in which all students have an equal opportunity to rise and become successful; those who do succeed do so through their own merit. From Thomas Jefferson's time until now, it has been assumed that schools should exert an equalizing effect on society; ergo, no distinction ought to be made as to students' opportunity to attain knowledge and skills. That is, in a system based on equal access for all, each individual's merit should determine the end results: some will succeed while others will not (Michelli & Keiser, 2005; Oakes, 1994; Tyack, 1974).

Experts distinguish between horizontal and vertical equity. When children are "equally situated" and receive equal treatment in terms of learning inputs, horizontal equity exists (Berne & Stiefel, 1999). In other words, equals are treated equally (Auerbach & Hassett, 2002). Horizontal equity also involves individuals and groups from the same income bracket, gender, and linguistic and/or cultural background. Inputs are supposed to be the same for these children, and it follows that they are expected to produce the same outputs. But this is not always the case. Equal treatment has produced diverse levels of academic achievement within horizontally located groups.

For instance, a subgroup of low-socioeconomic-status students (who may be racially or ethnically diverse) is said to be horizontally located. The horizontal equity approach may mean that those students who are racially/ethnically different but economically poor, receive the same teaching content delivered by the same teachers. They should theoretically produce the same results. Yet we know that most of the time this is not the case.

Vertical equity means that children who are differently situated receive different treatment in terms of learning inputs (Berne & Stiefel, 1999). This may translate into the purposeful infusion of resources for particular groups of children in order to bring those performing at a low level up to par with the ones performing at a high level; more targeted inputs, it is assumed, will produce higher outputs among lower-performing subgroups. However, reforms based strictly on this assumption have not succeeded in eliminating the achievement gap.

Adequacy

Adequacy plays a role similar to that of horizontal equity; it requires absolute results that complement the more relative results of vertical equity. For instance, from an adequate financial perspective, all inputs must provide the necessary support to increase the academic achievement of all children. From a vertical equity perspective, higher inputs must be provided for an underperforming subgroup, so that this group aligns its performance to that of the higher-performing subgroups. Legal language may further explain the definition of adequacy here.

In her rulings, the New York Court of Appeals Chief Judge Judith Kaye (2003) succinctly defined adequacy as "the process of determining the actual cost of providing a sound basic education" (p. 21). Adequacy litigation seeks to remedy inequity in the resources required to ensure a sound, basic education for every child.

Critics of adequacy-based school reform observe that providing basic education does not eliminate society's inherent injustices stemming from its hierarchical organization. Adequacy may only perpetuate the existing academic gaps, since providing adequate education does not address accumulated learning deficits among disadvantaged children and communities. Additionally, the argument against adequacy-based reform questions who defines what adequate means and how should it be measured.
In 1978 adequate was interpreted to mean that schools should be funded in a manner that allowed them—as Minorini and Sugarman (1999) put it in reviewing the 1978 Seattle v. State of Washington case—to “equip our children to function as citizens and as potential competitors in today’s market as well as in the marketplace of ideas” (p. 193). According to the authors, a broader definition was delivered in West Virginia in the 1979 Pauley v. Kelley case “as best the state of education expertise allows, the mind, bodies and social morality of its charges to prepare them for useful and happy occupations, recreation and citizenship, and does so economically” (p. 194).

A case that started as litigation over inequitable finances among school districts ended up as a case addressing inadequate resources that prevented children from obtaining a sound, basic education (Picus & Blair, 2004). Indeed, the Rose v. Council for Better Education case in Kentucky made its way up to the state supreme court, which in 1989 ruled that the entire state school system was unconstitutional. It violated both the education section and the equal protection clause of the state’s constitution. A total revamping of the funding structure ensued immediately, from the enactment of the Kentucky Education Reform Act to a more direct involvement of the state at the local level, including a substantial increase of state funds for education. Litigation spurred by the new focus increased considerably thereafter throughout the United States.

By 2005, about 32 states had faced adequacy lawsuits (Griffith, 2005); overall, 25 of these cases had been decided in favor of the plaintiffs (National Access Network, 2005). An example of this new trend is the Williams et al. v. the State of California case. It was filed in 1999 in San Francisco County Superior Court by about 100 students from low-socioeconomic and low-performing schools in the county of San Francisco and resolved in 2004.

The plaintiffs argued that the state had failed to provide qualified teachers and safe and decent facilities, thus depriving students of their right to basic, good-quality education. As a result of the court’s ruling in 2004, children and youth in low-performing schools that serve low-socioeconomic-status populations will potentially benefit from extra state funds, about $2.3 billion, earmarked to redress poor conditions.

In early January 2006 and just two months after the Supreme Court of Colorado made a similar decision to the Williams case, the Supreme Court of the State of Florida decided against a voucher system, known as the Opportunity Scholarship Program (OSP), created by then Governor, Jeb Bush. Citing article IX, section 1(a) of that state’s constitution—stating that “[a]dequate provision shall be made by law for a uniform, efficient, safe, secure, and high quality system of free public schools”—Judge Barbara J. Pariente ruled against the use of public funds to pay tuition for private education for more than 700 children in the state. Judge Pariente wrote: “It [the OSP] diverts public dollars into separate private systems parallel to and in competition with the public schools that are the sole means set out in the Constitution for the state to provide for the education of Florida’s children” (Supreme Court of Florida, 2006, p. 4).

It was the Kentucky Supreme Court decision of 1989, referred to earlier, that outlined the most clear and comprehensive factors defining “adequate” education. The decision includes the following seven key factors (Minorini & Sugarman, 1999):

1. Sufficient oral and written communication.
2. Sufficient knowledge of economic, social, and political systems.
3. Sufficient understanding of governmental processes.
4. Sufficient knowledge of his or her mental and physical wellness.
5. Sufficient grounding in the arts to enable each student to appreciate his or her cultural and historical heritage.
6. Sufficient training or preparation for advanced training in either academic or vocational fields . . . to choose and pursue life work intelligently.
7. Sufficient levels of academic or vocational skills to enable public school students to compete favorably with their counterparts in surrounding states, in academics, or in the job market.

We note that in this definition of adequacy, science and technology are not specifically mentioned, nor is financial literacy, global citizenship, or environmental citizenship. Are these, then, to be considered optional, at the discretion of the school districts? Furthermore, the bedrock sufficiencies in the Kentucky decision refer only to individual knowledge and skills, and do not take into consideration the interpersonal and community dynamics that both shape individuals and are shaped by individuals and groups. Are we to assume that if each individual achieves sufficient knowledge and skill in the seven areas, we as educators have done our job?

The individualized perspective represented in these sufficiencies is only part of the picture that is needed today. The other part involves the social and cultural dynamics of the school as a living, changing organization in which leaders of all kinds play key roles. Nowhere is this more true than in urban schools, which are typically large and highly complex systems at many levels of hierarchy, with often competing goals. In a democratic and multiethnic society, such as the United States, it is crucial that educational leaders develop ways of ensuring both equity and adequacy, and that the indicators of adequacy are relevant to the times in which we live. In the next section, we discuss how the notions of equity and adequacy are linked to the notion of transformative leadership in a multiethnic democracy.

Transformative Leadership for a Multiethnic Democracy

In Western democracies, and the United States in particular, schools presumably play a pivotal role in forging a well-informed and educated citizenry (Apple & Beane, 1995; Barber, 1984; Dewey, 1916). This ideal premise advances the notion that schools hold the potential for people to learn how to negotiate differences, to relate to the world critically, and to resolve social conflict while also acquiring the basic habits of citizenship (Apple, 1995; Meier, 2002; Simon, 2003; Sizer, 1992).

According to this view, schools are among the few social institutions where communities often unable to communicate and/or understand each other—either at the workplace, the neighborhood, or in general public spaces—converge. Schools often provide the only chance to talk and to embrace common interests by having people share a key interest: their children’s education. Furthermore, globalization and the demographic shift of the late 20th century (from predominantly European-origin immigrants to immigrants and refugees from all parts of the globe) represent the greatest opportunity for U.S. society to engender a true multiethnic, multiracial democracy.²

Preserving the public and secular nature of education is linked to the survival of democracy in the United States. And today’s struggle for equity and adequacy in schools constitutes the arena where the future of this democracy is being decided. Transformative urban school leaders sit at the front and center in this struggle.

How can such leaders embrace a strategy of change that places adequate and equitable education at the forefront of their action? In the following section, we define transformative leaders as the key agents of school reform.

Transformative Leaders

School leaders are traditionally thought of as administrators whose central role is to manage their institutions efficiently. This paradigm emerged in the early 20th-century’s push for the professionalization of education leaders. Cubberley (1916) aptly puts it this way: “The significance of this new movement is large, for it means nothing less than the ultimate changing of school administration
from guesswork to scientific accuracy” (pp. 325–326). The author applies the term scientific accuracy to both up-to-date managerial methodologies (as in business and new industries) and to the elevation of the preparation of school leaders to the same level as that of medical, law, and other professional schools.

Although the vast and complex nature of the education system makes it hard to establish clear and definite trends in the field of school administration, Tyack (1974), Nasaw (1979), and Callahan (1962), among others, profusely documented the predominance of business models in the early 20th century, which remain with us until this day. Swayed by then popular “scientific management” (i.e., F. Taylor’s 1911 work), people interested in becoming school administrators learned to direct schools following notions of efficient, centralized, corporate decision-making processes.

Throughout the 20th century, cost-effectiveness, economies of scale, and numerical measurement became enshrined and continue to prevail in this new century. Along with local state and federal restrictive policies (e.g., No Child Left Behind), the effort to redefine school administrators from business managers to transforming leaders faces seemingly insurmountable difficulties. We suggest here that viewing school leaders as active agents of change is key to surmounting these difficulties.

Agency

Agency may be defined as people’s deliberate daily labor or actions organized around social systems, personalities, and cultural systems (Parsons & Shils, 2001). The first step in moving toward an agentive view of school leadership (as opposed to a managerial view) is to place the notion of agency at the center of the conversation. In this sense, agents, or people with a sense of agency, take action steeped in the cultural and social life of the institutions and organizations where they function (Castelfranchi & Conte, 1995). Agents not only operate from knowing that they can act but deliberately choose to act. As Giddens (2005) notes, agency is not about the intent of doing things but about people’s “capability of doing these things” (p. 127).

Agency in school leadership operates at two levels: structures and culture. We understand structures as the various functions and systems that enable an organization to execute its plans. This is what Habermas (1987) identified as “systems world.” School leaders use their agency to plan how the system of the school will operate, usually including in their plan their key objectives which, if accomplished, eventually enable the organization to achieve its mission. Culture may be defined broadly as the material, mental, social, and behavioral products that humans collectively create (Mukhopadhyay, Henze, & Moses, 2007). Each school may be considered to have its own “micro-culture,” and it is to a degree intentionally shaped by those in leadership roles.

However, it is also shaped by everyone who works at and attends the school. Some cultural norms may be explicit and others implicit. Here, we focus mainly on school culture as it is carried out in the way people talk and define the way things are usually done, how people are categorized both formally and implicitly, and how relationships are sustained (Arriaza, 2004).

The second step of educational leaders as transformative agents is to have a clear but flexible set of approaches to guide their actions. We recognize the risk of prescriptive models, simply because these never work. Life and schooling are far too messy to adhere rigidly to a prescribed set of cookbook-like “recipes.” We have argued throughout the previous section that urban education leaders have a duty to relentlessly pursue and provide both adequate and equitable education. In the next section of this chapter, we argue for four approaches that will help urban education leaders achieve these twin goals and successfully engage the old as well as new challenges. We are not suggesting that these are the only approaches urban leaders should consider. Our aim is to propose approaches that respond not only to the old challenges that are yet unresolved but also to what we see as new issues affecting urban schools.
Four Approaches to Guide Action

Transformative Urban Leaders Debunk Deficit Approaches and Build Students' Capital

Transformative urban leaders understand the concept of social, cultural, and intellectual capital and use this concept to guide their actions. In order to do so, they need to debunk the opposite, which is deficit attribution of school failure. According to Padilla (1976), three arguments constitute the core of the deficit attribution model: genetics, culture, and social class. Although the idea that the human species is made up of superior and inferior races has been scientifically disproved for quite a long time, the genetic argument still shows up in academic discourse (e.g., Herrnstein & Murray, 1994). Proponents of this argument state that racialized peoples are feeble-minded and genetically less intelligent than Europeans.³

Culture as a source of deficit has largely taken the place of biological deficit arguments among educators nowadays. Cultural deficit arguments claim that when children do not excel academically, it is because their families’ cultures do not fit the culture of their schools (Valdez, 1996). According to this view, these children have not been exposed to a wide and rich range of vocabulary and linguistic expression in the dominant language (in the United States, standard English) or to the ways of behaving and believing that fit the rules and norms of schooling. Therefore, it becomes impossible for them to unlock school culture and participate in ways valued by mainstream educators and to follow social mores stemming from the European legacy of the education system’s founders.

One key social phenomenon, though, tends to be ignored by cultural deficit proponents—the demographic shift caused by increased immigration to the United States during the second half of the 20th century. The new demographics have moved public education further away from a European-based student population to a third world (euphemistically called the “developing world”) base, which has in turn infused significant cultural changes in schools. Furthermore, cultural deficit arguments do not address the power relations embedded in the school system.

The assumption is that the dominant culture’s norms are inherently better than those of minority populations and therefore should be the target for all children, as well as their parents. Workshops for parents on middle-class styles of parenting often exemplify a cultural deficit approach, because they ignore or devalue styles of parenting that differ from those of the dominant, European American middle class.

The third explanation for low-achieving students is social class, which often overlaps with culture. Children from low-socioeconomic backgrounds tend to fail in school owing to a culture of poverty, this argument explains. Children living in economic poverty become imbued with self-defeating traditions: few reading and writing habits, limited study skills, and a poor work ethic. Children from economically poor families appear doomed from the outset in terms of academic prowess; as a result, this rationale posits, they need to be equipped with the skills and habits appropriate to their potential—for instance, learning basic thinking skills and training for low-level technical jobs.

Deficit approaches place the burden of responsibility exclusively on the children’s and families’ shoulders. By doing so, schools externalize their responsibility for providing effective schooling for all children. Transformative urban leaders actively lay bare deficit attributions and shift responsibility to the institution. Briscoe, Arriaza, and Henze (2009) provide detailed examples of how school leaders have used language as a key tool in contesting deficit approaches, instead framing their communication through a language of possibility.

For example, José Jacinto, a new vice-principal at a large middle school in a Northern California city, explained that although normalized labels reflect deep-seated assumptions of people using them, these labels represent an opportunity for school leaders to problematize their use and thus help users increase awareness. He observes how by using seemingly harmless labels, such as “those kids,”
teachers put a social distance between them and students. This labeling masks deeper misunderstandings and ignorance which, in turn, do not allow teachers to establish personalized relations, fostering instead a punitive culture. Mr. Jacinto concluded:

Then what happens is that teachers have negative expectations. I try to let them see that... once they know about the student they will investigate. They usually say, “Oh, I didn’t know that.” A lot of people feel and are aware of labels, but they’re afraid to say anything because they fear the consequences with their peers. They don’t have the courage. Even if they have the skills, it might still be confrontational.

Leaders such as José Jacinto are aware of how the informal culture of a school can create labels such as “those kids,” which over time develop a negative connotation. They also realize that they must use their own personal agency to contest such deficit labeling and raise awareness among the other faculty and staff members. But doing so is a delicate matter, because professional colleagues may actively resist someone exposing their own lack of awareness. José Jacinto not only points out the issue of students not having certain types of “capital” valued in the school, but also raises faculty awareness about other types of capital the students do possess. And he expects other faculty members to use their intellectual capital to investigate further about the students’ experiences and background.

Other sorts of capital operate in similar ways that money capital does—we can accumulate it, transport it from place to place, and transfer it. We list here three kinds of capital: social, cultural, and intellectual. For purposes of brevity—given that the literature on the topic is quite extensive—we can provide only a limited description of each of these types.

Social Capital
Negotiating social boundaries and identifying and being part of social networks is the basis of this kind of capital. Transformative leaders help students learn how to successfully relate to others, how to connect to social networks that bring added value to their capital, and how to access, through those relationships, areas that might otherwise be inaccessible. Of vital importance here is understanding how to develop and sustain friendship groups and social status and to make explicit notions such as saving face, peer pressure, and criminalization.

Cultural Capital
An understanding of the role of identity, the cultural values of the elite, and the power of language in society constitutes this kind of capital. Transformative leaders help students by teaching them the modalities of the dominant language as it is used in formal, official settings and the difference between this use and that pertaining to informal contexts. They do not minimize the importance of maintaining the home or community language but rather engage the entire school community in developing greater awareness of how language use is governed by social situations and how power is differentially imbued in those situations (Delphit, 1995).

Children clearly distinguish between the forms of language in talking to their friends and in talking to an interviewer during a job search. They also nurture their language of origin and that of their forbears as a component of their social identity. Students learn to appreciate their origins and develop a strong sense of their position in society while also becoming skillful at negotiating power imbalances.

Intellectual Capital
This kind of capital includes the values, knowledge, and modalities of learning that students bring with them, which can support their dealings with the institutional barriers they encounter every step of the way in their schooling experience. These forms of intellectual capital originate from family and
community practices, such as primary language, artistic inclinations, study discipline, work habits, and technical knowledge. Transformative leaders help students and faculty learn how the intellectual capital students acquire at home and in their communities can be enhanced and transferred to school contexts.

Supporting the development of these forms of capital is educators’ central responsibility in a democratic society. By activating their agency in the above arenas, urban school leaders can advance school reform based on a dual equity/adequacy perspective.

*Transformative Urban Leaders Commit to Building Healthy Intergroup Relations*

Far too many children and youth attend schools where they are fearful of bullies, afraid to speak their home language, receive little or no support in their search for identity development and group affiliations, do not feel a part of the school culture, and do not receive any explicit curricular focus on such important and life-shaping matters as race (what it is and is not, how it affects our self-perception and the perceptions of others), sexual identity, cultural identity, conflict mediation, and other matters.

Many excellent resources by scholarly practitioners in the area of social justice exist, each speaking to various aspects of intergroup relations (see, e.g., Banks & Banks, 2007; Henze, Katz, Norte, Sather, & Walker, 2002; Lee, 1998; Lindsay, Robins, & Terrell, 1999; Tatum, 1997). In general, these authors agree that having safe schools is important but not sufficient, especially since safety is often taken to mean safety from physical harm, not necessarily safety from emotional abuse. All students have the right to learn in peaceful environments where they can focus on learning. When children and youth are distracted from learning because of unsafe and unhealthy intergroup dynamics in the school, the learning goals of an adequate education cannot possibly be met. Thus we see positive intergroup relations as a floor condition that must be present in order to provide the curricular and pedagogical elements of an adequate education.

Here, we would like to briefly touch on one model for organizing a school’s efforts to advance transformative intergroup relations. This model, depicted in Figure 10.1, emerged from a 2002 study
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by Henze et. al. of 21 schools that were effective in developing and maintaining transformative relations among ethnically diverse student (and faculty) populations; the work of Beverly Tatum (2001) also contributed to this model.

**Affirm Identity**
Affirmation of identity takes place in activities that emphasize how we are all different, and that these differences are valued, important resources. Classroom examples include using readings that provide information about the demographic groups that attend the school; asking students to share information about their own places of origin (including places within the United States); constructing maps of student origins; and asking students to teach some of their home language to others. Educators should avoid simplistic overgeneralizations about particular cultures or ethnic groups and “essentializing” statements—i.e., statements assuming that certain cultural behaviors are inherent in a person’s biology, or that students with Spanish surnames all share the same culture.

**Build Community**
This dimension emphasizes similarities, how we are the same, and how unity of purpose helps us work together toward common goals. Examples include asking students to develop an agreed-upon set of class or school-wide rules or guidelines for how people will treat each other; identifying a problem in the institution and working together to solve it; creating class matrices that display information about the class or the whole school (this can actually serve both to affirm identity to the extent that it points out differences and to build community in that it creates a sense of “us” as a group); and cooperative learning activities that require students to cooperate in order to solve a problem or complete a task.

**Cultivate Student Leadership**
This dimension emphasizes student voice, democratic participation, and the development of student leadership. It involves students becoming active subjects of their own histories, not just passive recipients of the history written in textbooks. Typically, only a small core of high-performing students play leadership roles; transformative urban leaders find opportunities for a wide range of students to play leadership roles.

**Address Root Causes of Conflict**
This dimension is essential, because if we focus only on the other three, we may never address the structural and institutional problems that cause ethnic and other kinds of intergroup conflict. For example, if some of the school staff exhibit racist attitudes, if tracking of certain groups places them in less demanding classes, or if informal segregation prevents individuals from coming to know members of other groups, transformative leaders must find ways to bring these issues to the surface and engage the school community in finding solutions (Henze et al., 2002).

Each of these dimensions is important for students’ growth and for the harmonious functioning of the school community. Working on one dimension without the others will result in an imbalance. Urban leaders who use their agency to ensure that not one but all four dimensions of this framework are active in their schools find that their schools become well-functioning communities where respect is practiced on a daily basis.
Transformative Urban Leaders Commit to a Simultaneous Focus on Place, Both Local and Global

Local Relevance
In past decades, anthropologists of education have made a strong case for education to be relevant to students' communities and to draw on the types of knowledge and skills students bring to school. Using a constructivist and culturally responsive paradigm, researchers showed that when teachers bring students' local knowledge into the classroom and make it part of the curriculum for everyone, students feel more engaged with school and are able to see connections between school knowledge and home knowledge. The Funds of Knowledge project in Tucson, Arizona (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005), is one of the best-known projects of this kind, but many others preceded and followed it. Projects such as Foxfire focused on oral history and community lore.

A number of recent projects place agency directly into the hands of students by involving them in participatory action research (PAR) to study and propose solutions to problems they and their communities face, such as lack of services for youth, unsafe school buildings, community violence, and other issues that directly affect young people (Davis, Bazzi, Cho, Ishida, & Soria, 2005; Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008).

Although the push for national accountability through increased standardized testing has forced the "local relevance" argument into the background ("there is only so much time in the school day"), we argue that local relevance remains necessary. Particularly in urban areas where all one reads or hears about on the news is negative, it is important for young people to take back their communities and find meaningful and positive actions that they can take to improve their neighborhoods.

Global Connections
Local relevance is not adequate by itself (Kumaravadivelu, 2008; Luke, 2004). Education leaders need to integrate local relevance with a focus on global connections, enabling students to make connections with places far from the local. Luke calls for teachers to model for students "an agentive engagement in flows across cultures, geographies, and sites" (p. 1441).

Globalization is a term that one reads and hears everywhere now. It is a construct, a label with multiple meanings attached to certain phenomena occurring in the "real world." We cannot directly touch globalization, yet one way or another we experience its effects, even if we are not aware of them at the time. A definition we find useful in thinking about globalization and its relation to education is the following: globalization is "a multidimensional set of social processes that create, multiply, stretch, and intensify worldwide social interdependencies and exchanges while at the same time fostering in people a growing awareness of deepening connections between the local and the distant" (Steger, 2003, cited in Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p. 32). Globalization is not a new phenomenon, strictly speaking, but the speed and extent to which worldwide exchanges are taking place make this era distinct from earlier forms of globalization.

How do changes triggered by globalization affect urban schools in the United States? They do so in several ways that students and faculty directly experience. One is through the speed of Internet-based exchanges, which make possible connections that were unheard of before the current era. Another way is through the availability of technological and scientific information that does not require physical libraries. Any student with a computer connected to the Internet can research and discover knowledge that was not available before except to students in elite schools. However, counterbalancing those positive changes are negative ones: globalization (and the outsourcing of manufacturing and communications jobs, coupled with frequent economic crisis) has left countless urban communities with a shrinking income base.

Globalization affects culture. Some claim that globalization and the threat of homogenization is pushing local communities to resist and thereby strengthen their local identities, whether cultural,
religious, or other types of identity. Others fear that the entire world population is adopting U.S.-style consumerism and moving toward complete homogenization.

A third or middle position, sometimes referred to as "glocalization," suggests that there is a push and pull, or creative tension, between cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization (Appadurai, 1990, cited in Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p. 45). This tension is reproduced on a smaller scale in schools whenever we see tensions and conflicts over whose culture or which ethnic group claims to be the dominant one. Some schools veer more in the direction of universal culture ("we are all the same") and some veer more toward particularistic cultures ("we are all different"), but few schools actually find a balance that includes both sides of the coin.

Transformative urban educational leaders need to insist that graduates of urban public high schools in the United States have a minimum level of global cultural consciousness. They should have a strong understanding of geography and a personal connection to a particular community in another country, including knowledge of its history, economy, demographics, folk legends, leaders, struggles, and at least a beginning level of competency in the language of that community.

For immigrant students, this might mean developing academic knowledge of their country of origin and advanced literacy in the mother tongue. Some of this global cultural consciousness may come about naturally through social contact with diverse peers and adults, but it is up to the school leaders to ensure that curriculum and instruction are purposefully directed toward these competencies.

It is worth pointing out that the United States is one of the few places on earth where large numbers of educated people are monolingual. Throughout the rest of the globe, education comes with knowing at least one additional language. The Council of Europe’s "Common European Framework of Reference," or CEFR (2001), emphasizes language study as a tool for social and economic participation. In this document, plurilingualism is emphasized: "An individual's experience of language and its cultural contexts expands from the language of the home to that of the society at large and then to the languages of other peoples (whether learnt at school or college or by direct experience)" (p. 4; cited in Larsen-Freeman & Freeman, 2008, pp. 160–161).

Definitions of language proficiency are also shifting in response to increasing global communication. Whereas old definitions of multilingualism emphasized equal proficiency in two or more languages, plurilingualism and the CEFR document "suggest that speakers of second and third languages shouldn't be compared to native speakers, but rather to highly competent non-native speakers" (Larsen-Freeman & Freeman, 2008, p. 160).

Our rapidly advancing technologies make global connections far easier and less expensive than in the past. Web-based collaborations take us far beyond the old technologies such as the mail, tele-type, cable- or telephone-based. Students would wait for weeks to receive penpal letters, by which time interest had to be regenerated all over again. Now, they can "skype" or "elluminate" with peers in another country in real time or share video, photos, scanned drawings, and documents on a group Web site. Although it may be financially unfeasible to expect every high school graduate to travel to a foreign country, students, with expert guidance and oversight, can make full use of the technologies now available to shrink the space between them and their world-wide peers. Such connections have always been commonplace among the children of the elite, who attend private schools and well-funded public schools.

In an equitable and adequate school environment, every student, regardless of family income or location, would enjoy such learning opportunities. The technologies now available render old excuses about the costs of foreign travel unacceptable. Foreign travel, while desirable, is no longer a precondition for fostering global awareness and skills as global citizens.

In this section, we have emphasized the need for urban educational leaders to cultivate in their schools both local, community-based knowledge and global cultural competence. Recent decades in
U.S. education have overemphasized the local at the expense of the global, particularly in urban and low-income communities. It is time to shift that balance once again to include the global. It is worth considering here Kumaravadivelu’s descriptions of two Indian state leaders, both from apparently similar religious, historical, national, and political environments.

Nehru had personal dealings with both Indian and Western cultural traditions, and these produced in him “an ambivalent, hybrid identity ... and a feeling of spiritual loneliness ... and ambivalence” (Kumaravadivelu, 2008, pp. 168–169). Gandhi, on the other hand, embraced both his own culture of origin and the contributions made to his identity development by his contact with other cultures—the “twin pillars of rootedness and openness” (p. 169). Gandhi stated, “I don’t want my house to be walled in on all sides and my windows to be stuffed. I want the cultures of all lands to be blown around my house as freely as possible. But I refuse to be blown off my feet by any” (Gandhi, 1921, cited in Kumaravadivelu, 2008, p. 167).

Transformative Urban Leaders Commit to the Integration of Academic and Applied Preparation

In 2003, Castellano, Stringfield, and Stone wrote:

Career and technical education has remained on the margins of secondary education since its inception and on the margins of secondary research for 30 years. However, the immense changes in the United States over the last 30 years necessitate a change ... [and require] the integration of career preparation into the fabric of secondary education. (p. 265)

For decades, educators have been stressing the importance of preparing all students to go to college. In fact, this is the assumed sine qua non measure of a high school’s success: what percentage of its graduates go on to two- and four-year colleges. Along the way to equity, which we have yet to achieve, we lost what was then termed vocational education. We lost it for good reasons. As Oakes (1994) and others amply demonstrated, vocational tracks were being used as dumping grounds for African American and Latino youth, and poor youth of all racial/ethnic groups. Not only were Black, Latino, and low-income students being encouraged to pursue a vocational path, but they were too often actively discouraged from seeking college preparation. Counselors and other school personnel were complicit in this (Erickson & Schultz, 1982).

Now, however, we have a generation of students in large cities who do not plan to go to college (even though their high schools supposedly prepared them for it) and who have no job skills that can provide them with a living wage. We seem to be caught in an either/or trap. In the past, we offered students a choice that was not a real choice because students were actively tracked; then we took away vocational preparation and claimed that we were all emphasizing college preparation. Only recently have schools begun to develop models that prepare students both to enter a two- or four-year college and to work in an applied field that would enable them to earn a living wage after graduation. According to Castellano et al. (2003), the current era of career/academic integration is “seriously under-researched” (p. 231) and lacks adequate outcome data to be able to confidently claim the effectiveness of the models used.

The old label vocational has been largely discarded since 1998 and replaced with the term career and technical education (CTE) (Castellano et al., 2003). The Carl Perkins Act, now in its fourth authorization (2006), has increased attention to accountability in order to measure learning outcomes both in the career area and academic subjects. The federal mandate for accountability has encouraged “new unions of CTE and academic departments in secondary schools” (Castellano et al., 2003, p. 231).

Three different approaches can be discerned in current efforts to integrate academic and CTE: “education through work, education about work, and education for work” (Stone, 2000, cited in Castellano et al., 2003, p. 244). Education through work involves learning traditional school subjects
with work as the context. Education about work involves learning broad knowledge and skills relating to work, such as the democratic rights of workers, safety concerns, the labor market, team building, job seeking, and so on. Education for work targets specific jobs and prepares students for those jobs while also integrating academic content in the preparation.

Data are beginning to show positive results for the new generation of career preparation in secondary schools, both in terms of academic outcomes and earning ability. For example, the Southern Regional Education Board found that “students at schools with highly integrated, rigorous academic and CTE programs have significantly higher student achievement in reading, mathematics and science than do students at schools with less integrated programs” (cited in ACTE, n.d., p. 1). The 2004 National Assessment of Vocational Education Independent Advisory Panel Report indicated that students who took four high school CTE courses showed an average increase in earnings of $1,200 immediately after graduation and $1,800 seven years later (cited in ACTE, n.d., p. 1).

One charter school in Chicago, ACE Tech (the ACE stands for architecture, construction, and engineering), has recently completed its fourth-year evaluation. This school serves a low-income population of whom 98% qualify for free or reduced-cost lunches. ACE Tech has achieved a graduation rate of 85%, compared with the Chicago public schools’ overall rate of 58%. The majority of its graduates have gone on to two- or four-year colleges, while others have gone to apprenticeship schools to become electricians, carpenters, and so on. The remaining graduates have gone immediately into paid employment. The main ingredients for success, according to Knight, Donohue, & Knight (2008), are “a focused curriculum, a well-organized management team, an engaged faculty, and an empowered student body” (p. 22). The school follows the academic standards of the Illinois Board of Education and incorporates relevant industry standards within the curriculum to ensure that students are meeting both sets of standards.

There are a number of issues that must be addressed if similar alliances of career preparation and academic content are to be more broadly successful. One is the need for teacher preparation to enable teachers to teach both academic content and applied areas, or for teachers across CTE and academic areas to develop much tighter collaborations so that they can effectively make use of planning time to provide coherent, rather than fragmented, curriculum and instruction.

Another issue is how to ensure that the careers that are infused in secondary school curricula are viable and can realistically be expected to employ students who complete high school. Because of rapid changes in the economy and rapid advances in technical fields, it is difficult to predict with any accuracy which jobs are likely to be open in the future. Some experts, such as Livingstone (2004), argue that focusing on career education without economic reform is misguided. He stresses that we should be focusing on economic reforms, such as work redistribution and workplace democratization, so that there will be jobs for future graduates. But this approach is not within the purview of urban school leaders, who still need to prepare students for viable means of earning a living.

The environmental challenges we face will lead to companies scrambling to get on board with cleaner, less environmentally damaging products and processes. Industries that respond to this urgent need may offer high school and college graduates in the United States prospects for jobs in the “green” industries. Students who graduate with a strong background in science and technology, along with environmental awareness, will be well poised either to pursue higher degrees in a related field or to go to work immediately after high school and receive further on the job training.

**Conclusion**

We have argued that urban education leaders in the coming decades require a different set of notions or approaches in order to realize the potential of public schooling in this multiethnic and multiracial democracy. Meeting the demand for equity and adequacy can no longer be satisfied by just moni-
toring compliance with state and federal mandates. To attain success requires deep examination of the personal commitment to and understanding of equity and adequacy as well as a broader set of skills to respond to present-day challenges.

From Darwin we learned that species that thrive are those capable of adapting to their environments. In the educational context, we suggest that transformative leaders who integrate into their work the four approaches outlined here will have a distinct advantage over more traditionally prepared leaders because they will be better able to adapt their leadership to a world that has become deeply interdependent, fragile, and compacted. They will be able to debunk deficit logic, forge transformative intergroup relations, establish local and global foci in curriculum and instruction, and integrate academic and applied preparation for students.

Above all, transformative leaders must understand how current “equity” policies are based on a very narrow conception of achievement. Instead, transformative leaders advance a twin approach of adequacy and equity, knowing that if the latter is to be achieved, the former must be present as well.

Notes

1. Some parts of this chapter were inspired by an in-progress piece written by Gilberto Arriaza and Arlando Smith.
2. The European-origin immigration to North America was multithetic; when European ethnic groups converged in North America with indigenous peoples, and later with Africans imported as slaves “racial” differences were invoked to create and maintain hierarchical power relations in which the European ethnic groups were located at the top of the hierarchy. However, the lines that separate “races” are socially constructed; nature and biology do not provide any evidence of separate human races (Mukhopadhyay, Henze, & Moses, 2007). The term multiracial as used here invokes a socially constructed distinction rather than a biological one.
3. The history of eugenics has been widely documented. A good source is the Harvard “Facing History and Ourselves Project” (e.g., see Stoksopf, 2002).
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