

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

CHICAGO TEACHERS UNION, LOCAL 1,
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
TEACHERS, AFL-CIO; DONALD L.
GARRETT JR.; ROBERT GREEN and
VIVONELL BROWN, JR., individually and
on behalf of all similarly situated persons,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY
OF CHICAGO, a body politic and corporate,

Defendant.

Case No. 12 C 10311

Judge Sara L. Ellis
Magistrate Judge Young Kim

FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 26(a)(2)(B) REPORT OF DR. TINA TRUJILLO

Effective, Non-discriminatory Alternatives to Chicago Public Schools’ Turnarounds

Tina M. Trujillo

University of California, Berkeley

Contents

Introduction and Qualifications	3
Summary of Opinions	4
The Empirical Evidence on School Turnarounds and Related Reforms	5
<i>School Turnarounds: A Reform Without a Research Base</i>	8
<i>The Challenges to Fairly Identifying Schools in Need of Turnaround</i>	10
<i>The Flaws Inherent to Limited “Snapshot” Analyses of Test Scores</i>	11
<i>Unwarranted Claims about Turnarounds’ Impacts on Student Achievement</i>	12
Less Discriminatory and More Effective Reforms That are Supported by Research.....	14
<i>Expand the turnaround framework: Use multiple measures of effectiveness over time</i>	15
<i>Implement a district-wide desegregation plan</i>	17
<i>Reduce class size</i>	18
<i>Invest in early childhood education</i>	19
<i>Implement full-service community schools</i>	20
Conclusion	24
Appendix.....	26
<i>Curriculum Vitae for Tina M. Trujillo</i>	26
<i>Materials Considered in Preparation of This Report</i>	45

Introduction and Qualifications

My name is Dr. Tina Marie Trujillo. I am an Associate Professor of educational policy and politics at the University of California, Berkeley, in the Graduate School of Education, where I teach in one of the nation's top ranked educational policy doctoral programs. I also teach in and serve as the Faculty Director of UC Berkeley's Principal Leadership Institute, a research-based master's program for future urban school principals. My background and training is in political science, policy studies, and organizational change in urban education.

My research, writing, and teaching focus on issues of inequality, equity, and school improvement. In my work, I examine the assumptions that govern educational reform policies, as well as what happens when district and school leaders implement these policies in high-poverty, high-minority urban school districts. A central thread of my scholarship examines the outcomes of reforms that endeavor to include corporate, business-like approaches to improving urban schools, such as school "turnarounds." These market-oriented approaches include alterations to the management and governance of schools and school districts, including policies that mandate mass layoffs as sanctions for students' performance on standardized tests. I consider how these reforms affect the educational environments of students, teachers, and leaders in urban school systems—the sites that are most likely to be targeted by such school improvement policies.

I have been employed at UC Berkeley since 2008. Previously, I earned a Ph.D. from the University of California, Los Angeles, in Education (emphasis: Urban Schooling), a M.A. from the University of Colorado at Boulder, in Education (emphasis: Educational Foundations, Policy, and Practice), and a B.A. from the University of Colorado at Boulder, in Political Science. I also hold a part-time faculty position at the University of Oslo in its Department of Teacher Education and School Research. I serve as a Faculty Affiliate for UC Berkeley's Center for Latino Policy Research and as a Research Affiliate for the Los Angeles Education Research Institute. In addition, I am a Fellow at the National Educational Policy Center, as well as a member of WestEd's Board of Directors and the Network for Public Education's Academic Advisory Board. I serve as the Secretary for the American Educational Research Association's Division of Policy and Politics. I have also contributed to various media outlets, either as an expert in educational policy, school turnarounds, and high-stakes testing and accountability, or as a researcher whose work has been cited. These outlets include NPR, CNN, Los Angeles Times, The Washington Post, New York Times, USA Today, PBS Newshour: The Rundown, The Oakland Tribune, and other sources. My full curriculum vitae is attached in the Appendix.

As part of my research on school turnarounds, I co-authored a peer-reviewed legislative policy report for the National Education Policy Center, which received the most prestigious award for a policy report granted by educational researchers' leading research association, the American Educational Research Association. This report investigated the empirical basis for the federal School Improvement Grant Program's school turnaround "option" and recommended research-based alternative reforms for improving consistently

low-scoring schools. I have also conducted reviews of three “think tank” reports (also for the National Education Policy Center), in which I evaluated the methodological rigor and overall research validity of reports that advocate for the use of school turnarounds as an effective reform strategy.

My hourly rate is \$275 per hour.

Summary of Opinions

I understand that on February 22, 2012, the Chicago Board of Education voted to “turn around” ten Chicago Public Schools that had a record of underperformance (as measured by consistently low standardized test scores) by laying off¹ all teachers, para-professional staff, and administrators at the ten schools. These layoffs are in addition to other turnaround-driven layoffs that the Chicago Board of Education conducted prior to 2012. The Plaintiffs, the Chicago Teachers Union, Local No. 1, American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, et al., filed a complaint against the Chicago Board of Education. The Plaintiffs claim that the layoffs contribute to an ongoing pattern and practice of discrimination. They claim that, by targeting South and West side schools that employ disproportionately higher African American teachers and staff for “turnaround,” the Defendant has engaged in a discriminatory employment practice. Although the Chicago Board of Education conducted turnarounds in 2012, these turnarounds are part of a pattern and practice of ongoing school turnarounds since 2008 and continuing after 2012.

The law firm of Robin Potter & Associates and the Edwin F. Mandel Legal Aid Clinic of the University of Chicago retained me to consult and provide analyses and opinions based on my professional expertise in connection with their representation of the Plaintiffs in *Chicago Teachers Union, et al. v. Chicago Board of Education*, No. 12 C 10311 (N.D. Ill.). I assist the Plaintiffs by analyzing the practice of school turnarounds, as well as that of alternative school reforms that are less discriminatory and more effective than turnarounds.

In this report I synthesize the full range of empirical research evidence on school turnarounds and related reforms, and then identify more viable, less discriminatory, and more effective reforms that are supported by research. My findings and opinions are as follows:

1. School turnarounds are not a viable reform for improving Chicago’s low-performing schools because they are ineffective at producing gains in student achievement, reduce the quality of students’ learning environments, and discriminate against teachers in the affected schools. The ineffectiveness and discriminatory nature of turnarounds stems from the following findings in the

¹ Throughout this report, when I use the term “layoff” I am referring to the displacement of all teachers and staff at a school selected for turnaround and/or reconstitution.

- research base on school turnarounds:
- a. Empirical evidence does not show consistent positive academic or non-academic effects associated with turnarounds and related layoff-driven reforms like reconstitution.
 - b. Empirical evidence demonstrates how turnarounds usually have the counterproductive effect of generating greater school upheaval, faculty churn, and instability in school climate.
 - c. Empirical evidence confirms that systems used to select schools targeted for reform are methodologically and statistically invalid.
2. The Chicago Public Schools could have implemented reforms that are less discriminatory and more effective than school turnarounds. These include the following interventions and changes.
- a. Expand the district’s overall turnaround framework (which includes systems for rating school quality) to use multiple measures to evaluate school effectiveness.
 - b. Implement a district-wide desegregation plan that is grounded in rigorous research evidence about the academic and social benefits of students attending diverse, racially and socioeconomically integrated schools.
 - c. Reduce class size, given the large body of rigorous research which confirms that reductions in class size are associated with increased learning gains and more effective teaching.
 - d. Invest in early childhood education programs, based on the large body of rigorous research which confirms that the impacts of high-quality preschool on lasting learning gains is robust, particularly for students from low-income, families of color who live in under-resourced communities.
 - e. Implement full-service community school reforms that address students’ and communities’ lack of opportunity for and access to high quality teaching and learning, including “out-of-school” factors.

All of these reforms represent viable alternatives to the Chicago Public Schools’ discriminatory and ineffective pattern and practice of school turnarounds.

The Empirical Evidence on School Turnarounds and Related Reforms

The Chicago Public Schools’ Board of Education and CEO have experimented with high-stakes accountability reforms for more than two decades – one of the longest histories of such attempts to reform under-performing schools in this country’s history.² Included among these reforms are efforts to turn around consistently low-scoring schools’ performance by “reconstituting” their staff, that is, by laying off all of their current teachers, para-professionals, and administrators.

² Bryk, A.S., Sebring, P.B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J.Q. (2010). *Organizing Schools for Improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

De la Torre, M., E. Allensworth, et al. (2012). *Turning around low-performing schools in Chicago (Summary Report)*. Chicago, IL, Consortium on Chicago School Research.

The school turnaround model was also included in the federal School Improvement Grant (SIG) program, a competitive grant program within the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). In 2007, President Obama signed into law the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, which provided \$3 billion worth of School Improvement Grants for states that committed to implementing one of four school reform models: transformation, turnaround, restart (defined as the conversion of a school to a charter school) or full closure, in their lowest scoring schools.

From an intuitive perspective, school turnarounds might appeal to district officials, including board members, superintendents, or district CEOs, because they appear to represent bold, new, innovative approaches to improving schools. Proponents of these reforms contend that they offer the best strategies for improving teacher quality and student outcomes.³ They maintain that the reforms can effectively narrow test-based performance gaps along lines of race and class, and that they can efficiently improve overall student achievement. These advocates assume that dramatically changing a school's performance trajectory requires policy makers and district leaders to implement, at least in part, dramatic staffing changes.⁴ However, in my opinion, and as I explain in the subsequent section of this report, this advocacy is based on unsubstantiated claims that are not supported by empirical evidence.⁵ Moreover, alternative reforms exist that are more valid, effective, and less discriminatory in that none involve the firing of teachers. Despite their potentially intuitive appeal, school turnarounds are ineffective at producing the results that the Chicago Public Schools sought.

Districts and states have been experimenting with turnaround-style reforms since before the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.⁶ A sizeable body of rigorous research evidence exists about these reforms' outcomes as well as their unintended consequences. Multiple high-quality research studies and other evidence reveal that these reforms disproportionately affect students of color, and that these effects are deleterious.⁷

³ Michelle Rhee et. al, *How to fix our schools: A manifesto by Joel Klein, Michelle Rhee and other education leaders*, The Washington Post (2010). <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/10/07/AR2010100705078.html>.

⁴ See, e.g., Melissa Lazarin, *Charting New Territory: Tapping Charter Schools to Turn Around the Nation's Dropout Factories* (2011). <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/report/2011/06/30/9753/charting-new-territory/>.

Tiffany D. Miller & Catherine Brown, *Dramatic Action, Dramatic Improvement: The Research on School Turnaround*. (2015). <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/report/2015/03/31/110142/dramatic-action-dramaticimprovement/>.

⁵Tina Trujillo, Review of *Charting New Territory: Tapping Charter Schools to Turn Around the Nation's Dropout Factories* 3 (2011). <http://nepc.colorado.edu/thinktank/review-charting-new-territory>.

Tina Trujillo & Marialena Rivera, Review of *The Effect of Co-Locations on Student Achievement in NYC Public Schools* 4 (2014). <http://nepc.colorado.edu/thinktank/review-effect-of-co-locations>.

⁶ Tina Trujillo & Michelle Renée, *Irrational Exuberance for Market-based Reform: How Federal Turnaround Policies Thwart Democratic Schooling*, 117 *Teachers College Record* 1, 3 (2015).

⁷ *Id.*

More generally, generations of research show that turnaround-style reforms are based on faulty evidence and unwarranted claims. They are not supported by empirical research evidence, ignore contradictory research evidence, or both. One of the most erroneous claims about turnaround reforms is that they can yield significant improvements in student achievement. The other is that the drastic reconstitution of school staff will prove beneficial. Neither claim is supported by empirical evidence.

School turnarounds are an example of what many scholars call a market-based reform.⁸ Market-based school reforms are based on principles of market theory. The driving idea behind a market theory of public education is that schools can and should behave in the same way as private corporations. From this perspective, principles of competition, external threats, performance monitoring, and strict accountability for results are assumed to produce more effective, efficient schools. School turnarounds, like charter schools or vouchers, are grounded in market-based principles.

In contrast to market-based models are what some scholars refer to as democratic school reforms. A democratic theory of public school reform assumes that schooling is a public good that requires the participation of diverse constituencies. From this perspective, public schools are seen as furthering social progress by creating opportunities for local educators and community members to equitably share decision-making and participate in self-governance. Such participation is presumed to promote collective engagement in the shaping of local education, as well as a public system whose goal is to provide all students with equitable opportunities to learn. Community schools and desegregation policies are examples of democratic reforms.

More specifically, school turnarounds are based on the market-oriented assumptions that strong external threats motivate teachers and principals to improve, that standardized test results are reliable measures of student performance, that meaningful, sustainable changes in instruction and staffing can be spurred by competition, and that test-based accountability reforms can effectively interrupt and reverse heavily entrenched patterns of low test performance. In other words, turnarounds are based on the assumption that the only barrier to success in the past was teachers', administrators', and staff members' lack of motivation and incentive, and that the best forms of motivation and incentive include external threats or money. Market-based school reforms like turnaround policies are not designed to address the insidious effects of contextual factors such as schools' socioeconomic and racial isolation or disparities in financial or other outside-of-school resources.

⁸ Lipman, P. (2004). *High-stakes education: Inequality, globalization and urban school reform*. New York, Routledge.

Apple, M. (2007). Ideological success, educational failure?: On the politics of No Child Left Behind. *Journal of Teacher Education* 58(2): 108-116.

Hursh, D. (2007). Assessing No Child Left Behind and the rise of neoliberal education policies. *American Educational Research Journal* 44(3): 493-518.

School Turnarounds: A Reform Without a Research Base

In 2007, the Mass Insight Education and Research Institute published *The Turnaround Challenge*, a report that argued for a new, tougher approach to improving the bottom 5% of schools.⁹ It was motivated by the mounting evidence documenting the failure of the No Child Left Behind Act's reforms to produce quick, intensive test score gains, as well as by the growth of business and management consultants who were promoting corporate-style turnaround efforts.¹⁰ At that time, school turnaround efforts had already begun springing up, most notably those spearheaded by Chicago's Academy for Urban School Leadership.¹¹

Such turnaround efforts continued to increase despite the continued growth¹² of "a large body of research [that] explains the advantages of experienced teachers over lower-paid novices, and the importance of continuity and stability in improving student outcomes."¹³ In D.C., New York, and Chicago, for example, not only were lower quality teachers brought in as replacements in turnaround schools; more experienced, credentialed teachers voluntarily resigned after the layoffs.¹⁴ A comprehensive, long-term study in Maryland demonstrated that reconstitution inadvertently reduced schools' social stability and climate, and was not associated with either organizational improvements or heightened student performance.¹⁵ In Texas, a cross-case analysis of four turnaround urban high schools found that rapidly changing technical changes and haphazard adjustments from external organizations in effect magnified certain organizational challenges that existed prior to the turnaround efforts. The study also found no immediate improvements in student achievement, grade retention, or dropouts.¹⁶ This study parallels other research, which showed that non-test-based indicators of quality, such as learning

⁹ Andrew Calkins et al., Mass Insight Education & Research Institute, *The Turnaround Challenge: Why American's Best Opportunity to Dramatically Improve Student Achievement Lies in Our Worst-Performing Schools*, (2007). <http://www.massinsight.org/resources/the-turnaround-challenge/>

¹⁰ See, e.g., Jim Collins, *Good to great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap ...and Others Don't* (2001). See also Joseph Murphy & Coby V. Meyers, *Turning Around Failing Schools: Leadership Lessons From the Organizational Sciences* (2008).

¹¹ David Duke, *Tinkering and turnarounds: Understanding the contemporary campaign to improve low-performing schools*, *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)* (2012).

¹² This research includes studies from before and after 2012. While research on turnarounds' and reconstitution's ineffectiveness and counter-productiveness existed prior to 2012, researchers have continued to compile evidence on such reforms that took place both before and after 2012.

¹³ Elaine Weiss & Don Long, *Broader, Bolder Approach to Education, Market-oriented education reforms' rhetoric trumps reality: The impacts of test-based teacher evaluations, school closures, and increased charter school access on student outcomes in Chicago, New York City, and Washington, D.C.* (2013).

¹⁴ M. Holzman, *A Rotting Apple: Education Redlining in New York City*. (2012). <http://www.otlcampaign.org/sites/default/files/resources/redlining-full-report.pdf>

¹⁵ Betty Malen et al., *Reconstituting schools: "Testing" the "Theory of Action"*, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 113 (2002).

¹⁶ Hamilton M., Vasquez Heilig J., Pazez B. L. (2014). A nostrum of school reform? Turning around reconstituted urban Texas high schools. *Urban Education*, 49, 182-215.

climate, the level of intellectually challenging academic work, or family and community involvement, did not match up with a turnaround school's test scores from year to year.¹⁷

These patterns corroborate the seminal studies of Chicago's reform experiences, which demonstrate that teacher turnover harms schools even when higher quality replacements are found.¹⁸ In addition to the adverse effects of mass layoffs on students' and teachers' morale, localized knowledge about students and the community also declines. Collegiality, trust, professional relations, and community ties – necessary conditions for improving student performance – all wane.

Consistent with these findings, researchers from the Broader, Bolder Approach to Education also found that turnaround-driven layoffs and related reforms did not strengthen school systems, and actually *increased* instability and faculty churn.¹⁹ They cite evidence from Washington D.C. in which teacher attrition – beyond that attributable to the mass firings – increased each year the reforms were instituted. They also demonstrate that in order for teacher layoffs to achieve their intended goals, the systems must lose the worst teachers, but in D.C., for example, the majority of those who left during these reforms were the better, more experienced educators.

What is more, scholars have investigated the effects of turnaround-driven layoffs and teacher replacements due to charter conversions or expansions to find that such staffing changes decreased the representation of teachers of color, particularly educators of color.²⁰ Notably, in Chicago Public Schools, researchers found that school reforms over the last two decades, most of which included turnaround-style interventions that included mass layoffs, were associated with teacher workforces that were more likely to be white, younger, and less experienced, as well as more likely to possess only provisional certification, than those teachers who were employed at the schools prior to the reforms.²¹

These demographic shifts are concerning, given the research that has demonstrated the positive effects of having a teacher of one's own race on student achievement²² and on

¹⁷ M. Berkeley, *A practitioner's view on the policy of turning schools around*, Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR) (2012).

¹⁸ Bryk, A.S., et al. (2010). *Organizing Schools for Improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

¹⁹ Elaine Weiss & Don Long, *Broader, Bolder Approach to Education, Market-oriented education reforms' rhetoric trumps reality: The impacts of test-based teacher evaluations, school closures, and increased charter school access on student outcomes in Chicago, New York City, and Washington, D.C.* (2013).

²⁰ Kristen L. Buras, *Charter Schools, Race, and Urban Space: Where the Market Meets Grassroots Resistance* 125 (2015).

²¹ De la Torre, et al. (2012). *Turning around low-performing schools in Chicago (Summary Report)*. Chicago, IL, Consortium on Chicago School Research.

²² Anna J. Egalite, et al., *Representation in the classroom: The effect of own-race teachers on student achievement* Economics of Education Review (2015)

Robert W. Fairlie, et al., National Bureau of Economic Research, *A Community College Instructor Like Me: Race and Ethnicity Interactions in the Classroom*. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w17381.pdf> (2011)

Thomas S. Dee, *The Race Connection: Are Teachers more Effective with Students Who Share*

students' understanding about racism and ethnocentrism in school and society.²³ Such turnaround-driven layoffs also work against national efforts to diversify the teaching force by retaining teachers of color in order to strengthen the quality of schools that serve large proportions of children of color.²⁴

In my opinion, based on these patterns, the ultimate effects of turnarounds are lower quality teachers and less stable learning environments for districts' neediest students.

The Challenges to Fairly Identifying Schools in Need of Turnaround

At the same time, the literature on turnarounds has still not resolved the question of what constitutes an effective turnaround. Researchers have put forward various proposals for systematically identifying successful turnarounds,²⁵ yet there is no single agreed-upon definition for the amount of growth that is required, the length of time in which this growth should occur, or the requisite sustainability of the results. Techniques for tracking growth in single cohorts of students, rather than comparing different groups of students, have not been widely accepted. As a result, many of the initial allegedly successful turnaround cases are selected based on anecdotal evidence or reputation, and they ignore counter-examples in which turnaround efforts are associated with decreased test scores. Furthermore, given that a turnaround is, by definition, a case of swift, dramatic gains in test performance, identifying effective turnaround schools requires researchers to rely on single- or two-year fluctuations in test scores – patterns that tend not to hold up from one year to the next.²⁶

The National Research Council has also critiqued the use of standardized test scores as indicators of schools' effectiveness. In its seminal report on the validity of incentives and

Their Ethnicity?, Education Next (Spring 2004). http://educationnext.org/files/ednext20042_52.pdf.

²³ Alice Quioco & Francisco Rios, *The Power of their Presence: Minority Group Teachers and Schooling*, Review of Education Research 485, 487 (2000).

Ana Maria Villegas, et al., *Closing the Racial/Ethnic Gap Between Students of color and their teachers: an elusive goal*, Equity & Excellence in Education 283, 287(2012).

²⁴ Betty Achinstein, et al., *Retaining Teachers of Color: A Pressing Problem and a Potential Strategy for "Hard-to-Staff" Schools*, Review of Educational Research (2010)

Erica Frankenberg, *The Segregation of American Teachers*, Education Policy Analysis Archives (2009). <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ829905.pdf>.

²⁵ Hansen, M. and K. Choi (2011). Chronically low-performing schools and turnaround: Evidence from three states (CALDER Working Paper #60). Washington, DC, Center for the Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.

Huberman, M., T. Parrish, et al. (2011). Turnaround schools in California: Who are they and what strategies do they use? Sacramento, CA: California Comprehensive Center at WestEd, American Institutes for Research, and School Services of California.

Hansen, M. (2012). Key issues in empirically identifying chronically low-performing and turnaround schools. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)* 17(1-2): 55-69.

Meyers, C., J. Lindsay, et al. (2012). A statistical approach to identifying schools demonstrating substantial improvement in student learning. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)* 17(1-2): 70-91.

²⁶ Bowers, A. (2010). Toward addressing the issues of site selection in district effectiveness research: A two-level hierarchical linear growth model. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 46(3): 400.

test-based accountability policies, the Council concluded that test-driven reforms violate the basic methodological assumptions behind standardized tests because they require district or other officials to make invalid inferences that reach beyond those for which the tests were designed.²⁷

The Flaws Inherent to Limited “Snapshot” Analyses of Test Scores

Aside from the basic challenge of identifying effective turnaround cases, the results of the few systematic – but not peer-reviewed – studies of turnaround efforts are decidedly mixed. Some analyses have suggested that turnaround schools have achieved small test gains and improved student attendance compared to other low-performing schools in Philadelphia and Chicago.²⁸ A study of turnaround in California found more substantial test gains, but the study was based on a very small sample of schools and on only a single year’s test scores.²⁹ Like the earlier research on effective schools and districts, such “snapshot” studies of effective turnarounds examine gains made over a brief period of time – usually only one year – and therefore suffer from the same methodological shortcomings outlined above.³⁰ Other analyses have yielded opposite findings, concluding that turnaround cases did not produce the expected changes in test scores.³¹ One case study found that non-test-based indicators of quality, such as learning climate, the level of intellectually challenging academic work, or family and community involvement, did not match up with turnaround schools’ test scores from year to year.³²

Other studies have taken up questions that consider issues beyond the narrow window of test performance. For example, some analysts examined the long-term test performance

²⁷ National Research Council (2011). *Incentives and Test-Based Accountability in Education*. Committee on Incentives and Test-Based Accountability in Public Education, M. Hout and S.W. Elliott, Editors. Board on Testing and Assessment, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/12521/incentives-and-test-based-accountability-in-education>.

²⁸ Gold, E., D. Good, et al. (2011). *Philadelphia’s Renaissance Schools: A report on start up and early implementation*. Philadelphia, PA, Research for Action.

Gold, E., M. Norton, et al. (2012). *Philadelphia’s Renaissance Schools initiative: 18 month interim report*. Philadelphia, PA, Research for Action.

De la Torre, M., E. Allensworth, et al. (2012). *Turning around low-performing schools in Chicago (Summary Report)*. Chicago, IL, Consortium on Chicago School Research.

²⁹ Dee, T. (2012). *School turnarounds: Evidence from the 2009 Stimulus*. Working Paper 17990. *NBER Working Paper Series*. Cambridge, MA, National Bureau of Economic Research. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w17990>.

³⁰ A single year’s changes in test scores are likely to be reflections of multiple random effects or of confounding variables like changes in enrollment patterns or in the numbers of students tested. For more on this, see Kane, T. J. and D. O. Staiger (2002). *Volatility in school test scores: Implications for test-based accountability systems*. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*. Washington, DC, The Brookings Institution.

³¹ Designs for Change. (2012). *Chicago’s democratically-led elementary schools far out-perform Chicago’s “turnaround schools”: Yet turnaround schools receive lavish extra resources*. Chicago, IL, Author.

³² Berkeley, M. (2012). *A practitioner's view on the policy of turning schools around*. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)* 17(1-2): 34-39.

of schools initially identified as turnarounds. They found that almost all gains incurred during the one- to three-year windows were not sustained and in some cases were associated with later declines in test scores.³³

The literature that advocates for school turnarounds is also distinguished by an almost singular focus on standardized test-based notions of success. Rarely does this literature examine turnarounds' impacts on non-test-based indicators of quality, such as classroom learning climate, the level of intellectually challenging academic work, family and community involvement, graduation rates or attendance rates—all indicators of a sustainable, effective school reform.³⁴

Unwarranted Claims about Turnarounds' Impacts on Student Achievement

In terms of school turnarounds' effects on student achievement, according to the final, longitudinal evaluation of the SIG program by Mathematica Policy Research, American Institutes for Research, and the Institute for Education Sciences, the implementation of SIG reform models, including the school turnaround option, was found to have had *no significant impacts* on math or reading test scores across all grades, high school graduation rates, or college enrollment.³⁵ This same evaluation documented that elementary schools that implemented any of the four SIG reform models (turnaround, transformation, restart, or closure) experienced similar improvements regardless of which SIG model they implemented – the turnaround option or the others.³⁶ While secondary schools that implemented the turnaround model were found to have had somewhat larger improvements in math test scores than those that implemented the transformation model (but no differences in reading test scores), the researchers noted that the differences may be due to factors other than the reform itself, including differences between schools that existed prior to the reforms.³⁷

The results from this final evaluation report corroborate other findings about turnaround-related reforms in educational research. Methodologically rigorous, systematic research on early reconstitution reforms shows that firing and replacing school staffs has usually failed to achieve the intended effects. One meta-analysis showed that reconstituted schools in San Francisco continued to be placed on other lists of low-performing

³³ Smarick, A. (2010). The turnaround fallacy. *Education Next* 10(1).

³⁴ Berkeley, M. (2012). "A practitioner's view on the policy of turning schools around." *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)* 17(1-2): 34-39.

Luppescu, S., E. Allensworth, et al. (2011). Trends in Chicago's schools across three eras of reform. Chicago, IL, Consortium on Chicago School Research.

³⁵ Dragoset, L., Thomas, J., Herrmann, M., Deke, J., James-Burdumy, S., Graczewski, C., Boyle, A., Upton, R., Tanenbaum, C., & Giffin, J. (2017). School Improvement Grants: Implementation and Effectiveness (NCEE 2017- 4013). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

³⁶ *Id.*

³⁷ *Id.*

schools.³⁸ A comprehensive, long-term study in Maryland demonstrated that reconstitution inadvertently reduced the social stability and climate of schools and was not associated with either organizational improvements or heightened student performance.³⁹ In Chicago, longitudinal research on the district's early reconstitution efforts revealed that staff replacements were no higher in quality than their predecessors and that teacher morale deteriorated under these reforms.⁴⁰

Thus, in my opinion, the patterns in this research clearly indicate that the policy, pattern or practice of school turnaround is not supported by rigorous, empirical evidence, and that it is implemented despite contrary evidence. Research on reconstitution and similar mass layoffs indicates that these techniques do not yield higher quality teacher replacements and that they regularly damage schools' climate, student and teacher engagement, and increase teacher attrition – even for those teachers not yet targeted for layoffs. Student achievement, as measured by test scores, does not improve the way policymakers and advocates anticipate it will.

Empirically, school turnarounds represent an invalid reform in that they are ineffective at producing the results that their advocates expect, because they have been proven to produce several of the negative conditions in schools that they are expected to address, and because they are designed to discriminate against the teachers who work in the affected schools.

School turnarounds are designed to be minimally attentive, if at all, to the social and economic conditions within which the targeted schools exist. Despite decades of social science research that points to the pervasive effects of poverty, as well as the impacts of racial and economic segregation on students' academic performance,⁴¹ these policies focus squarely on within-school factors to improve achievement. They do not address the community conditions in which these struggling schools are embedded. By ignoring larger structural impediments to students' educational opportunities, they deprive under-resourced schools of sustained, equitable resources. In their narrow focus on teacher- and

³⁸ Mathis, W. (2009). NCLB's *Ultimate Restructuring Alternatives: Do they Improve the Quality of Education?* Boulder and Tempe: Education and the Public Interest Center & Education Policy Research Unit. <http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/Mathis-SANCTIONS.pdf>.

³⁹ Malen, B., Croninger, R., Muncey, D., & Jones, D. (2002). Reconstituting schools: "Testing" the "theory of action". *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(2), 113–132.

⁴⁰ Hess, G.A. (2003). Reconstitution—three years later: Monitoring the effect of sanctions on Chicago high schools. *Education and Urban Society*, 35(3), 300–327.

⁴¹ James Coleman, *The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity*, in *Transforming Urban Education* (Joseph Krestovics & Edward J. Nussel, eds., 1994)

Christopher Jencks et al., *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America* (1972)

Ira Katznelson & Margaret Weir, *Schooling for all: Class, Race, and the Decline of the Democratic Ideal* (1985)

Gloria Ladson-Billings, *From the Achievement Gap to the Education Debt: Understanding Achievement in U.S. schools*, Educational Researcher (2006)

Richard Rothstein, *The racial achievement gap, segregated schools, and segregated neighborhoods: A constitutional insult*, *Race and Social Problems* (2015)

Jean Anyon, *Ghetto schooling: A political economy of urban educational reform* (1997).

school-based accountability for test-based achievement, they minimize attention to students' social, emotional, mental, and physical health—all factors that predict students' academic success more than high-stakes interventions like mass layoffs. Instead, school turnarounds have the effect of exacerbating existing inequalities among schools.

In what follows, I outline alternatives to school turnaround that are supported by the research as less discriminatory, more viable reforms, particularly for communities that include disproportionately higher numbers of teachers, para-professionals, and/or administrators who are racial minorities.

Less Discriminatory and More Effective Reforms That are Supported by Research

It is my opinion that less discriminatory and more effective alternatives to school turnarounds include reforms that address the root causes of racial and socioeconomic disparities in academic performance. These reforms depart from narrowly focused, “quick fix” strategies like mass layoffs in that they are designed to systematically and comprehensively address the structural and institutional obstacles that students in low-performing schools (and limited opportunity neighborhoods and communities) face, all of which result in persistently low school performance. These viable alternatives are also not discriminatory because none of these target schools with a high proportion of minority students and teachers for punitive consequences.

By implementing reforms that do not rely on punitive threats and consequences for historically under-performing schools, and that instead rely on more sustained inputs that are based on proven strategies for increasing students' opportunities for high quality teaching and learning, Chicago Public Schools could have designed a robust system of educational support that addresses the various opportunity gaps that children of color and low-income families face outside of school. These reforms are intended to ensure greater educational opportunity – by redistributing financial and educational resources in a manner that targets families who lack access to stable housing, employment, health care, and other conditions that strongly predict educational success.⁴² They require district officials to shift toward an assistance and capacity-building role, rather than a regulatory or monitoring role. They also require them to collaborate with social service and other agencies to ensure adequate personal, social, and economic opportunities for children in Chicago's least advantaged communities.

It is important to note that in this section I do not simply compare the statistical “effect size” of one reform to another because doing so would be methodologically invalid. While effect sizes represent one factor that can be considered when evaluating the potential effectiveness of a reform, when studies use different designs, standards for evidence, data sources, statistical controls, and research questions, a straightforward comparison of effect sizes is misleading. What is more methodologically valid and

⁴² Kevin G. Welner & William J. Mathis, National Education Policy Center, Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Time to Move Beyond Test-Focused Policies (2015). <http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/nepc-policymemo-esea.pdf>

practically useful is to compare the full characteristics of the findings from different studies in order to arrive at a more comprehensive, valid understanding of the potential benefits and/or trade-offs of different reforms.

I organize these reforms around five focal areas: expanding the district's turnaround framework to include multiple measures of effectiveness over time, implementing a district-wide desegregation plan, reducing class size, investing in early childhood education, and implementing full-service community schools. These interventions and changes are all more valid in that they have been proven to be more effective at producing the results that the Chicago Public Schools sought when it relied on the less valid school turnaround reforms.

Expand the turnaround framework: Use multiple measures of effectiveness over time

Based on Dr. Bruce Baker's analyses and opinions in his report for this same case, "Racially Disparate Impact of Chicago School Turnarounds on Black and Hispanic Teachers," the Chicago Public Schools could have also expanded its overall framework for school turnaround, which would include not just specific interventions that are less discriminatory but systems for identifying and selecting schools targeted for reform that are less discriminatory as well. Dr. Baker's findings that the racial composition of student enrollments in schools is associated with the racial composition of the teacher workforce in those schools, and that the Chicago Public Schools' indicator system for rating school quality and imposing sanctions is not designed to isolate teacher or administrator effectiveness, indicate that the district could have expanded its turnaround framework to use multiple measures of school effectiveness for rating school quality.

Under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), states must measure school performance using one or more non-academic indicators, which make such an expanded framework not only viable, but also consistent with other policy requirements. Leading researchers have documented that low-test scores reflect social inequalities, including the socioeconomic and racial segregation of schools, as well as disparities in housing patterns and school resources.⁴³ Thus, ESSA requires that states and, therefore, districts place "substantial weight" on a combination of four variables (academic achievement, student growth, graduation rates, and English proficiency). At least one "school quality" indicator

⁴³ Berliner, D. (2016). Addressing Poverty: Our Impoverished View of Educational Reform. In W. Mathis & T. Trujillo (Eds.), *Learning from the Federal Market-Based Reforms: Lessons for the Every Student Succeeds Act* (pp. 437-486). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Schwartz, H. (2010). *Housing Policy Is School Policy: Economically Integrative Housing Promotes Academic Success in Montgomery County, Maryland*. New York: The Century Foundation. <https://www.tcf.org/assets/.../tcf-Schwartz.pdf>

Rothstein, R. (2016). The Racial Achievement Gap, Segregated Schools and Segregated Neighborhoods: A Constitutional Insult. In W. Mathis & T. Trujillo (Eds.), *Learning from the Federal Market-Based Reforms: Lessons for the Every Student Succeeds Act* (pp. 487-506). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Wells, A. (2015). *Diverse Housing, Diverse Schooling: How Policy Can Stabilize Racial Demographic Change in Cities and Suburbs*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/housing-school-nexus>

must be included. These school quality indicators permit states and their districts to incorporate a range of measures of effectiveness beyond standardized tests. Given the findings and opinions in Dr. Baker’s report, my previous discussion in this report about the volatility of standardized test scores from year to year, and the methodological limitations of trying to measure a reform’s effectiveness in a short period of time (e.g., one to three years), these measures should also include interim measures of effectiveness that can be used to evaluate whether a school is making progress toward ongoing, sustained improvement.

Synthesizing ten years of research on the Chicago Public Schools’ reform experiences, Bryk et al. concluded that effective, sustainable reforms required five years to implement, wherein initial restructuring changes were evident first and student achievement changes were observed last. Moreover, they found that any changes in student outcomes during the first two years of a reform were not associated with sustained changes in student outcomes by the end of the reforms.⁴⁴

Likewise, Kirp’s longitudinal analysis of more than 20 years of successful, sustained district-wide reform in Union City, New Jersey, showed how district officials invested in long-term changes in their entire system of schools, in lieu of “quick fixes” like mass layoffs.⁴⁵ He found that after staying the course with a comprehensive set of research-based school reforms, all of which were designed to support schools’ and communities’ capacity for improvement, not sanction them for low performance, this high-poverty, high minority school district eventually achieved – and continued to achieve – graduation rates that were approximately 10 percentage points above the national average (89.5%), a 75 percent college enrollment rate, and test scores that roughly approximated state averages. These improvements, however, did not transpire within one or two or three years. They developed gradually over time as Union City leaders maintained a consistent collection of capacity-building reforms that were grounded in empirical evidence.

Given these research findings, interim measures of a school’s effectiveness are critical to validly assessing a school’s progress toward more sustained, successful reform. For the Chicago Public Schools, these measures can include indicators of changes in school climate; increases in social trust among teachers, students, and families; the expansion of school and community partnerships; increases in parent participation in school affairs; increases in teachers’ professional knowledge; or increases in the types and/or numbers of stakeholders’ input into the schools’ decision-making processes, among others.⁴⁶ Other measures could include indicators of students’ engagement in school; changes in their socio-emotional learning; or improvements in attendance, graduation, dropout,

⁴⁴ Bryk, A.S., et al. (2010). *Organizing Schools for Improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Kerbow, D., Rollow, S., & Easton, J. Q. (1998). *Charting Chicago school reform: Democratic localism as a lever for change*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

⁴⁵ Kirp, D. (2013). *Improbable Scholars: The Rebirth of a Great American School System and a Strategy for America’s Schools*.

⁴⁶ Julia Daniel, Kevin Welner, and Michelle Renée Valladares (2016). *Time for Improvement: Research-based Expectations for Implementation of the Community Schools Initiative in New York City*.

suspension, expulsion, and referral rates. They can also include indicators of changes in college-course taking patterns and college-going rates; increases in Grade Point Averages; English Language Learner re-designation rates; or improvements in students' health outcomes.⁴⁷ Data on all of these indicators can be disaggregated by race, socioeconomic status, language status, grade level or subject matter, teacher characteristics (e.g., certification status or experience level), or other relevant factors.

All of these measures represent a more valid, less discriminatory way of selecting schools that could have been and will be targeted for turnaround. They can also serve a formative purpose; that is, they can be used by district and school leaders to continually evaluate the progress of their reforms and adjust aspects of the changes in need of revision, rather than merely discontinuing entire reforms and selecting new models.

Implement a district-wide desegregation plan

A district-wide desegregation plan is a viable alternative to school turnarounds because it is grounded in solid research evidence about the academic and social benefits of students attending diverse, racially and socioeconomically integrated schools.⁴⁸ Despite the decision in the landmark case, *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), which declared segregated schooling inherently unequal, today's African American and Latino students continue to be likely to attend schools that are highly segregated by race, poverty, and language. Their schools are likely to have fewer resources, experience greater faculty turnover, have higher rates of drop-outs, and use harsher discipline policies than integrated schools and schools that serve higher proportions of White students. In cities where housing and neighborhoods are largely segregated by race and poverty, like Chicago, this segregation contributes to a pattern of unequal schools and school resources.

Based on the large body of evidence that confirms the deleterious effects of segregated schooling, especially for low-income children and children of color, the Chicago Board of Education could have implemented a desegregation plan that requires all schools to enroll a racially and socioeconomically diverse student population. Integrated schools provide traditionally disadvantaged students (i.e., racial minorities and students from high poverty backgrounds) with access to more resources and opportunities for high quality teaching and learning. These students' academic and social outcomes are consistently higher than those of comparable students in segregated schools.⁴⁹ Integrated schools also benefit all students because they expand opportunities for students to be exposed to other backgrounds and perspectives and prepare for participation in a diverse society.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ *Id.*

⁴⁸ Erica Frankenberg, Liliana Garces, and Megan Hopkins (2016). *School Integration Matters: Research-based Strategies to Advance Equity*. New York: Teachers College Press

⁴⁹ Gary Orfield. (2016). A New Civil Rights Agenda for American Education. In W. Mathis & T. Trujillo (Eds.), *Learning from the Federal Market-Based Reforms: Lessons for the Every Student Succeeds Act* (pp. 279-314). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

⁵⁰ James Coleman, *The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity*, in *Transforming Urban Education* (Joseph Krestovics & Edward J. Nussel, eds., 1994).

Other racially and socioeconomically diverse districts have successfully implemented desegregation plans with success. For example, the Berkeley Unified School District (BUSD) designed an integration plan to maintain balanced school diversity at all schools, despite the district's deeply segregated neighborhoods.⁵¹ In BUSD, the district uses different geographical data to assign students to schools based on attendance zones and residential block categories. It does not use students' race to determine school assignments, which is why the California Supreme Court declined to review an appellate court's decision to uphold the legality of the plan.

Reduce class size

Class size reduction is a viable alternative to turnarounds that could have been managed by gradually implementing the reform to the extent that the Chicago Public Schools had the capacity to do so. A large body of research confirms that reductions in class size are associated with increased learning gains and more effective teaching.⁵² Class size can predict test-based outcomes as well as broader, non-test based outcomes over the course of students' lifetime, especially for low-income and minority children. Research also demonstrates that the increased financial expenses that are required to reduce class size produces substantial future educational and social savings that outweigh initial costs.⁵³ Importantly, class sizes do not necessarily only need to be reduced to a specific student-to-teacher ratio, such as 20 students per teacher or 15 students per teacher. Class size reductions have a fairly linear effect on student outcomes, which means that a district that engages in this reform can decrease class size progressively, given the availability of teaching and other resources that are required to support the reductions.

Christopher Jencks et al., *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America* (1972).

⁵¹ Lisa Chavez and Erica Frankenberg (2009). *Integration Defended: Berkeley Unified's Strategy to Maintain School Diversity*. The UCLA Civil Rights Project.

⁵² Schanzenbach, D. (2016) Does Class Size Matter? In W. Mathis & T. Trujillo (Eds.), *Learning from the Federal Market-Based Reforms: Lessons for the Every Student Succeeds Act* (pp. 565-582). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

⁵³ Chetty, R., Friedman, J. N., Hilger, N., Saez, E., Schanzenbach, D. W., & Ya-gan, D. (2011). How does your kindergarten classroom affect your earnings? Evidence from Project STAR. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126(4), 1593–1660. □

Finn, J., Gerber, S., & Boyd-Zaharias, J. (2005). Small classes in the early grades, academic achievement, and graduating from high school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2), 214–223. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.2.214> □

Fredriksson, P., Öckert, B., & Oosterbeek, H. (2013). Long-term effects of class size. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 128(1), 249–285. □

Word, E., Johnston, J., Bain, H. P., Fulton, B. D., Zaharies, J. B., Lintz, M. N., Achilles, C. M., Folger, J., & Breda, C. (1990). *Student/Teacher Achievement Ratio (STAR), Tennessee's K–3 class size study: Final summary report 1985–1990*. Nashville, TN: Tennessee State Department of Education. □

Molnar, A., Smith, P., Zahorik, J., Palmer, A., Halbach, A., & Ehrle, K. (1999). Evaluating the SAGE program: A pilot program in targeted pupil-teacher reduction in Wisconsin. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 21(2), 165–177. doi:10.3102/01623737021002165

For the Chicago Public Schools Board of Education, this reform could have entailed not reductions in class size across the entire district, but in the schools that have a history of persistent under-performance. In other words, for those schools that would ordinarily be targeted for turnaround, the Board of Education could have taken steps to gradually reduce class sizes in these schools, beginning in select grades and then expanding the reductions to other grades on an annual basis. The maximum number of students per teacher could be progressively reduced over a number of years.

Invest in early childhood education

Finally, investments in early childhood education are another viable alternative that could have been managed by gradually implementing early childhood education programs to the extent that the Chicago Public Schools had the capacity to do so. Early childhood education represents one of the most promising, effective alternatives to school turnarounds. The research evidence on the impacts of high-quality preschool on lasting learning gains is robust.⁵⁴ These gains are particularly evident for students from low-income, families of color who live in under-resourced communities.⁵⁵ Consensus now exists among researchers of early childhood education that the first five years of life are a time of rapid learning and growth, although children from families who have attained lower levels of education or who earn lower income levels experience lower rates of cognitive, social, emotional, and academic outcomes during these years.⁵⁶ High quality preschool can substantially improve these rates of development. Both quantitative and qualitative reviews of the research evidence on early childhood education confirm these benefits. In his synthesis of the empirical evidence behind high-quality preschool education programs, Barnett notes that over 1200 researchers endorsed the findings of a recent meta-analysis of preschools' effectiveness, which included the conclusions that:

⁵⁴ Barnett, S. (2016). Expanding Access to Quality Pre-K is Sound Public Policy. In W. Mathis & T. Trujillo (Eds.), *Learning from the Federal Market-Based Reforms: Lessons for the Every Student Succeeds Act* (pp. 525-546). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Porter, A. (u.d.). Rethinking the Achievement Gap Penn GSE Newsroom.
<https://www.gse.upenn.edu/news/rethinking-achievement-gap>

Sylva, K., Melhuish, E., Sammons, P., Siraj, I., & Taggart, B. (2014). *The Effective Preschool, Primary and Secondary Education Project (EPPSE 3-16+) Students' educational outcomes at age 16*. London, England: Institute of Education, University of London. □

⁵⁵ Yoshikawa, H., Weiland, C., Brooks-Gunn, J., Burchinal, M. R., Espinosa, L. M., Gromley, W. T., Ludwig, J., Magnuson, K.A., Phillips, D., & Zaslow, M. J. (2013). *Investing in our future: the evidence base on preschool education*. Society for Research in Children and Foundation for Child Development. <http://fcd-us.org/sites/default/files/Evidence%20Base%20on%20Preschool%20Education%20FINAL.pdf> □

⁵⁶ Burchinal, M., McCartney, K., Steinberg, L., Crosnoe, R., Friedman, S. L., McLoyd, V., Pianta, R., & NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2011). Examining the Black–White achievement gap among low-income children using the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development. *Child Development*, 82(5), 1404–1420. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01620.x

Halle, T., Forry, N., Hair, E., Perper, K., Wandner, L., Wessel, J., & Vick, J. (2009). *Disparities in early learning and development: Lessons from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study–Birth Cohort (ECLS–B)*. Washington, DC: Child Trends. □

Quality early childhood education can reduce the achievement gap, producing impacts on long-term life outcomes that are more important than those on test scores.

Many low- and moderate-income families cannot obtain high quality early education on their own, a situation that may increase inequality in child development and life outcomes.

Quality programs address the needs of the whole child, stimulating language and cognitive growth while nurturing social and emotional development. They use evidence-based curricula, coach teachers to high levels of practice, and include health and parent engagement activities.

Quality early education can be brought to scale, with examples available across the country.

Such programs can benefit children from middle-income families, as well as those in poverty, while everyone benefits from the substantial economic returns to society as whole.⁵⁷

Importantly, high-quality pre-school education is not narrowly academic in nature. Rather, it is broad-based and grounded in experiential learning. Emphasizing traditional subject matter knowledge or standardized testing is not associated with improved, sustained development for the least advantaged students. In fact, researchers have found that these features of early childhood education are related to lower levels of development and academic attainment in later grades.

The Chicago Public Schools Board of Education could have implemented high-quality preschool programs in those schools that would otherwise be targeted for turnaround. District officials could tailor the specifics of these programs based on numerous, empirically effective preschool programs from both domestic and international examples. However, it is important to note, as researchers have confirmed, that efforts to design high-quality preschool must include adequate, ongoing training for preschool educators and administrators, as well as evidence-based curricula that address the needs of the whole child (e.g., social, emotional, physical, and academic needs).

Implement full-service community schools

Full-service community school models are a viable alternative to school turnarounds because they could have been funded through the federal School Improvement Grant (SIG) Program. In 2009, the Obama Administration renewed the SIG Program, which included considerable grant monies (up to \$2 million per year for up to three years) for

⁵⁷ Barnett, S. (2016). Expanding Access to Quality Pre-K is Sound Public Policy. In W. Mathis & T. Trujillo (Eds.), *Learning from the Federal Market-Based Reforms: Lessons for the Every Student Succeeds Act* (pp. 525-546). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, p. 528.

schools to implement various reform models, including the school turnaround option, but also including the more holistic, comprehensive transformation option. Funded as a part of the SIG program's transformation option, these full-service community school reforms could have provided a more effective, valid alternative to school turnarounds.

They are also included as approved reforms for schools that are complying with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). That is, for schools that receive Title I and/or IV funding (which includes every school in the Chicago Public Schools that has been targeted for turnaround), they have the option to implement this reform as a part of their compliance with federal policy requirements for comprehensive reforms that can expand community engagement and reduce non-academic barriers to student success.

In place of turnaround reforms that depend largely on market-based competition among schools and teachers, punitive sanctions (the threat of layoffs), and "within-school" changes, full-service community schools provide an equitable, effective reform strategy that addresses students' and communities' lack of opportunity for and access to high quality teaching and learning, including "out-of-school" factors.⁵⁸ These reforms are preferable to rapid turnaround reforms in large part because they target not just conditions inside of schools, but conditions outside of schools and their communities. Given that at least twice as much of the variance in student outcomes is predicted by out-of-school factors compared to within-school factors, the promise of these reforms lies in their potential to meet the range of needs that are characteristic of communities of concentrated poverty.⁵⁹

No singular, seminal, peer-reviewed study points to the effectiveness of full-service community schools compared to other school reform models because the definition of a full-service community school varies from state to state, district to district, and even school to school. The lack of agreement among both practitioners and researchers about the mandatory components of a full-service community school poses considerable methodological challenges to designing research studies that validly compare such reforms to other types of reforms. That said, several rigorous research and evaluation studies support a set of common features for these schools, including integrated academic, physical, mental, and familial supports; expanded learning time, and authentic community engagement, all of which have been documented to increase student achievement, student engagement, graduation rates, and attendance rates.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Julia Daniel & Jon Snyder (December, 2015). *Community Schools as an Effective Strategy for Reform*, Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education, National Education Policy Center. <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/community-schools-as-an-effective-strategy-for-reform>

⁵⁹ *Id.*

Goldhaber, D.D., Brewer, D.J., & Anderson, D.J. (1999). A three-way error components analysis of educational productivity. *Education Economics*, 7(3), 199-208.

Berliner, D. (2016). Addressing Poverty: Our Impoverished View of Educational Reform. In W. Mathis & T. Trujillo (Eds.), *Learning from the Federal Market-Based Reforms: Lessons for the Every Student Succeeds Act* (pp. 437-486). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

⁶⁰ Blank, M. J., Melaville, A., & Shah, B. P. (2003), *Making the difference: Research and practice in community schools*. Coalition for Community Schools. <http://www.communityschools.org/assets/1/page/ccsfullreport.pdf>

At least 17 state legislatures have introduced bills to provide for full-service community schools through state grants, re-allocated funding streams (e.g., federal ESEA waivers), and the allowable use of full-service community schools as an alternative to the current SIG turnaround models.⁶¹ Each of these states provides constructive examples of the features of these reforms that individual districts can implement in place of school turnarounds.

For example, California's recent community schools bill provides a strong model upon which the Chicago Public Schools' full-service community schools could be based.⁶² It shows how a school district can invest in students' social, emotional, mental, and physical health, as well as their broad academic development, by implementing a comprehensive set of research-based, school-wide changes in schools targeted for reform.

For the Chicago Public Schools Board of Education, implementing full-service community schools reforms would require district officials to:

- a. Significantly increase mental and physical health services for children and their families, including hiring and/or increasing the currently allocated school psychologist, school nurse, and social worker. Open a school clinic that is available to both students and their families.

Valli, L., Stefanski, A., & Jacobson, R. (2016) School-Community Partnerships: A Typology for Guiding Systemic Educational Reform. In W. Mathis & T. Trujillo (Eds.), *Learning from the Federal Market-Based Reforms: Lessons for the Every Student Succeeds Act* (pp. 583-602). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Axelroth, R. (2009). *The Community Schools Approach: Raising Graduation and College Going Rates—Community High School Case Studies*. Washington, DC: Coalition for Community Schools, Institute for Educational Leadership.

LaFrance Associates. (2005). *Comprehensive evaluation of the full-service community schools model in Washington: Showalter Middle School*. San Francisco: LaFrance Associates. McClanahan Associates & Research for Action.

Hartford Community Schools Evaluation, Final Report 2009-2011.

[http://www.communityschools.org/assets/1/AssetManager/HCS%20Final%20Report%20\(2-6-12\).pdf](http://www.communityschools.org/assets/1/AssetManager/HCS%20Final%20Report%20(2-6-12).pdf)

Heers, M., Van Klaveren, C., Groot, W. & Maasen van den Brink, H. (2011). *Community Schools Unfolded: A review of the literature*. Tier Working Paper Series WP 11/04.

<http://www.tierweb.nl/index.php?id=425>

ICF International. (2010, October). *Communities in Schools national evaluation: Five year executive summary*. Fairfax, VA: ICF International.

<http://www.communitiesinschools.org/about/publications/publication/five-year-national-evaluation-executivesummary>

McCord, M. T., Klein, J. D., Foy, J. M., Fothergill, K. (1993). School-Based Clinic Use and School Performance. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 14: 91-98.

Sheldon, S. B. (2003). Linking school-family-community partnerships in urban elementary schools to student achievement on state tests. *Urban Review* 35(2), 149-165.

⁶¹ Tina Trujillo (2016). Restoring the Federal Commitment to Equal Educational Opportunity: New Directions for ESSA's school improvement Initiatives. *Education Law and Policy Review* 3, 141-165.

⁶² SB-403 California Community Schools Act. http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0401-0450/sb_403_bill_20150407_amended_sen_v98.html

- b. Implement research-based, whole-school curriculum for socio-emotional learning.
- c. Develop systems for Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports, Restorative Justice, or other school-wide strategies that reinforce positive behaviors, reduce ineffective and counterproductive punitive practices (e.g., zero tolerance policies), and build students' capacity to identify positive resolutions to conflict, repair harm, and develop a school-wide climate of respect, dignity, and collective-minded values.
- d. Expand learning time to provide the lowest income families with high-quality, affordable summer and after-school resources, including summer camps, after-school enrichment classes, tutoring, fine arts lessons, and athletics. These programs should be located on the school property, a location that all school families can reach. These resources can be secured by collaborating with community and business partners, pre-existing out-of-school programs, and local philanthropic organizations. In low-income communities, students spend less time on learning activities than their middle- and upper-class counterparts.⁶³ More affluent families have access to resources that can compensate for short days and summer vacations. These resources help prepare students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds for academic success, college, and careers. Yet these conditions serve to widen the gaps in opportunities for high-quality learning between more and less advantaged students.⁶⁴ High-quality, expanded learning time and its associated resources is related with increased student achievement.⁶⁵
- e. Mandate that schools develop plans for significantly reducing suspensions, expulsions, truancies, and referrals to law enforcement agencies. Mandate that these plans focus on racial, economic, or other populations that are over-represented in the schools' discipline statistics.
- f. Develop research-based, school-wide professional development for all staff that focuses on implicit bias and cultural competence training, as well trauma-informed practices.

⁶³ Jaime L. Del Razo and Michelle Renée (2013). Expanding Equity through More and Better Learning Time. *Voices in Urban Education*, 36 (Winter/Spring), pp. 27-34. Providence, RI: Annenberg Institute for School Reform.

⁶⁴ Dobbie, W., & Fryer, R. (2011). Are High-Quality Schools Enough to Increase Achievement among the Poor? Evidence from the Harlem Children's Zone. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 3(3), 158-87. <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles.php?doi=10.1257/app.3.3.158>

Cooper, H., Valentine, J., Chariton, K., & Melson, A. (2003, Spring). Effects of Modified School Calendars on Student Achievement and on School and Community Attitudes. *Review of Educational Research*, 73(1), 1-52.

Del Razo, J.L., M. Saunders, M. Renée, R.M. López, and Ullucci, K.. (2014). *Leveraging Time for Equity: Indicators to Measure More and Better Learning Time*. Providence, RI: Annenberg Institute for School Reform, Brown University.

⁶⁵ Jaime L. Del Razo and Michelle Renée (2013). Expanding Equity through More and Better Learning Time. *Voices in Urban Education*, 36 (Winter/Spring), pp. 27-34. Providence, RI: Annenberg Institute for School Reform.

g. Require partnerships with multiple community-based organizations (CBOs) that have a demonstrated track record of successfully providing the wrap-around services that the school is implementing. CBOs that are not located within the community and that do not have a history of serving the school's surrounding community (e.g., national school reform organizations or technical assistance providers that are external to the community) are not eligible.

h. Assemble a district stakeholder decision-making council composed of multiple school leaders, a cross-section of teachers, students, a demographically representative number of parents, mental health staff, a district representative, and community-based leaders. Authorize the council to review and select the school-wide wraparound services described above.

i. Engage the district stakeholder council in deliberating about the schools' instructional priorities and in reviewing and selecting research-based, school-wide professional development resources for teaching and learning. In order to ensure that schools targeted for this reform develop a well-rounded instructional focus, require that these resources focus on more than test-based instructional priorities. Do not allow funding for full-service community schools reforms to be used for untested consultants, coaches, "turnaround specialists," or other intermediary organizations that do not have a demonstrated track record of success in providing support to demographically similar schools in non-test based instructional areas. Require that these new instructional priorities be specific to each school's faculty needs. That is, design professional learning opportunities that differentiate among novice teachers, experienced teachers, teachers of English Language Learners or special needs students, etc.

j. Develop an evaluation and monitoring system in which the school reports the goals, progress, and outcomes of its integrated services each year to the Chicago Public Schools Board of Education. Require that the school stakeholder council collaborate with the district to revise its goals for integrated services each year, based on the annual monitoring data.

Conclusion

In my opinion, CPS should have departed from ineffective school turnaround reforms and instead should have used more viable and effective research-based reforms: expanding the district's turnaround framework to include multiple measures of effectiveness over time, implementing a district-wide desegregation plan, reducing class size, investing in early childhood education, and implementing full-service community schools. In doing so, the Board of Education could have eliminated its discriminatory pattern and practice of carrying out reforms that lack empirical evidence behind their design and instead implemented reforms that are grounded in solid, robust scientific knowledge about viable strategies that are proven to yield positive, long-term academic and life outcomes for students in its historically underperforming schools.

Signature

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tina M. Trujillo', written in a cursive style.

March 28, 2018

Tina M. Trujillo

Appendix

Curriculum Vitae for Tina M. Trujillo

TINA MARIE TRUJILLO

3649 Tolman Hall
University of California
Graduate School of Education
Berkeley, CA 94720
trujillo@berkeley.edu

1612 Rose Street
Berkeley, CA 94703
510.517.0874 (cell)

EDUCATION

- 2008 **Ph.D. in Education.** University of California, Los Angeles, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies. Urban Schooling.
- 2000 **M.A. in Education.** University of Colorado at Boulder, School of Education. Educational Foundations, Policy, and Practice.
- 1997 **Professional CLEAR Teaching Credential,** California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- 1997 **Multiple Subject Teaching Credential,** Emphasis in Cross-cultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD), California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- 1996 **B.A. in Political Science.** University of Colorado at Boulder.

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

Educational policy	Research design
Urban school and district reform	Mixed methods
Educational leadership	Politics of education

AWARDS AND SPECIAL RECOGNITION

- 2015 Guest Professor, University of Oslo, Norway
- 2015 Visiting Minority Scholar, University of Wisconsin, Madison

- 2014 American Educational Research Association's Division L
National Policy Report Award
- 2007 Chancellor's Dissertation Year Fellowship
- 2006 Hoyt Fellowship
- 2005 Graduate Research Mentorship Program Fellowship
- 2005 Graduate Division Fellowship
- 2004 Marion Wells Fellowship
- 2003 Graduate Division Fellowship

GRANTS

- 2016 Co-Principal Investigator (with Dr. Jorunn Møller). The Peder Sather Center for Advanced Study. Assessing The Impact Of Leadership Preparation In Two Distinct Testing And Accountability Policy Contexts, \$20,000.
- 2013 Co-researcher (with Drs. John Powell and Na'ilah Nasir). The California Endowment. *A Study of Oakland Unified School District's Structural Racialization and Targeted Universalism*, \$125,000.
- 2013 Principal Investigator. UC Berkeley's Committee on Research, Research Assistantship in the Humanities Grant. *Teach For America and the Racial Politics of Redefining Educational Inequality*, \$4,000.
- 2012 Principal Investigator. UC Berkeley's Committee on Research, Research Assistantship in the Humanities Grant. *The Role of District Policy and Principal Leadership in Promoting Rigorous, Equitable Instruction*, \$4,000.
- 2012 UC Berkeley's Committee on Research, Research Enabling Grant, \$1,400.
- 2011 Co-Principal Investigator (with Dr. Janelle Scott). Hellman Family Faculty Fund Award. *An Exploratory Study of Teach For America and Civic Engagement*, \$48,366.
- 2010 Principal Investigator. UC Berkeley's Committee on Research, Faculty Research Grant. *Teach For America and Civic Engagement: A Study of Aspiring, Current, and Alumni Corps Members*, \$9,000.
- 2010 Principal Investigator. Dirk and Charlene Kabcenell Foundation, Subcontract from Partners in School Innovation. *An External Evaluation of Partners in School Innovation*, \$77,468.
- 2009 Principal Investigator. UC Berkeley's Committee on Research, Faculty Research Grant. *Leadership and Management in Urban Schools: An Exploration of the Relationship between Performance Management, Student Learning, and Teacher Practice*, \$7,000.
- 2008 UC Berkeley's Committee on Research, Research Enabling Grant, \$1,000.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- 2015-present Associate Professor, Policy, Organization, Measurement, and Evaluation, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley
- 2015-present Faculty Director, Principal Leadership Institute, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley
- 2015-present Adjunct Associate Professor, Department of Teacher Education and School Research, Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Oslo, Norway
- 2008-2015 Assistant Professor, Policy, Organization, Measurement, and Evaluation, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley
- 2011-present Faculty Affiliate, Center for Latino Policy Research, University of California, Berkeley
- 2011-present Research Affiliate, Los Angeles Education Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA
- 2006 Co-Editor, *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, Los Angeles, CA
- 2004-2006 Project Manager, The Study of California Middle School Improvement, University of California, Los Angeles
- 2003-2006 Graduate Student Researcher, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST), University of California, Los Angeles
- 2001-2003 School Partnership Director, Partners in School Innovation, San Francisco, CA
- 2001-2003 Evaluation Manager, Partners in School Innovation, San Francisco, CA
- 2000-2001 Evaluator, Rockman *Et Al*, San Francisco, CA
- 1996-1999 Teacher, Laurel Street Elementary School, Compton, CA

PUBLICATIONS

Peer-reviewed Journal Articles

Trujillo, T., Scott, J., & Rivera, M. (in press). Follow the yellow brick road: Teach For America and the making of educational leaders. *American Journal of Education*.

Trujillo, T. (2016). Restoring the federal commitment to equal educational opportunity: New Directions for ESSA's school improvement Initiatives. *Education Law and Policy Review* 3, 141-165.

Trujillo, T., Scott, J., & Rivera, M. (2016). Reframing Teach For America: A conceptual framework for the next generation of scholarship. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(12).

Trujillo, T., & Renée, M. (2015). Irrational exuberance for market-based reform: How federal turnaround policies thwart democratic schooling. *Teachers College Record*, 117(6).

Trujillo, T., Hernandez, L., 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.

Trujillo, T., & Woulfin, S. (2014). Equity-oriented reform amid standards-based accountability: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis of an intermediary's instructional practices. *American Educational Research Journal, 51*(2), 253-293.

Trujillo, T. (2014). The modern cult of efficiency: Intermediary organizations and the new scientific management. *Educational Policy, 28*(2), 207-232.

Trujillo, T., & Cooper, R. (2014). Framing social justice leadership in a university-based preparation program: The University of California's Principal Leadership Institute. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 9*(2), 142-167.

Trujillo, T. (2013). The disproportionate erosion of local control: Urban school boards, high-stakes accountability, and democracy. *Educational Policy, 27*(2), 334-359.

Trujillo, T. (2013). The reincarnation of the effective schools research: Rethinking the literature on district effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Administration, 51*(4), 426-452.

Trujillo, T. (2013). The politics of district instructional policy formation: Compromising equity and rigor. *Educational Policy, 27*(3), 531-559.

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2007). The practical relevance of accountability systems for school improvement: A descriptive analysis of California schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 29*(4), 319-352.

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2005). Corrective action in low-performing schools: Lessons for NCLB implementation in first-generation accountability systems. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 13*(48). <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/153/279>.

Peer-reviewed Handbook Chapters

Nasir, N., Scott, J. Trujillo, T., & Hernandez, L. (2016). The sociopolitical context of teaching. In D. Gotimer & C. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (5th ed., pp. 349-390). Washington D.C.: AERA.

Peer-reviewed Book Chapters

Trujillo, T., Hernandez, L., & Kissell, R. (in press). Community-based urban district reform: The historical antecedents of Oakland's political landscape. In D. Gamson & E. Hodge (Eds.), *The Shifting Landscape of the American School District*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Morales, P.Z., Trujillo, T., Kissell, R. (2016). Educational Policy and Latin@ Youth. In S. Nichols (Ed.), *Educational Policies and Youth in the 21st Century: Problems, Potential, and*

Progress (pp. 3-22). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Trujillo, T. (2016). Why the Federal School Improvement Grant Program Triggers Civil Rights Complaints. In E. Frankenberg, L. Garces, M. Hopkins (Eds.), *School integration matters: Research-based strategies to advance equity* (pp. 89-104). New York: Teachers College Press.

Trujillo, T. (2016). Learning from the past to chart new directions in the study of district effectiveness. In A. Daly & K. Finnigan (Eds.), *Thinking and acting systematically: Improving school districts under pressure* (pp. 11-48). Sage Publications and the American Educational Research Association.

Renée, M. & Trujillo, T. (2014). The trouble with federal turnaround policies and their impact on low-scoring schools. In P. Gorski & K. Zenkov (Eds.), *The Big lies of school reform: Finding better solutions for the future of public education* (pp. 153-168). Routledge Press.

Trujillo, T., & Woulfin, S. (2013). Equity-minded instructional leadership: Turning up the volume for English Learners. In M. B. Katz & M. Rose (Eds.), *Public education under siege* (pp. 148-157). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Peer-reviewed Research Briefs and Policy Reports

Mathis, W.J. & Trujillo, T.M. (2016). *Lessons from NCLB for the Every Student Succeeds Act*. Legislative policy brief. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/lessons-from-NCLB>.

Trujillo, T., & Rivera, M. (2016). *Review of "Measuring School Turnaround Success"* Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/reviews/TTR%20Trujillo%20Turnaround_0.pdf.

Trujillo, T. (2015). *Review of "Dramatic Action, Dramatic Improvement: The Research on School Turnaround"* Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/thinktank/review-school-turnaround>.

Trujillo, T., & Rivera, M. (2014). *Review of "The Effect of Co-Locations on Student Achievement in NYC Public Schools"* Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. <http://nepc.colorado.edu/thinktank/review-effect-of-co-locations>.

Trujillo, T., & Renée, M. (2012). *Democratic school turnarounds: Pursuing equity and learning from evidence*. Legislative research brief. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/democratic-school-turnarounds>. *Awarded AERA Division L 2014 Policy Report Award.

Reprints

Trujillo, T. M., & Valladares, M. R. (2016). Democratic school turnarounds: Pursuing equity and learning from evidence, In W. Mathis & T. Trujillo (Eds.). *Learning from the federal market-based reforms: Lessons for the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)* (pp. 127-157). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Trujillo, T., & Renée, M. (2013). Democratic school turnarounds: Pursuing equity and learning from evidence. *Voices in Urban Education*, 36 (Winter/Spring), pp. 18-26. Providence, RI: Annenberg Institute for School Reform.

Trujillo, T., & Renée, M. (2013, March). Democratic school turnarounds: Pursuing equity and learning from evidence. *Education Digest*, 79(7), pp. 55-59.

Trujillo, T. (2011). *Review of "Charting New Territory: Tapping Charter Schools to Turn Around The Nation's Dropout Factories"* Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. <http://nepc.colorado.edu/thinktank/review-charting-new-territory>.

Trujillo, T. (2011). *School reform for students of color and English Learners: Leaving pedagogy behind*. (CLPR Policy Brief). Berkeley: University of California, Center for Latino Policy Research (CLPR). <http://www.escholarship.org/uc/item/8bq006r6>.

Non-peer Reviewed Journal Articles and Commentaries

Trujillo, T. (2016). Developing school leaders amid a new world order: Lessons for researchers and practitioners. *Acta Didactica Norge*, 10(4).

Trujillo, T., & Scott, J. (2014). Superheroes and Transformers: Rethinking Teach For America's Leadership Models. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 95(8), pp. 57-61.

Trujillo, T. (2012). The paradoxical logic of school turnarounds: A Catch-22. *Teachers College Record*, Date Published: June 14, 2012 <http://www.tcrecord.org> ID Number: 16797.

Edited Books

Mathis, W.J., & Trujillo, T.M. (Eds.) (2016). *Learning from the federal market-based reforms: Lessons for ESSA*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Journal Editorships

Trujillo, T., & Scott, J. (2016). Special issue of *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, Teach For America: Research on politics, leadership, race, and education reform, 24(12).

Trujillo, T., & Howe, K. (2015). Special Issue of *Teachers College Record*, Weighing the democratic potential of federal educational policy: Reframing the discourse on high-stakes accountability, 117(6).

Manuscripts Under Review

Woulfin, S., & Trujillo, T. A methodological tool for studying complex instructional phenomena in urban settings: Qualitative Comparative Analysis. Submitted to *Qualitative Research*.

Trujillo, T. (revise and resubmit). Urban principals under centralized district instructional policies: Instructional leadership or performativity? Submitted to *Teachers College Record*.

Manuscripts in Progress

Moses, M., Finnigan, K., Scott, J., Jackson, D., & Trujillo, T. Unjust contexts: The Black Lives Matters movement and educational reform. To be submitted to the National Education Policy Center.

Trujillo, T., Scott, J. & Rivera, M. The making of an educational policy entrepreneur: A qualitative comparative analysis of Teach For America alumni career paths. To be submitted to *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*.

Trujillo, T., Hernandez, L., & Kissell, R. *Conditions that foster participatory democratic education: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis of Oakland's community-based reform environment*. To be submitted to *American Educational Research Journal*.

Trujillo, T. The new managerialism: How the policy environment shapes urban school leadership. To be submitted to *Educational Administration Quarterly*.

Other Journal Articles, Book Reviews, Blogs, and Notes

Trujillo, T. (2012). The politics of district instructional policy formation: Compromising equity and rigor. *Policy Analysis for California Education*, Invited blog post. <http://www.edpolicyinca.org/blog/politics-district-instructional-policy-formation-compromising-equity-and-rigor>.

Trujillo, T., & Renée, M. (2012). *The research on turnarounds doesn't show what Arne Duncan thinks it shows*. Response to Federal Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/democratic-school-turnarounds>.

Calderone, S., Collins, C., Meeker, S., & Trujillo, T. (2007). Editors' note. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*. Vol. 3, Issue 1, Article 1. <http://repositories.cdlib.org/gseis/interactions/vol3/iss1/art1>.

Trujillo, T. (2004). Review: *Making schools work: A revolutionary plan to get your children the education they need* by William G. Ouchi. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*. Vol. 1, Issue 1, Article 7. <http://repositories.cdlib.org/gseis/interactions/vol1/iss1/art7>.

Technical Reports

Trujillo, T., Woulfin, S., & Jarrell, T. (2010). *An external evaluation of Partners in School Innovation: A final report of the findings*. San Francisco. (Submitted to Partners in School Innovation).

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2007). *The practical relevance of accountability systems for school improvement: A descriptive analysis of California schools* (CSE Tech. Report No. 713) Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST).

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2007). *School improvement under test-driven accountability: A comparison of high and low-performing middle schools in California* (CSE Tech. Report No. 717) Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST).

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2005). *Corrective action in low-performing schools: Lessons for NCLB implementation from state and district strategies in first-generation accountability systems- Updated Version* (CSE Tech. Rep. No. 657) Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST).

Mintrop, H. & Trujillo, T. (2004). *Corrective action in low-performing schools: Lessons for NCLB implementation from state and district strategies in first-generation accountability systems* (CSE Tech. Rep. No. 641) Los Angeles: University of California, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST).

Invited Expert Presentations, Paper Panelists, Chairs, and Discussants

Trujillo, T. (2016). District policies that advance civil rights: Moving beyond school turnarounds, closures, and charter conversions. *We Choose ALL: Building a System of Excellent Public Education Invitation-only Symposium*. Los Angeles, CA.

Trujillo, T. (2016). Invited speaker, *The making of an educational policy entrepreneur: The roles of race, class, and ideology in Teach For America*, University of Oslo, Norway.

Trujillo, T. (2016). Invited speaker, *The modern cult of efficiency: Intermediary organizations and the new scientific management*, University of Oslo, Norway.

Trujillo, T. (2016). Invited speaker, *The modern cult of efficiency: Intermediary organizations and the new scientific management*. University of Agder, Norway.

Trujillo, T. (2016). Invited speaker, *Designing robust, practically relevant research on upper secondary schools: Challenges and opportunities*. Norwegian Superintendents' Workshop. BI Norwegian Business School, UC Berkeley, Stanford, California Department of Education.

Trujillo, T. (2016). Invited panelist, *Neoliberal governance and privatization: Intersectionality with class, gender, disability, LGBTQ, and race*. Conference on The Politics of Privatization in Education, New York University.

Trujillo, T. (2016). Discussant, *Educational policy and the cultural politics of race*. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington D.C.

Trujillo, T. (2016). Invited panelist, *Presidential session: Public scholarship and community organizing for sustainable community schools*. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington D.C.

Trujillo, T. (2016). Invited panelist, *Presidential session: Researchers meet community organizers: Can public scholarship contribute to struggles for immigration rights, community schools, and public institutions in Neoliberal times?*, Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington D.C.

Trujillo, T. (2016). Invited speaker, *The modern cult of efficiency: Intermediary organizations and the new scientific management*. Dean's Distinguished Lecture Series. University of Oregon, College of Education.

Trujillo, T. (2016). Invited speaker, *The modern cult of efficiency: Intermediary organizations and the new scientific management*. Educational Policy and Politics Speaker Series. Michigan State University, Department of Teacher Education.

Trujillo, T. (2015). Invited speaker, *Using research driven classroom observation instruments to assess educational quality*. Transforming Teaching and Learning Research into Leadership Practice: Seminar for Norwegian School Principals. BI Norwegian Business School, UC Berkeley Principal Leadership Institute.

Trujillo, T. (2015). Invited speaker, *Using research driven classroom observation instruments to assess educational quality*. Transforming Teaching and Learning Research into Leadership Practice: Seminar for Norwegian School Principals. BI Norwegian Business School, UC Berkeley Principal Leadership Institute.

Trujillo, T. (2015). Invited speaker, *Performance-based management trends*. Public Sector in Transformation: Seminar for Norwegian Kindergarten Principals. University of Agder, UC Berkeley Department of Sociology's Program for Comparative Studies of Societies, Berkeley.

Trujillo, T. (2015). Invited speaker, *Mixed methods research studies: Methodological, Epistemological, and Political Considerations*. Soka University of America, Aliso Viejo, CA.

Trujillo, T. (2015). Invited speaker, *American Democracy and Public Education*. Al Shanker Institute and the American Federation of Teachers. Georgetown University. Washington, D.C.

Trujillo, T. (2015). Invited panelist, *Choosing a research focus and publishing*. William L. Boyd National Education Politics Graduate Student Mentorship Workshop. Chicago.

Trujillo, T. (2015). Invited panelist, *Developing a research agenda: From dissertation to tenure*. David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration and Policy. Chicago.

Trujillo, T. (2015). Invited speaker, *The marketization and privatization of the teacher workforce*. The Forum on the Future of Public Education. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Trujillo, T. (2015). Invited speaker, *Performance-based management trends in American education*. Tools of Governance: Seminar for Norwegian Public Sector Administrators. UC Berkeley Department of Sociology's Program for Comparative Studies of Societies, Berkeley.

Trujillo, T. (2015). Invited speaker, *Equity-minded public school reform: How mandated private service providers impact teaching, learning, and democratic education*. Wisconsin Center for Education Research. University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Trujillo, T. (2015). Invited expert, *Innovative methodologies for studying urban education: Qualitative Comparative Analysis*. University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Trujillo, T. (2014). Invited expert, *The benefits of combining Qualitative Comparative Analysis and case studies: Using set-theoretic multi-method research in educational settings*. 2nd International QCA Expert Workshop. University of Zurich. Zurich.

Trujillo, T. (2014). Invited panelist, *Should Qualitative Comparative Analysis set aside its algorithms?* 2nd International QCA Expert Workshop. University of Zurich. Zurich.

Trujillo, T. (2014). Invited speaker, *Using Qualitative Comparative Analysis to study equity-oriented reform*. Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College Series in Interdisciplinary Intellectual Cultures. Arizona State University, Tempe.

Trujillo, T. (2014). Invited speaker, *Using classroom observation protocols*. Transforming Teaching and Learning Research into Leadership Practice: Seminar for Norwegian School Principals. BI Norwegian Business School and UC Berkeley Principal Leadership Institute Leadership Exchange.

Trujillo, T. (2014). Invited speaker, *The making of an educational policy entrepreneur: The roles of race, class, and ideology in Teach For America*. Race, Diversity, and Educational Policy Cluster Speaker Series. UC Berkeley Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society, Berkeley.

Trujillo, T. (2014). Invited panelist, *Research and activism*. First Annual Conference of the Network for Public Education, Austin.

Trujillo, T. (2013). Chair, *Reflections on the portfolio model as an urban district reform: The Philadelphia case*. Invited Session at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Philadelphia.

Trujillo, T. (2013). Discussant, *Turnaround: As good as advertised?* Symposium at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Nasir, N., Scott, J. & Trujillo, T. (2013). Invited speaker, *Symposium for the handbook of research on teaching*. Chapter presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Trujillo, T. (2012). Invited panelist, *Democratic school turnarounds: Pursuing equity and learning from evidence*. Sixth Annual NEPC Fellows Research Panel. National Education Policy Center, Boulder.

Trujillo, T. (2012). Invited panelist, *Between institutions and systems: Using public policy to (re)form and (trans)form our society*, Second Annual Race & Policy Symposium. Students of Color in Public Policy (SCiPP) at The Goldman School of Public Policy, Berkeley.

Trujillo, T. (2012). Invited speaker, *Performance-based management trends in American urban education*. Improving Schools: A Seminar for Norwegian School Superintendents. UC Berkeley Department of Sociology's Program for Comparative Studies of Societies, Berkeley.

Trujillo, T. (2011). Invited speaker, *The reincarnation of the effective schools research: Rethinking the literature on district effectiveness*. Paper presented at the AERA-sponsored Research Conference, Thinking Systemically: Improving Districts Under Pressure, Rochester.

Trujillo, T. (2011). Panel moderator, UC Berkeley's Center for Latino Policy Research (CLPR) Panel Discussion: *Translating research into policy: Improving educational and social opportunities for Latinos*, Berkeley.

Trujillo, T. (2011). Invited panelist, *Mothering in academia: Constructing a dual identity as a scholar and a mother*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Trujillo, T. (2010). Invited speaker, *School reform for students of color and English Learners: Leaving pedagogy behind*. UC Berkeley's Center for Latino Policy Research (CLPR) Speaker Series, Latino Policy Research: Challenges and Insights, Berkeley.

Trujillo, T. (2010). Invited speaker, *Principal responses to centralized instructional policies: Instructional leadership or performativity?* Improving Schools: A Seminar for Norwegian School Superintendents. UC Berkeley Department of Sociology's Program for Comparative Studies of Societies, Berkeley.

Trujillo, T. (2010). Invited speaker, *Beyond prescriptions: Renewing the promise of public education*. UC Berkeley Graduate School of Education's Homecoming Seminar, Berkeley.

Trujillo, T. (2009). Discussant, *The ebb and flow of network ties between district leaders: A case of structural inertia*. Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE) Policy Research Panel, Stanford.

Selected Conference Papers and Presentations

Trujillo, T., Hernandez, L., & Kissell, R. (2015). *Community-based urban district reform: The historical antecedents of Oakland's political landscape*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Trujillo, T. (2014). *The new managerialism: How the policy environment shapes urban school leadership*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Washington D.C.

Trujillo, T., & Hernandez, L. (2014). *Community schools as urban district reform: Analyzing Oakland's political landscape through oral histories*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Washington D.C.

Trujillo, T. (2014). *How Obama's education policies trigger civil rights complaints: The disproportionate effects of school closures, turnarounds, and charter conversions*. Pennsylvania State University Conference on Education and Civil Rights, State College.

Trujillo, T. (2014). *Looking inside the black box: Comparing analytic tools for studying instruction in urban contexts*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Philadelphia.

Trujillo, T. (2013). *The disproportionate erosion of local control: Urban school boards, high-stakes accountability, and democracy*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Trujillo, T. (2013). *Theorizing social justice leadership in a university-based preparation program: The University of California's Principal Leadership Institute*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Trujillo, T., Scott, J., & Rivera, M. (2013). *Follow the yellow brick road: Teach For America and the making of entrepreneurial leaders*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Trujillo, T. (2013). *Today's cult of efficiency: Intermediary organizations, high-stakes accountability, and scientific management*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Trujillo, T. (2012). *The disproportionate erosion of local control: Urban school boards, high-stakes accountability, and democracy*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Denver.

Trujillo, T. (2012). *Theorizing social justice leadership in a university-based preparation program: The University of California's Principal Leadership Institute*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Denver.

Trujillo, T. (2012). *The reincarnation of the effective schools research: Rethinking the literature on district effectiveness*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Vancouver.

Trujillo, T. (2011). Teach For America and educational leadership: A framework for understanding TFA career aspirations, alumni networks, and political activities. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh.

Trujillo, T. (2011). *The reincarnation of the effective schools research: Rethinking the literature on district effectiveness*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh.

Trujillo, T., & Woulfin, S. (2011). *Reforming urban schools: Privileging content, leaving pedagogy behind*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Scott, J., & Trujillo, T. (2011). *Teach For America and civic engagement: A framework for understanding TFA career aspirations, alumni networks, and political activities*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Trujillo, T. (2009). *Principal responses to centralized instructional management: Instructional leadership or performativity?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego.

Trujillo, T. (2009). *The politics of centralized instructional management*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego.

Trujillo, T. (2009). *Blending centralized accountability with local professionalization*. Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE) Policy Research Panel, Sacramento.

Trujillo, T., & Mintrop, H. (2008). *High-stakes accountability and centralized instructional management: District control, school leadership, and instructional quality*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Orlando.

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2008). *High-stakes accountability, Teacher learning communities, and school leadership*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Orlando.

Trujillo, T. (2008). *Centralized district instructional management: Tracing policy to practice*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Trujillo, T., & Mintrop, H. (2007). *Centralized district instructional management: District control, organizational culture, and school performance*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2007). *Accountability urgency, organizational learning, and educational outcomes: A comparative analysis of California middle schools*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2006). *The practical relevance of accountability systems for school leaders: The California case*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, San Antonio.

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2006). *The practical relevance of accountability systems for school improvement: A descriptive analysis of California schools*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2006). *Learning organizations or regulated learning in standards-based accountability systems?* Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2005). *Corrective action in low-performing schools: Lessons for NCLB implementation from state and district strategies in first-generation accountability systems*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Mintrop, H., & Trujillo, T. (2005). *The promise and educational consequences of corrective action*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

MEDIA COVERAGE

Berkshire, J. (2016, February). Your fired! *Have You Heard* podcast and blog. Expert on school turnarounds interviewed for podcast episode and blog post.
<http://haveyouheardblog.com/tag/school-turnarounds/>.

Straus, V. (2016, September). School reform: What went wrong, what went right, and what we should do in the future. Guest blog for The Answer Sheet, by W. Mathis & T. Trujillo. *The Washington Post*.
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2016/09/19/school-reform-what-went-wrong-what-went-right-and-what-we-should-do-in-the-future/>

Slovic, B. (2014, September). 'Reconstitution' of East Gresham Elementary School is part of Obama administration's controversial plan for struggling classrooms. *The Oregonian*. Quoted as expert on educational policy.
http://www.oregonlive.com/gresham/index.ssf/2014/09/reconstitution_of_east_gresham.html.

Toppo, G. (2013, April 28). Leaving no school behind: Can bad ones be turned around? *USA Today*. Quoted as expert on school turnarounds and research cited.

<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/04/28/failing-schools-turnaround-education/2116171/>.

Renee, M. (2013, March 22). Prince George's takeover plan: Beyond the silver bullet. *The Washington Post: The Answer Sheet*. Research cited.
http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/therootdc/post/prince-georges-school-take-over-plan-beyond-the-silver-bullet/2013/03/21/4d4b59a4-91a3-11e2-9abd-e4c5c9dc5e90_blog.html.

Johnson, F. (2013, February 4). Tensions on school closings. National Journal Education Experts Blog. Democratic School Turnaround Report Coverage. Research cited.
<http://education.nationaljournal.com/2013/02/tension-on-school-closings.php>.

Palchikoff, K. (2013, January 9). Advocate: Turnaround schools fail to provide broad curriculum. Voice of Russia American Edition. Quoted as expert on educational policy and research cited.
http://voicerussia.com/radio_broadcast/70924886/100567753.html.

DeNisco, A. (2012, December). School turnaround policies ineffective, report states. District Administration. Quoted as expert on educational policy and research cited in print and online.
<http://www.districtadministration.com/article/school-turnaroundpolicies-ineffective-report-states>.

Kantrowitz, J. (2012, October 3). It's not just Connecticut: Problems with "education reform" come directly from Washington. Connecticut Media Group. Research cited.
<http://blog.ctnews.com/kantrowitz/2012/10/03/>.

Chen, K. (2012, October 5). Does U.S. School Reform Need to be Reformed? *PBS Newshour: The Rundown*. Research cited.
<http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2012/10/what-does-it-mean-to-be-a-turnaround-school.html>.

Murphy, K. (2012, October 4). Report: School turnarounds are based on faulty evidence. *The Oakland Tribune: The Education Report*. Research cited.
<http://www.ibabuzz.com/education/2012/10/04/report-school-turnarounds-are-based-on-faulty-evidence/>.

Strauss, V. (2012, October 3). Why Obama's school turnaround policy doesn't work. *The Washington Post: The Answer Sheet*. Research cited.
http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/post/why-obamas-school-turnaround-policy-doesnt-work/2012/10/01/3fa3d8c8-0c27-11e2-bd1a-b868e65d57eb_blog.html.

Zubrzycki, J. (2012, October 3). Turnaround Strategy Needs Turning Around, Says NEPC Report. *Education Week: District Dossier*. Research cited.
http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/District_Dossier/2012/10/turnaround_school_program_rare.html

Molnar, M. (2012, October 1). Collaboration, Investment: Best Aids for Disadvantaged Schools. *Education Week: K-12 Parents and the Public*. Research Cited.

http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/parentsandthepublic/2012/10/collaboration_investment_best_aids_for_disadvantaged_schools.html.

Murray, D. (2012, October 1). Study: Obama turnaround plans “force schools to run like corporations.” *Michigan Live*. Research cited.
http://www.mlive.com/education/index.ssf/2012/10/study_obama_turnaround_plans_f.html.

Oxford, A. (2012, August 10). Teach For America Success in SA Debated. *San Antonio Current*. Quoted as expert on urban school reform and Teach For America.
<http://blogs.sacurrent.com/index.php/staff/teach-for-america-success-in-sa-debated/>.

Tintocalis, A. (Show Host). (2012, July 23). The California Report: Student Photos of STAR Tests Delay Test Results. *National Public Radio*. Quoted as expert on testing policy.
<http://www.californiareport.org/archive/R201207230850/a>.

Watanabe, T. (2012, July 22). To boost test scores, schools clamor for a horseman's advice. *Los Angeles Times*. Quoted as expert on testing and school reform organizations.
<http://articles.latimes.com/2012/jul/22/local/la-me-parker-20120722>.

Frysh, P. (2012, February 14). NCLB waivers: Where’s the beef? CNN: Schools of Thought. Quoted as expert on educational policy.
<http://schoolsofthought.blogs.cnn.com/2012/02/14/nclb-waivers-wheres-the-beef/>

Hing, J. (2011, August 15). Cheating Atlanta Schools Received \$500k in Bonuses, What Now? *Colorlines: News for Action*. Quoted as expert on urban district policy.
http://colorlines.com/archives/2011/08/cheating_atlanta_schools_received_500k_in_bonuses_what_now.html.

Tintocalis, A. (Show Host). (2011, July 22). Morning Edition: California Brings Gay History Into The Classroom. *National Public Radio*. Quoted as expert on educational policy.
<http://www.npr.org/2011/07/22/138504488/california-brings-gay-history-into-the-classroom>.

Musiker, C. (Show Host). (2011, July 14). Gov. Signs Landmark Bill to Teach LGBT History *KQED News*. Quoted as expert on educational policy.
<http://www.kqed.org/a/kqednews/RN201107141730>.

Martin, S. (Show Host). (2011, July 6). LGBT History on Way to Becoming Required Curriculum. *KQED News*. Quoted as expert on educational policy.
<http://www.kqed.org/a/kqednews/RN201107061730/a>.

Toppo, G. (2005, April 12). States plug away with NCLB. *USA Today*. Research cited.
http://www.usatoday.com/news/education/2005-04-12-nclb_x.htm.

TEACHING

- UC Berkeley, Policy, Organizations, Measurement and Evaluation Program (Ph.D.)
Power and Politics in Urban District Reform (2011, 2012, 2013, 2015)
Introduction to Disciplined Inquiry (2012, 2013, 2014, 2015)
- UC Berkeley, Leadership for Educational Equity Program (Ed.D.)
Systemic Educational Reform 1 (2009, 2011, 2013, 2015)
Systemic Educational Reform 2 (2014)
- UC Berkeley, Principal Leadership Institute (M.A. + Tier 1 Administrative Credential)
Urban School Leadership and Management (2009, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016)
- UC Berkeley, Undergraduate Education Minor (B.A.)
Contemporary Issues in U.S. Public Education (2016)

SERVICE

National

- Reviewer, Spencer Foundation's Lyle Spencer Research Awards Program, 2016.
- Reviewer, W.T. Grant Foundation Research Grants Program, 2016.
- Expert, Rethinking Governance Structures for School Districts: Perspectives from Thought Leaders, Research Convening of the Nelle Mae Education Foundation, 2015.
- Expert, National Public Radio's Source of the Week, 2016-present.
- Expert Reviewer, Schools of Opportunity Project at the National Education Policy Center.
- Member, Board of Directors, WestEd, 2016-present.
- Secretary (elected), American Educational Research Association's Division L (Policy and Politics), 2014-2016
- Fellow, National Education Policy Center, 2013-Present
- Editorial Board Member, National Education Policy Center, 2015-Present
- Academic Advisory Board Member, Network for Public Education, 2013-Present
- Member, Editorial Board, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 2015-present
- Member, Editorial Board, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 2013-present
- Member, Editorial Board, *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 2011-present
- Member, Editorial Board, *Education and Urban Society*, 2015-present
- Mentor, David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration and Policy, 2015
- Mentor, William L. Boyd National Politics of Education Workshop, 2014, 2015
- Member-at-Large (elected), American Educational Research Association's Politics of Education Association Special Interest Group, 2012-2014

- Chair, Membership and Recruitment Committee, American Educational Research Association's Politics of Education Association Special Interest Group, 2012-2014
- Member, Nomination Committee, American Educational Research Association's Politics of Education Association Special Interest Group, 2013-2014
- Member, American Educational Research Association's Division L Mentoring and Membership Committee, 2013-2014
- Chair, American Educational Research Association's Division L, Section 3, 2013 Annual Meeting
- Chair, American Educational Research Association's Districts in Research and Reform Special Interest Group Dissertation Committee, 2013
- Member, Executive Steering Committee, American Educational Research Association's Districts in Research and Reform Special Interest Group, 2012-present
- Reviewer, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *Educational Policy*, *Sociology of Education*, *American Educational Research Journal*, *Consortium for Policy Research in Education*
- Expert Reviewer, *National Evaluation of the Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers*, funded by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) at the U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., 2007-2009
- Reviewer, American Educational Research Association's Division A (Administration, Organization, & Leadership), Division L (Policy & Politics), and Districts in Research and Reform (Special Interest Group)
- Reviewer, University Council for Educational Administration, 2011, 2012
- Reviewer, *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 2003-2008
- Member, New Scholar Editorial Board, *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 2007-2010
- Book Review Editor, *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, 2005-2006
- Student Advisory Board Member, *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, 2006-2007

University

- Member, Faculty Advisory Committee, Lawrence Hall of Science, 2016-present.
- Member, Race, Diversity, and Educational Policy Faculty Cluster, Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society, UC Berkeley, 2013-present.
- Member, Project Learning with Automated, Networked Supports (PLANS) Advisory Board, 2016-2017.
- Participant, Faculty Research Seminar: Race, Data, and Inequalities in the Social Sciences, University of California, Berkeley, 2015-2016
- Participant, University of California Faculty Engagement Institute, University of California Office of the President, 2015.

- Participant, March Madness Faculty Dinner, College of Letters & Science, Residential Programs and the Career Center, University of California, Berkeley. 2015.
- Member, Undergraduate Minor Committee, University of California, Berkeley, Graduate School of Education, 2013-2014; 2014-2015; 2015-2016
- Co-advisor, Center for Latino Policy Research Working Group, UC Berkeley, 2010-2011
- Member, Personnel Committee, University of California, Berkeley, Graduate School of Education, 2010-2011; 2011-2012
- Search committee member, Principal Leadership Institute, University of California, Berkeley, Graduate School of Education, 2010
- Member, Committee on Professional Education Programs, University of California, Berkeley, Graduate School of Education, 2008-2009; 2012-2013
- Member, Association of Academic Women, University of California, Berkeley, 2008-Present
- Member, Parent Advisory Committee, Early Childhood Education Program, University of California, Berkeley, 2009-Present

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

- American Educational Research Association
- University Council for Educational Administration
- Politics of Education Association

Materials Considered in Preparation of This Report

ANTHONY S. BRYK ET AL., ORGANIZING SCHOOLS FOR IMPROVEMENT: LESSONS FROM CHICAGO (2010).

MARISA DE LA TORRE ET AL., TURNING AROUND LOW-PERFORMING SCHOOLS IN CHICAGO: SUMMARY REPORT (2012).

Michelle Rhee, *How to Fix Our Schools: A Manifesto by Joel Klien, Michelle Rhee and Other Education Leaders*, WASH. POST (Oct. 10, 2010), <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/10/07/AR2010100705078.html>.

Melissa Lazarin, *Charting New Territory*, CTR. FOR AM. PROGRESS (June 20, 2011, 9:00 AM), <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2011/06/30/9753/charting-new-territory/>.

Tiffany D. Miller & Catherine Brown, *Dramatic Action, Dramatic Improvement*, CTR. FOR AM. PROGRESS (Mar. 31, 2015, 5:00 AM), <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education/reports/2015/03/31/110142/dramatic-action-dramatic-improvement/>.

TINA TRUJILLO, REVIEW OF CHARTING NEW TERRITORY (Nat'l Educ. Pol'y Ctr. 2011), <http://nepc.colorado.edu/thinktank/review-charting-new-territory>.

TINA TRUJILLO & MARIALENA RIVERA, REVIEW OF THE EFFECT OF CO-LOCATIONS ON STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN NYC PUBLIC SCHOOLS (Nat'l Educ. Pol'y Ctr. 2014), <http://nepc.colorado.edu/thinktank/review-effect-of-co-locations>.

Tina Trujillo & Michelle Renee, *Irrational Exuberance for Market-based Reform: How Federal Turnaround Policies Thwart Democratic Schooling*, 117 TCHR. C. REC. 1, 3 (2015).

PAULINE LIPMAN, HIGH STAKES EDUCATION: INEQUALITY, GLOBALIZATION, AND URBAN SCHOOL REFORM (Michael W. Apple ed., 1st ed. 2003).

Michael W. Apple, *Ideological Success, Educational Failure?: On the Politics of No Child Left Behind*, 58 J. OF TCHR. EDUC. 108 (2007).

David Hursh, *Assessing No Child Left Behind and the Rise of Neoliberal Education Policies*, 44 AM. EDUC. RES. J. 493 (2007).

ANDREW CALKINS ET AL., THE TURNAROUND CHALLENGE (Mass Insight Educ. & Res. Inst. 2007), https://www.massinsight.org/wpcontent/uploads/sites/2/2015/11/TheTurnaroundChallenge_ExecutiveSummary.pdf.

- JIM COLLINS, *GOOD TO GREAT: WHY SOME COMPANIES MAKE THE LEAP . . . AND OTHERS DON'T* (1st ed. 2011).
- JOSEPH MURPHY & COBY V. MEYERS, *TURNING AROUND FAILING SCHOOLS: LEADERSHIP LESSONS FROM THE ORGANIZATION SCIENCES* (Rachel Livey et al. eds., 1st ed. 2007).
- Daniel L. Duke, *Tinkering and Turnarounds: Understanding the Contemporary Campaign to Improve Low-Performing Schools*, 17 J. OF EDUC. FOR STUDENTS PLACED AT RISK 9 (2012).
- ELAINE WEISS & DON LONG, MARKET-ORIENTED EDUCATION REFORMS' RHETORIC TRUMPS REALITY: THE IMPACTS OF TEST-BASED TEACHER EVALUATIONS, SCHOOL CLOSURES, AND INCREASED CHARTER-SCHOOL ACCESS ON STUDENT OUTCOMES IN CHICAGO, NEW YORK CITY, AND WASHINGTON, D.C. (2013), <http://www.edweek.org/media/rhetorictrumpsreality-28reports.pdf>.
- MICHAEL HOLZMAN, *A ROTTING APPLE: EDUCATION REDLINING IN NEW YORK City* (2012), <http://www.otlcampaign.org/sites/default/files/resources/redlining-full-report.pdf>.
- Betty Malen et al., *Reconstituting Schools: "Testing" the "Theory of Action,"* 24 EDUC. EVALUATION & POL'Y ANALYSIS 113 (2002).
- Madlene P. Hamilton et al., *A Nostrum of School Reform? Turning Around Reconstituted Urban Texas High Schools*, 49 URBAN EDUC. 182, 182-215 (2014).
- Muriel Berkeley, *A Practitioner's View on the Policy of Turning Schools Around*, 17 J. OF EDUC. FOR STUDENTS PLACED AT RISK 34 (2012).
- KRISTEN L. BURAS, CHARTER SCHOOLS, RACE, AND URBAN SPACE: WHERE THE MARKET MEETS GRASSROOTS RESISTANCE 125 (2014).
- Anna J. Egalite et al., *Representation in the Classroom: The Effect of Own-Race/Ethnicity Teacher Assignment on Student Achievement*, 45 ECON. OF EDUC. REV. 44 (2015).
- Robert W. Fairlie et al., *A Community College Instructor Like Me: Race and Ethnicity Interactions in the Classroom*, 104 AMER. ECON. REV. 2567 (2014).
- THOMAS S. DEE, THE RACE CONNECTION: ARE TEACHERS MORE EFFECTIVE WITH STUDENTS WHO SHARE THEIR ETHNICITY? (2004), https://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/ednext20042_52.pdf.
- Alice Quiocho & Francisco Rios, *The Power of Their Presence: Minority Group Teachers and Schooling*, 70 REV. OF EDUC. RES. 485, 487 (2000).
- Ana Maria Villegas et al., *Closing the Racial/Ethnic Gap Between Students of Color and Their Teachers: An Elusive Goal*, 45 EQUITY & EXCELLENCE IN EDUC. 283, 287 (2012).

- Betty Achinstein et al., *Retaining Teachers of Color: A Pressing Problem and a Potential Strategy for “Hard-to-Staff” Schools*, 80 REV. OF EDUC. RES. 71 (2010).
- Erica Frankenberg, *The Segregation of American Teachers*, 17 EDUC. POL’Y ANALYSIS ARCHIVES 1 (2009), <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ829905.pdf>.
- Michael Hansen & Kilchan Choi, *Chronically Low-Performing Schools and Turnaround: Evidence from Three States* (Nat’l Ctr. For Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Educ. Res., Working Paper No. 60, 2012).
- METTE HUBERMAN ET AL., TURNAROUND SCHOOLS IN CALIFORNIA: WHO ARE THEY AND WHAT STRATEGIES DO THEY USE? (Amer. Inst. for Res. 2011).
- Michael Hansen, *Key Issues in Empirically Identifying Chronically Low-Performing and Turnaround Schools*, 17 J. OF EDUC. FOR STUDENTS PLACED AT RISK 55, 55-69 (2012).
- C. Meyers et al., *A Statistical Approach to Identifying Schools Demonstrating Substantial Improvement in Student Learning*, 17 J. OF EDUC. FOR STUDENTS PLACED AT RISK 70, 70-91 (2012).
- Alex J. Bowers, *Toward Addressing the Issues of Site Selection in District Effectiveness Research: A Two-Level Hierarchical Linear Growth Model*, 46 EDUC. ADMIN. Q. 395, 400 (2010).
- NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, INCENTIVES AND TEST-BASED ACCOUNTABILITY IN Education (M. Hout & S.W. Elliott eds. 2011), <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/12521/incentives-and-test-based-accountability-in-education>.
- EVA GOLD ET AL., PHILADELPHIA’S RENAISSANCE SCHOOLS: A REPORT ON START UP AND EARLY IMPLEMENTATION (Res. For Action 2011).
- EVA GOLD ET AL., PHILADELPHIA’S RENAISSANCE SCHOOLS INITIATIVE: 18 MONTH INTERIM Report (Res. For Action 2012).
- Thomas Dee, *School Turnarounds: Evidence from the 2009 Stimulus* (Nat’l Bureau of Econ. Res., Working Paper No. 17990, 2012), <http://www.nber.org/papers/w17990>.
- THOMAS J. KANE & DOUGLAS O. STAIGER, VOLATILITY IN SCHOOL TEST SCORES: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEST-BASED ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS (Brookings Inst. 2002).
- DESIGNS FOR CHANGE, CHICAGO’S DEMOCRATICALLY-LED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS FAR OUT PERFORM CHICAGO’S “TURNAROUND SCHOOLS” (2012).
- Andy Smarick, *The Turnaround Fallacy*, 10 EDUC. NEXT 1 (2010).

- STUART LUPPESCU, TRENDS IN CHICAGO'S SCHOOLS ACROSS THREE ERAS OF REFORM: SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS (Consortium on Chicago Sch. Res. 2011).
- LISA DRAGOSET ET AL., SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS: IMPLEMENTATION AND Effectiveness (U.S. Dept. of Educ. 2017).
- WILLIAM J. MATHIS, NCLB'S ULTIMATE RESTRUCTURING ALTERNATIVES: DO THEY IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION? (Educ. Pol'y Res. Unit 2009), <http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/Mathis-SANCTIONS.pdf>.
- G. A. Hess, *Reconstitution—Three Years Later: Monitoring the Effect of Sanctions on Chicago High Schools*, 35 EDUC. & URB. SOC'Y 300, 300-27 (2003).
- James Coleman, *The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity*, in TRANSFORMING URBAN EDUCATION (Joseph Krestovics & Edward J. Nussel eds., 1994).
- CHRISTOPHER JENCKS ET AL., INEQUALITY: A REASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTS OF FAMILY AND SCHOOLING IN AMERICA (1972).
- IRA KATZNELSON & MARGARET WEIR, SCHOOLING FOR ALL: CLASS, RACE, AND THE DECLINE OF THE DEMOCRATIC IDEAL (1985).
- Gloria Ladson-Billings, *From the Achievement Gap to the Education Debt: Understanding Achievement in U.S. Schools*, 35 EDUC. RES. 3 (2006).
- Richard Rothstein, *The Racial Achievement Gap, Segregated Schools, and Segregated Neighborhoods: A Constitutional Insult*, 6 RACE AND SOC. PROBLEMS 21 (2015).
- JEAN ANYON, GHETTO SCHOOLING: A POLITICAL ECONOMY OF URBAN EDUCATIONAL REFORM (1997).
- KEVIN G. WELNER & WILLIAM J. MATHIS, REAUTHORIZATION OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT: TIME TO MOVE BEYOND TEST-FOCUSED POLICIES (Nat'l Educ. Pol'y Ctr. 2015), <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/esea>.
- JEANNIE OAKES, KEEPING TRACK: HOW SCHOOLS STRUCTURE INEQUALITY (2nd ed. 2005).
- J. Oakes et al., *Curriculum Differentiation: Opportunities, Outcomes, and Meanings*, in HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH ON CURRICULUM 570-608 (1992).
- Robert Slavin, *Ability Grouping in the Middle Grades: Achievement Effects and Alternatives*, 93 ELEMENTARY SCH. J. 535, 535-52 (1993).
- KEVIN G. WEINER, LEGAL RIGHTS, LOCAL WRONGS: WHEN COMMUNITY CONTROL COLLIDES WITH EDUCATIONAL EQUITY (2001).

J. Oakes et al., *Norms and Politics of Equity-Minded Change: Researching the Zone of Mediation*, in THE INT'L HANDBOOK OF EDUC. CHANGE 952-75 (M. Fullan ed., 1998).

David B. Berliner, *Addressing Poverty: Our Impoverished View of Educational Reform*, in LEARNING FROM THE FEDERAL MARKET-BASED REFORMS: LESSONS FOR THE EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT (W. Mathis & T. Trujillo eds., 2016).

HEATHER SCHWARTZ, HOUSING POLICY IS SCHOOL POLICY: ECONOMICALLY INTEGRATIVE HOUSING PROMOTES ACADEMIC SUCCESS IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND (Century Found. R. 2010), <https://tcf.org/assets/downloads/tcf-Schwartz.pdf>.

Richard Rothstein, *The Racial Achievement Gap, Segregated Schools and Segregated Neighborhoods: A Constitutional Insult*, in LEARNING FROM THE FEDERAL MARKET-BASED REFORMS: LESSONS FROM THE EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT (W. Mathis & T. Trujillo eds., 2016).

AMY STUART WELLS, DIVERSE HOUSING, DIVERSE SCHOOLING: HOW POLICY CAN STABILIZE RACIAL DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGE IN CITIES AND SUBURBS (Nat'l Educ. Pol'y Ctr. 2015), <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/housing-school-nexus>.

ANTHONY S. BRYK ET AL., CHARTING CHICAGO SCHOOL REFORM: DEMOCRATIC LOCALISM AS A LEVEL FOR CHANGE (1998).

DAVID L. KIRP, IMPROBABLE SCHOLARS: THE REBIRTH OF A GREAT AMERICAN SCHOOL SYSTEM AND A STRATEGY FOR AMERICA'S SCHOOLS (2013).

JULIA DANIEL ET AL., TIME FOR IMPROVEMENT: RESEARCH-BASED EXPECTATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS INITIATIVE IN NEW YORK CITY (Nat'l Educ. Pol'y Ctr. 2016).

JULIA DANIEL & JON SNYDER, COMMUNITY SCHOOLS AS AN EFFECTIVE STRATEGY FOR Reform (Nat'l Educ. Pol'y Ctr. 2016), <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/community-schools-as-an-effective-strategy-for-reform>.

Dan D. Goldhaber et al., *A Three-Way Error Components Analysis of Educational Productivity*, 7 EDUC. ECON. 199, 199-208 (1999).

MARTIN J. BLANK, MAKING THE DIFFERENCE: RESEARCH AND PRACTICE IN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS (Coalition for Comm. Sch. 2003), <http://www.communityschools.org/assets/1/Page/CCSFullReport.pdf>.

Linda Valli et al., *School-Community Partnerships: A Typology for Guiding Systemic Educational Reform*, in LEARNING FROM THE FEDERAL MARKET-BASED REFORMS: LESSONS FOR THE EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT 583-602 (W. Mathis & T. Trujillo eds., 2016).

- RITA AXELROTH, THE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS APPROACH: RAISING GRADUATION AND COLLEGE GOING RATES (Coalition for Comm. Sch. 2009).
- LAFRANCE ASSOCIATES, COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION OF THE FULL-SERVICE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS MODEL IN WASHINGTON: SHOWALTER MIDDLE SCHOOL (Milton S. Eisenhower Found. 2005).
- OMG CENTER FOR COLLABORATIVE LEARNING, HARTFORD COMMUNITY SCHOOLS EVALUATION (2011),
[http://www.communityschools.org/assets/1/AssetManager/HCS%20Final%20Report%20\(2-6-12\).pdf](http://www.communityschools.org/assets/1/AssetManager/HCS%20Final%20Report%20(2-6-12).pdf).
- M. Heers et al., *Community Schools Unfolded: A Review of the Literature* (Tier Working Paper Series, Working Paper No. 11/14, 2011), <http://www.tierweb.nl/index.php?id=425>.
- ICF INTERNATIONAL, COMMUNITIES IN SCHOOLS NATIONAL EVALUATION: FIVE YEAR EXECUTIVE Summary (2010),
https://www.communitiesinschools.org/media/uploads/attachments/Communities_In_Schools_National_Evaluation_Five_Year_Executive_Summary.pdf.
- M. T. McCord et al., *School-Based Clinic Use and School Performance*, 14 J. OF ADOLESCENT HEALTH 91, 91-98 (1993).
- Steven B. Sheldon, *Linking School-Family-Community Partnerships in Urban Elementary Schools to Student Achievement on State Tests*, 35 URBAN REV. 149, 149-65 (2003).
- Tina Trujillo, *Restoring the Federal Commitment to Equal Educational Opportunity: New Directions for ESSA's School Improvement Initiatives*, 3 EDUC. L. & POL'Y REV. 141, 141-65 (2016).
- S.B. 403, Leg., Reg. Sess. (Cal. 2015), http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/15-16/bill/sen/sb_0401_0450/sb_403_bill_20150407_amended_sen_v98.html.
- Jaime L. Del Razo & Michelle Renee, *Expanding Equity through More and Better Learning Time*, 36 VOICES IN URBAN EDUC. 27, 27-34 (2013).
- Will Dobbie & Roland G. Fryer, Jr., *Are High-Quality Schools Enough to Increase Achievement Among the Poor? Evidence from the Harlem Children's Zone*, 3 AMER. ECON. J.: APPLIED ECON. 158, 158-87 (2011).
- Harris Cooper et al., *Effects of Modified School Calendars on Student Achievement and on School and Community Attitudes*, 73 REV. OF EDUC. RES. 1, 1-52 (2003).
- JAMIE L. DEL RAZO ET AL., LEVERAGING TIME FOR EQUITY: INDICATORS TO MEASURE MORE AND BETTER LEARNING TIME (Annenberg Inst. for Sch. Reform 2014).

- Diane Schanzrenbach, *Does Class Size Matter?*, in *LEARNING FROM THE FEDERAL MARKET BASED REFORMS: LESSONS FOR THE EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT 565-82* (W. Mathis & T. Trujillo eds., 2016).
- Chetty R. Friedman et al., *How Does Your Kindergarten Classroom Affect Your Earnings? Evidence From Project STAR*, 126 Q. J. OF ECON. 1593, 1593-1660 (2011).
- Jeremy Finn et al., *Small Classes in the Early Grades, Academic Achievement, and Graduating from High School*, 97 J. OF EDUC. PSYCHOL. 214, 214-23 (2005).
- Peter Fredriksson et al., *Long-Term Effects of Class Size*, 128 Q. J. OF ECON. 249, 249-85 (2013).
- E. WORD ET AL., *TENNESSEE'S K-3 CLASS SIZE STUDY: FINAL SUMMARY REPORT 1985-1990* (Tenn. St. Dept. of Educ. 1990).
- Alex Molnar et al., *Evaluating the SAGE Program: A Pilot Program in Targeted Pupil-Teacher Reduction in Wisconsin*, 21 EDUC. EVALUATION & POL'Y ANALYSIS 165, 165-77 (1999).
- Steven Barnett, *Expanding Access to Quality Pre-K is Sound Public Policy*, in *LEARNING FROM THE FEDERAL MARKET-BASED REFORMS: LESSONS FOR THE EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT 525-46* (W. Mathis & T. Trujillo eds., 2016).
- Andy Porter, *Rethinking the Achievement Gap*, PENN GSE NEWSROOM, <https://www.gse.upenn.edu/news/rethinking-achievement-gap>.
- KATHY SYLVA ET AL., *THE EFFECTIVE PRESCHOOL, PRIMARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROJECT (EPPSE 3-16+) STUDENTS' EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AT AGE 16* (2014).
- H. YOSHIKAWA ET AL., *INVESTING IN OUR FUTURE: THE EVIDENCE BASE ON Preschool* (Found. For Child Dev. 2013), <https://www.fcd-us.org/the-evidence-base-on-preschool/>.
- M. Burchinal et al., *Examining the Black-White Achievement Gap Among Low-Income Children Using the NICHD Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development*, 82 CHILD DEV. 1404, 1404-20 (2011).
- TAMARA HALLE ET AL., *DISPARITIES IN EARLY LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT: LESSONS FROM THE EARLY CHILDHOOD LOGITUDINAL STUDY-BIRTH COHORT (ECLS-B)* (Council of Chief St. Sch. Officers 2009).
- Erica Frankenberg, Liliana Garces, and Megan Hopkins (2016). *School Integration Matters: Research-based Strategies to Advance Equity*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Gary Orfied. (2016). *A New Civil Rights Agenda for American Education*. In W. Mathis & T. Trujillo (Eds.), *Learning from the Federal Market-Based Reforms: Lessons for the Every Student Succeeds Act* (pp. 279-314). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Lisa Chavez and Erica Frankenberg (2009). *Integration Defended: Berkeley Unified's Strategy to Maintain School Diversity*. The UCLA Civil Rights Project.

Bruce Baker. (2016). Racially Disparate Impact of Chicago School Turnarounds on Black and Hispanic Teachers. FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 26(a)(2)(B) Report.

Chicago Teachers Union v. Chicago Board of Education. (2012). First Amended Complaint. Case: 1:12-cv-10311.

Chicago Board of Education. (2013). Answer to First Amended Complaint. Case: 1:12-cv-10311.

Chicago Teachers Union v. Chicago Board of Education. (2015). Complaint. Case: 1:15-cv-08149.

Chicago Board of Education. (2015). Answer to Complaint. Case: 1:15-cv-08149.