

“Darles el lugar”: A Place for Nondominant Family Knowing in Educational Equity

Urban Education

1–28

© The Author(s) 2016

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0042085916652179

uex.sagepub.com



Filiberto Barajas-López¹ and Ann M. Ishimaru¹

Abstract

Educational researchers, leadership, and policymakers have had the privileged voices and place from which to theorize and address educational inequities. But for some exceptions, nondominant families have been relegated to participation in school-centric “parent involvement” activities. Drawing from a participatory design-based research study using standpoint and critical race theory, our findings suggest key convergences between the lived experiences and insights of nondominant parents and recent educational equity scholarship, while revealing untapped expertise, knowledge, and capacity for addressing inequity. We argue that holding a “place” for the complex understandings of nondominant families can open expansive possibilities for transforming educational systems toward racial equity.

Keywords

race, urban education, parental involvement, multicultural schools, parent participation, families, equity, educational reform

Introduction

Amid widespread educational inequity in the United States, educational scholars and policymakers have begun to attend to the ways in which schools

¹University of Washington, Seattle, USA

Corresponding Author:

Filiberto Barajas-López, College of Education, University of Washington, 115H Miller Hall, Seattle, WA 98195, USA.

Email: barajasf@uw.edu

are situated within broader, consequential contexts, which might include forces of poverty, racism, oppression, or violence (Anyon, 2014; Rothstein, 2015). The recognition of these broader influences on inequity has begun to re-open a conversation about the role of families and communities in education. In particular, this study attends to the conversations emerging from communities experiencing increasing racial, cultural, and linguistic diversity, growing poverty, and challenges of health care, housing, immigration, transportation, and other dynamics facing schools, described by some scholars as “urban characteristic” (Milner, 2012). We focus our attention on nondominant¹ families in these contexts and build from an extensive literature on parent involvement and engagement that suggests that families are critical in improving student learning and academic achievement (Epstein, 1995; Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Jeynes, 2005, 2007; Pomerantz, Moorman, & Litwack, 2007). Despite long-standing recognition and calls for strengths-based approaches to nondominant families in schools (Hong, 2011; Ippolito, 2010b, 2015; López, 2001; López, Scribner, & Mahitivanichcha, 2001), policy and practice still largely relegate such families to passive, accommodationist roles in maintaining the status quo of schools (Lareau & Horvat, 1999; Olivos, 2006; Shirley, 1997).

As many scholars have noted, conventional approaches to engaging nondominant parents in education—for example, attendance at school open houses, parent–teacher conferences, and parent–teacher association meetings—are rooted in conceptions of parents and families as deficient, sometimes lacking knowledge, skills, capital, and capacities, and at other times, as lacking more fundamentally in caring or will (Baquedano-López, Alexander, & Hernandez, 2013; Valencia & Black, 2002). Much family engagement practice focuses on how to remediate “those” parents and families to conform to dominant norms, expectations, and agendas (e.g., see critiques in Auerbach, 2007; Cooper, 2009; Valdés, 1996). Thus, the voices, insights, and contributions of nondominant families are rarely central to educational theory, policy, and practice.

In this study with African American and immigrant Latino/a and Asian families and, in some instances, educators, we suggest a different narrative about nondominant families and communities, a narrative not only of strength and resilience but also of untapped insights, understandings, and opportunities for fundamentally reshaping how schools and school systems educate children. While much of the research has moved beyond deficit-based perspectives on parents/families, familial expertise has not figured prominently in conversations about racial equity in education. In our estimation, the extant educational equity theories and practices are not grounded in the “lived theory” (hooks, 1994) of nondominant families, and have yet to become central

to broader educational reform movements. Instead, nondominant families continue to hold spaces in education as clients and beneficiaries, or as instrumental levers of power as individual consumers. We argue that the lived experiences and insights of nondominant parents and families open more expansive and complex possibilities for change regarding the dynamics of race, culture, community, learning, and, ultimately, educational equity. The opening Spanish phrase in the title “*darles el lugar*” makes reference to a mother’s desire for a place (e.g., physical and emotional) for her son as a human being in the classroom and in school. The phrase also raises a provocative question about how nondominant parents themselves might claim and be granted a respected “place” in schools and in the key theoretical deliberations about educational justice.

In this article, we first outline key literatures related to educational equity and elaborate a conceptual framework drawing on standpoint theory and critical race theories (CRTs) to provide a rationale for centering nondominant family knowledge and perspectives. We then describe briefly the participants, study design, and use of community-based design research methodologies (CBDR; Bang, Medin, Washinawatok, & Chapman, 2010) to address the research question:

Research Question 1: Within a participatory-design-based research project, how do nondominant parents narrate and make collective sense of their experiences of racial inequity in education?

We examine four interactions between nondominant parents, and sometimes educators, in a community-based design process to highlight their systemic conceptions of learning and inequity in schools. These dimensions speak to key convergences in the scholarship of educational equity and open new avenues for theorizing and addressing educational inequity. Ultimately, we argue that transformative possibilities in the field emerge when we move from individualistic, deficit-based approaches to families to tapping nondominant parent, family, and community knowledge and collective capacities in the theory, policy, and practice of learning and systems change for educational equity.

Who Can Theorize Educational Inequity?

We build on a long-standing literature focused on strength-based approaches to family engagement that call out deficit-based assumptions about nondominant parents, families, and communities in education (Auerbach, 2007; Ippolito, 2010a, 2015; López et al, 2001; Olivos, 2006; Pushor & Murphy, 2004). This work recognizes the consequential contexts of race, class, and

other power asymmetries that infuse family-school relations (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Carreón, Drake, & Barton, 2005), and examines the potential of alternative asset-based models (Bolívar & Chrispeels, 2011; Hong, 2011; Ishimaru, 2014; Lawson & Alameda-Lawson, 2012; Warren et al., 2009). These (and other) studies highlight the social, cultural, and intellectual resources that nondominant parents possess in the context of education, and argue for the need to recognize the nuanced cultural practices and collective political efforts that exist within and between families and communities. This literature offers an important critique of school-based outreach and engagement activities targeting families who have historically been positioned as “hard to reach” (Mapp & Hong, 2010).

We acknowledge this critical body of work and seek to expand the lens to theory about educational inequity to highlight a broader potential domain for family expertise. We argue that deficit-based family-school-community relations are manifestations of broader systemic inequities—like racial disproportionality in discipline and special education and disparities in achievement and graduation (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Sullivan, Artiles, & Hernandez-Saca, 2015). We posit that a more expansive focus on understanding and disrupting inequities in educational systems opens up new possibilities for considering the role of nondominant families, beyond the dichotomy of engagement and disengagement.

We thus begin with an overview of the primary theoretical explanations for disparities in educational outcomes among low-income students of color because the understandings of the problem—and the solutions implicit in them—are often invoked in ahistorical ways that risk oversimplifying how scientific knowledge gets constructed relative to dominant ideologies and sociopolitical influences. These explanations have shaped decades of research as well as educational policy and interventions to improve the success of students whose performance lags by traditional measures. Historically infused notions about with whom the problem rests and who is capable of addressing the problem are also inherent in these theories and the ways they have been taken up by policymakers and practitioners.

Given the vast research conducted in this area, a comprehensive review of all research related to educational inequity is beyond the scope of this article, but we suggest that conceptualizing two broad approaches to understanding inequity may be useful to consider the kinds of explanations—and solutions—they offer, and therefore, the place of families and communities in the problem and solution. Although the groupings we suggest here are oversimplified and may diminish points of overlap, we offer these broad categories to suggest—by way of parent/family insights—convergences

between lines of theorizing. We refer to the two primary “branches” of equity-related theories as cultural and institutional/structural explanations.

Before we outline these primary “branches,” we first situate our discussion of educational equity within the context of well-trod territory about the distinction between *equity* and *equality* (e.g., Brayboy, Castagno, & Maughan, 2007; Gutiérrez & Jaramillo, 2006). *Equality* refers to every individual receiving the same treatment, resources, or inputs, or what Gutiérrez and Jaramillo (2006) referred to as “sameness as fairness.” This often involves a “colorblind” narrative that overlooks the historical and structural impacts of racism, colonialism, and oppression. In contrast, an educational *equity* agenda, as articulated by Crossland (2004) and elaborated by Gutiérrez and Jaramillo (2006), seeks to directly address “the link between economic disparities, asymmetrical power relations, and historically racialized practices” (p. 6). An equity agenda recognizes that the playing field is not equal, and that marginalized students and communities have systematically fewer opportunities, resources, and less power to shape policies and decision making as a result of historical and ongoing oppression. However, this emerging agreement about the distinction between equity and equality belies different explanations for existing educational disparities.

Cultural Explanations of Inequity

Cultural explanations for inequity emerged, in part, to challenge long-standing and deeply entrenched biological explanations for disparities, which served to rationalize oppression and conquest over the course of centuries. After the Coleman (1966) report found that students’ educational attainment or outcomes could best be explained by students’ family background, Oscar Lewis’s (1961) notion of the “culture of poverty” came to the fore to describe the behaviors, attitudes, and traits of a monolithic deficient culture that created its own circumstance of poverty and low education, thus blaming low-income people for their own predicament. Fordham and Ogbu (1986) later theorized that Black students underperformed academically because, as involuntary minorities, Black youth associated high academic success with “acting white” and embraced an oppositional culture that rejected academic success. Used to make distinctions about which groups succeed and which do not, their theory essentialized racial group experiences and left little agency—beyond acceptance of dominant norms or self-defeating resistance—for challenging oppression (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001). Despite empirical research that moved “beyond black and white” categories of self-defeating behaviors (P. L. Carter, 2005; Nasir, 2011), the oppositional culture discourse persists in popular media and discourses (Warikoo & Carter, 2009).

More recent research-based cultural explanations have moved away from “blaming the victim” toward explanations that highlight how U.S. schools devalue nondominant cultures. For example, Valenzuela (1999) examined the ways in which schools “subtract” the social and cultural resources that Latino/a students bring with them to school and position Mexican students and those with marginal standing in school as deficient. Likewise, Delpit (1988) highlighted the “culture of power” in schools that privileges Western cultural norms, behaviors, and ways of knowing and being in ways that lead to traditional notions of academic achievement. Others have illuminated how schools and educators devalue and marginalize the nondominant cultural capital of students of color (P. L. Carter, 2005; Lee, 2001). Thus, these and other scholars make explicit the ways in which normative American culture shapes the dynamics and interactions within U.S. schools in ways that lead to lower academic success for nondominant students. Although these explanations illuminate the complex sociocultural interactional dynamics that shape differential experiences for students, a different strand of theories and research focuses attention on the ways in which inequity is also structured and reproduced through policies, structures, and systems in education.

Institutional/Structural Explanations of Inequity

Institutional and structural explanations for inequity highlight differential “opportunities to learn,” resources, institutional experiences, and access as a source of educational disparities. Rooted in legal frameworks pursued to achieve civil rights, explanations in this branch primarily problematize disparities of inputs and outcomes. From *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) on, policymakers and activists continued to seek remedies in the form of structural or institutional changes to provide equal access to resources (material and human), learning environments and supports (Orfield & Frankenberg, 2014). For example, Oakes’s (1985) pioneering work on tracking highlighted how sorting policies and practices resulted in unequal opportunities for students of color within schools. In the 1990s, educational scholars used CRT to theorize about the centrality of race and racism in understanding structural inequities (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; see Howard & Navarro, 2016, for a historical account of CRT). More recent studies highlight how exclusionary disciplinary policies keep “challenging” students out of the classroom (Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera, 2010); pull-out English-language supports limit student access to the core content (Callahan, Wilkinson, & Muller, 2010); restrictive enrollment criteria limit access to college preparatory coursework (Oakes, 2004); English-language learner (ELL) teacher placements can restrict access to high-quality instruction (Dabach, 2015); and seemingly

“neutral” policies can result in inequitable resource allocation (Alemán, 2006).

A growing body of scholarship in this branch attends to the complex sociohistorical, cultural, political, and interactional dimensions of inequity *in tandem with* the structural and systemic barriers to students’ opportunities to learn. For instance, Diamond and Lewis (2015) examined how racial inequality played out in one high school through the complex, mutually reinforcing dynamics of structural hierarchies, institutional practices, and racial ideologies, many of which masquerade under seemingly race “neutral” guises. Likewise, in examining the racialization of disabilities through policies and legal decisions, Artiles (2011) argued for a central focus on power in investigations of educational equity and the “critical importance of understanding the connection between local practices and larger sociohistorical practices” (p. 440). Critical legal scholars, such as Guinier (2004) and Núñez (2014), have employed conceptions of racial literacy and intersectionality to attend to how multiple identities, varying contexts, and systems of interlocking power and oppression shape individual experiences and offer avenues for addressing racial equity in legal and policy realms.

Contributions of This Study

Despite the different emphases of cultural and structural explanations of inequity, neither highlights a central or contributing “place” for parents, families, and communities, beyond their background influence on students themselves. As many studies have illuminated, school contexts constrain family voices in dialogues around educational improvement and equity. Through a series of convenings with parents and educators, we aimed to create an enabling context for nondominant parents to develop relationships, share personal experiences and concerns, and engage collectively around issues of race, culture, learning, and educational inequity. Because other papers focus on the process of shaping this space, we focus in this article on a subset of the insights and interactions themselves, drawing on standpoint and CRTs.

Conceptual Framework

We draw on feminist standpoint theory (Harding, 1993) to center nondominant parent perspectives and epistemologies in examining systemic oppressions within the field of education. We posit that parents’ perspectives reveal the limitations of extant dominant theory and practice about schooling and educational inequity, drawing on their lived experiences as a starting point to produce a critique that is unbounded by the policies and jargon of education.

According to Harding (2004), knowledge (e.g., science) is socially constructed, and therefore the perspectives of those in power to define it (e.g., males) are reflected in the way in which knowledge is produced and understood. From this perspective, claims about objectivity reflect a standpoint that denies marginalized groups (in her case, women) the possibility to produce and enact objectivity from their standpoint.

Consistent with Harding's (1993) theory, we privilege the experiences of those on the "margins" to counter the accepted and normative standpoints that shape and define knowledge and knowing in society, and to critique and begin to confront how systems and power relations are organized to the benefit of those in power. From this vantage point, nondominant parents' voices provide not only a critique about schooling but also a generative space to ask divergent questions, to develop new ideas, and to point the field in new directions. Such parent perspectives can also potentially make explicit the relationship between individual experiences and institutional/systemic patterns by exposing how power manifests to reproduce inequity in microcontexts and connects to broader patterns of inequity at institutional and systemic levels.

While standpoint theory provides a theory to forward a critique about asymmetrical power relations and what the "voices" of those in the margins offer as a form of "objectivity," we draw from CRT (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002) to situate the voices of nondominant families as a legitimate source of knowledge and expertise on the nature of inequity in education and in society. We specifically take up two fundamental tenets of CRT: (a) counterstorytelling to narrate and understand racialized experience, and (b) the intersectionality of race, class, national origin, gender and how these play out in everyday interactions. We also recognize that parents' individual and unique experiences also shape their perspectives. That is, within a broader focus on the centrality of race and racism in understanding educational inequity, a CRT lens challenges dominant perspectives and works to prioritize experiential knowledge through the counternarratives of those marginalized by race, in addition to other forms of subordination and oppression. We use a CRT lens to center the stories and knowledge of nondominant parents to contribute to theorizing about the cultural and structural dynamics of inequity.

Method

Community-Based Design Research (CBDR)

This study used CBDR (Bang et al., 2010), an innovation on design-based research (DBR) rooted in decolonizing methodologies (Smith, 1999). DBR is

an iterative process of innovative design, implementation, and analyses focused on both theory and practice in “real-life” contexts (Collins, Joseph, & Bielaczyc, 2004). Rooted in the learning sciences, DBR seeks to understand and address the complexities of context and to reposition researchers as collaborators in the design and testing of educational interventions, particularly in U.S. science learning (Anderson & Shattuck, 2012; Bell, 2004). CBDR takes up the challenge “to make explicit the position and power of decision makers as well as potential opportunities to reconfigure aspects of design toward equity” (Bang, Marin, Faber, & Suzukovich, 2013, p. 711). In our case, this meant engaging nondominant parents as key decision makers in the design of a new parent education curriculum, following the lead of indigenous scholars (Bang et al., 2010) who use CBDR as a tool for reclaiming and reinventing communities’ lived understandings and practices toward self-determination.

Study Design

The episodes in this article emerged from a CBDR project that was part of a broader, multiyear mixed-methods study of family engagement initiatives conducted from 2012 to 2015 by a team of researchers of color in collaboration with school districts and community-based organizations. The lead author was tapped for his expertise in analyzing and designing learning environments with nondominant parents and community members, particularly around issues of racial equity, and the second author was one of two principal investigators (PIs) leading the research team.

Specifically, this CBDR study brought together a design team of nine parents, three teachers, and two principals—alongside five researchers (PIs and doctoral student researchers) and two district leaders—to build a new parent education curriculum² for an existing evening 9-week parent education initiative. The project aimed to create a curriculum that reflected the particular priorities and interests of local diverse families and could be shared throughout the region. We sought to create a parent-driven, collective learning environment and more equitable family–educator collaboration through the design process.

Consistent with the formative interventionist approaches of DBR in expansive learning (Engeström & Sannino, 2010), as researchers, we were active collaborators alongside the two district leaders in shaping and facilitating the overall process, which consisted of a series of monthly or bimonthly meetings held at an elementary school library over the course of 10 months (January–October 2014). As a result of our ethnographic work in the prior year, as part of the broader research project, the PIs and the district leader (the

director of family engagement) developed a research partnership premised on a concept of equitable parent–school collaboration, which included goals of systemic transformation, strategies focused on building capacity and relationships, roles for parents as fellow educational leaders who help shape the agenda, and attention to political and community contexts (Ishimaru, 2014).

After an initial all-team launch, researchers and district leaders facilitated talks with parents around their hopes and dreams for their children, then assisted them in identifying priorities for lesson topics. Addressing bullying and fostering students' positive racial/ethnic identities emerged as top priorities. Teachers and principals then participated in prioritizing lesson topics, but when parents analyzed meeting transcripts (a design facilitation decision made by the leadership team of researchers, district leads, and eventually parent leaders), they found that their ideas were overlooked or reframed. Consequently, parents decided not to proceed with teachers and principals for a time. At the parents' invitation, the teachers later rejoined subsequent meetings. Thus, the episodes we describe in our findings represent data that emerged from discussions with parents, sometimes with educators present, about preparing lessons for the curriculum.

Study Context

We conducted this CBDR project within the Kellogg School District,³ a district of about 27,000 students in a region of increasing suburban poverty and marked diversity (the 2013–2014 student population in the district was 38% White, 21% Latino, 17% Asian/Pacific Islander, 12% African American, and 0.6% American Indian). The parents, teachers, and principals in the design team were drawn from two elementary schools, both of which had a higher proportion of low-income and students of color than the district average (e.g., 75.5% and 82.6% eligibility for free and reduced-price lunch at the two schools, compared with the district average of 51.9%).

Data and Analyses

To address the research questions in this study, we examined data from 13 design meetings with five to 19 design team members, including nine parents who were identified as follows: two African/African American, one White, four Latina, two Vietnamese; three teachers (all White), two principals (both White), two district administrators (who identified as African American and multiracial Pacific Islander), and two to five researchers (all of whom identify as people of color, including Asian American, African American, and Latino/a). Most meetings lasted 2 to 2.5 hr, but two were 4-hr long sessions,

and several of the meetings consisted of separate convenings for parents, without educators. We took detailed fieldnotes and video- and audio recordings of every meeting. The audio transcripts, fieldnotes, and documentation from these sessions form the basis of the data for this study.

All audio recordings were transcribed and cleaned by project research assistants. We conducted an initial round of descriptive coding of the transcript and fieldnote data using the qualitative software Dedoose to identify excerpts focused on race, cultural identity, power, and equity in learning and education, then, through an iterative process with members of the research team, we sorted these excerpts into categories based on design team decisions (about learning priorities) to work with in the construction of the lessons on racial/cultural identity. This analysis led to a closer focus on how the parents' interactions and sense making illuminated alternative conceptions of learning and complex systems understandings of inequity. We identified emergent themes in the data related to multilevel dynamics (e.g., interpersonal, institutional, and systemic) of racial, cultural, or linguistic marginalization, then selected the four episodes, described in our findings, to examine more deeply how parents narrated their own and their children's experiences with learning and racial inequity.

Although these episodes were broadly representative of the themes we identified across the data, these episodes were selected because they narrate observations and experiences across a range of educational contexts across the educational system and present an arc of the settings and situations that families experience firsthand. For example, the episodes account for racial discrimination (in the classroom and in the educational system), classroom interactions between students and teachers, interactions between parents and teachers, and the examination of school policies. The episodes we highlight are also rich examples that provide a more detailed and nuanced account of the experiences relative to other excerpts.

Finally, our stake in this work, as researchers of color, was to position non-dominant parents in situations of expertise and act as a kind of "mirror" to parent experiences and priorities. As a Mexican immigrant of indigenous descent and an Asian American woman—both with our own families of three children and histories of cultural work outside of academia in our own communities, it was impossible to separate ourselves—and the relationships we sought to build with parents—from the knowledge that was produced, a central feature of participatory design work (Bang & Voussoughi, in press). As such, the work also entailed constant tensions and complexities of power in relation to other members of the design team, particularly in mediating dynamics between the principals and the parents, when we used our university-based authority to insist that parent priorities drive decision making (even when

principals resisted, as they did when bullying emerged as a topic of primary concern).

Findings: Conceptualizing Transformative Terrain in Educational Equity

In this section, we make visible the ways families make sense of their own and their children's experiences of schooling by focusing on four episodes that parents narrated in discussing inequity. Across the episodes, parents referenced their children's lived experiences as they came into contact with teachers and schools. Although linguistic diversity is implied in some of the episodes, language intersects with race, culture, class, and power. The interactions we highlight represent conceptions that are often dismissed by educators but, on deeper reflection, reveal an understanding of the complexity of educational inequity and the forces that shape learning in and out of schools. We also highlight educator tendencies to simplify parental/family broad systemic understandings of learning and inequity through what Ippolito (2015) described as a "school-based" discourse privileging institutional policies and practices.

Episode 1: Accountability Policy and Equity of Learning Opportunities

We first examine an episode that arose in a parent discussion about how race matters in student academics and schools. The notions articulated in this episode highlight tensions about high-stakes testing and student learning that many educators also experience and navigate in their own classrooms and schools. However, the complexities raised in this discussion are rarely invoked as a starting point for discussions about the role of accountability policies in moving toward greater educational equity. That is, a typical point of departure in policy discussions focuses on the efficacy (or lack thereof) of top-down efforts to monitor and mandate equitable outcomes in the form of eliminating "gaps" in standardized assessment performance between federally defined student subgroups. However, the exchange below—initiated by one Latina mother (Natalia) and then built upon by another (Lourdes, the interpreter, is also a Latina mother in the district)—suggests a more complex systems understanding of schools. Their experiences of the dynamics in their school call out how policy efforts designed to produce equitable outcomes have exacerbated the status quo of disparities between learning opportunities and environments in White, middle-class, English-only schools and lower-income schools serving predominantly linguistically and racially diverse students.

Natalia: Yo he visto que en la escuela cuando hay un niño Americano se enfocan mucho en los estudios, incluso les tiene que pagar clases extra a los niños. En cambio donde hay muchas culturas, como en la escuela de nosotros, lo que ellos les interesa es que pasen el examen de . . .

Lourdes: What she has seen is that in other schools that commonly [are] Caucasian they will pay for extra help and do different things to better their education. Where in the school that she's at, like in our school, there's so much other cultures and different races that she's noticed that they're more concerned about, It's just making sure the kids pass, it's just pass, just pass, but they don't actually put anything else into it.

Facilitator/Researcher: So there's more discrimination towards schools that have more races, that they don't encourage . . . ?

Lourdes: They don't encourage they just want to pass the kids, it's just more, let's get them to pass instead of teaching them.

Natalia first distinguishes the school her own child attends (characterized by many cultures and races) from a school in the same district that serves predominantly White, middle-class students. She points out that these more privileged schools have a different set of assumptions and standards when it comes to both their investments in and conceptions of student learning. For instance, Caucasian parents pay for extra help and provide additional learning opportunities for students. In contrast, Lourdes emphasizes how in “our schools,” the primary focus is on their students passing high-stakes tests—“just pass, just pass”—rather than “teaching them” and “bettering their education.” Collectively, these mothers are narrating not only a broader, more expansive conception of education beyond that which can be measured by performance on standardized assessments, but they are also pointing to how accountability policies are playing out in the daily experience of their children and school.

Moreover, the mothers highlight a dynamic in their own district identified by scholars in the wake of accountability policy. That is, a common educator response to accountability policy in schools that are struggling under sanctions for their performance has been to engage in practices “that improve accountability status but not necessarily student learning” (Diamond, 2012, p. 152). Although high-quality instruction has become a common focus of educational equity efforts, Diamond (2012) found a predominance of didactic (in contrast to interactive) instruction and unequal resource distribution between low- and high-performing schools. In other words, the mothers are pointing to the ways in which school organizational responses to accountability policies designed to address disparities in their context work to *counter* educational equity.

Thus, this episode highlights how nondominant parents' lived experiences and conceptions of educational inequity simultaneously address and navigate multiple levels, from individual interactions to broad policy dynamics. Their experiences and sense making highlight schooling contexts as complex systems within which policies and responses to it are enacted differently in high-poverty, diverse schools in ways that shape the normative assumptions of the school, daily practice of educators, and interactions between parents and teachers.

Episode 2: Racial Discrimination in the Classroom and the Educational System

The second episode we highlight attends to an episode from an early design session in which parents discussed a common concern, issues of student bullying at the school. As the conversation developed, though, Mary, a Vietnamese mother on the team, raised critical question about how parents should engage conversations about race and racial discrimination in school. We focus on an interaction that attended to children of color experiencing differential treatment in the classroom and the way in which parents of color feel silenced to raise concerns about racism/discrimination in schools.

In the conversation, Mary questions how issues of racial discrimination can be raised in school by rhetorically asking, "That's how we start the conversation?" Mary's question emerged out of concern that she believed children of color experienced racial discrimination in school. More specifically, she pointed to how discipline is handled differently for students of color in situations of bullying. The first issue pertains to teachers' response to bullying. Based on her experiences, Mary expressed her belief that teachers were more likely to discipline a child of color for bullying than a White child for the same transgression. In a prior conversation, Mary then mentioned her perception of a lack of responsiveness when a student of color bullies or is bullied by another student of color. In her estimation, teachers did not intervene because they believe such behavior to be "normal" among students of color (Fieldnotes, Design Meeting, May 6, 2014).

In her attempt to address the issues that she observed playing out, Mary wondered where such situations related to discrimination could be raised, discussed, and remedied. Mary stated,

I didn't communicate with the school about discrimination because if the teacher was being discriminating, you can't go to her, and if we went to the principal, she might know the teacher. That's her employee, and you're stuck. Where do you go, school board? That's how we start that conversation?

We highlight Mary's dilemma here because she sensed that she did not have recourse to raise issues of racial discrimination within the system, resulting in a default form of silencing. Mary suggests that school personnel may not be the best individuals to approach because conflict of interest, personal relationships between school personnel, and lack of institutional power may leave parents with few options to initiate talk about racism and discrimination in classrooms and in school. She recognizes the hierarchical authority of a school board over district personnel, but seems to question whether this is a helpful starting place for this conversation, as indeed, school boards know little about what happens in the everyday situations, and such concerns can be easy to dismiss and diffuse as a simple misunderstanding. From Mary's perspective, because discussions of racial inequity do not take place, issues like bullying cannot be addressed productively. That is, if parents perceive racial differences in teacher or school responses to bullying, the lack of avenues or opportunities to discuss racial bias preclude any remedy for the situation.

The issue highlighted by Mary echoes a broader discussion among the parents about differential teacher treatment of students based on their race, ethnicity, or language. Their narration of these experiences and interpretations of the dynamics between students and teachers highlight schools as racialized institutional spaces. According to Martin (2010), race and racism also take shape in school and in society through power and practice, including discursive practices. This episode, thus, highlights parents' understanding of the complexity of racial discrimination as it manifests from individual interactions to institutional practices, as well as the constraints of parents' position on the margins in terms of acting to address the issue at different levels of the educational system. Although nondominant parents may be uniquely positioned to perceive and address issues of discrimination toward their children, the power asymmetries in educational systems often work to isolate and dismiss families' concerns and insights.

Episode 3: The "Place" of Student Learning in the Classroom

The third interaction we highlight attends to a classroom context from the perspective of a parent retelling a student–teacher interaction as experienced by her child. On the surface, this interaction might be interpreted as solely an issue of language between a student and a teacher. But a closer look at the exchange reveals that this interaction is also about a parent advocating for their child and raising issues about what a child can question in school and how teachers should interact with students of color. We attend here not to the

verity of the exchange (one may well mistrust how well the secondhand telling reflects the actual interaction) but to the sense the parent is making of the school and teacher through her narration of what her son has told her. For ease of following, we first provide the entire exchange and interpretation (as provided in the design team meeting) before unpacking each segment for closer examination.

First, in the retelling of the experience, the mother points to the way in which a teacher responded to her child when the child asked for clarification on a topic the teacher had just explained to the class. According to mother, the teacher accused the child of not paying attention and responded negatively to her son. The mother recounted,

My son told the teacher that he didn't understand what she [the teacher] had explained to the class. The teacher told him broadly if he didn't pay attention that's why he didn't understand. He responded, "I did pay attention, but I didn't understand." [My] child told [me] "Yeah, she . . . answered really badly."

Parent (in Spanish)	Interpreter
<p>Que mi hijo le dijo a la maestra que no entendía lo que ella había explicado. Y le dijo la maestra "si tu no pusiste atención por eso no entendiste." Y el le dijo "si le puse atención pero no entendí." Mi niño me dijo, "Y me contesto bien feo."</p>	<p>My son told the teacher that he didn't understand what she had explained to the class. The teacher told him broadly if he didn't pay attention that's why he didn't understand. He responded, "I did pay attention, but I didn't understand." [My] child told [me], "yeah, she . . . answered really badly."</p>
<p>Entonces lo que yo, uno como padre, uno también tiene una la responsabilidad, verdad. Entonces yo le dije a mi hijo, "¿Que pasa si tu te quedas con la duda?" No te quedas con la duda . . . Ve en los libros.</p>	<p>[Then what I -] As a parent, we do have responsibility. I told my son ask don't just . . . Ask about that. Basically to pursue another way to figure it out, and don't just accept that.</p>
<p>Inclusivo el mismo le dijo, le dijo a la maestra, es que "yo se sobre ese tema" le dijo a la maestra. "Y yo lo estudie" le dijo. "¿Como?" Y la maestra, pues se quedo. Entonces le dijo si ya lo sabia porque le estaba preguntando.</p>	<p>Then he told the teacher, "I do know about this stuff." Then the kid told her, I study. I study it and I know about it, and he . . . said the teacher said, "So why are you asking me about it?"</p>
<p>Cuando el niño sabe también la maestra debería darle el lugar.</p>	<p>When the kid knows something about it, she should let the kid—give him that place, or space . . .</p>

Parent (in Spanish)	Interpreter
<p>Y le pregunto de donde lo sabia el. Y dijo, "Mi papi y mi mami miran programas y todo eso, yo lo vi y paso en [inaudible]" le dijo a la maestra. Que no todo tiempo iba a ser lo mismo lo que el miraba y lo que era. En esa cuestión, yo me voy al punto de que también a los niños hay que respetarlos.</p>	<p>The teacher asked how he knew that, and he said, "Well my parents have seen programs and know about this." The teacher said that it's not always the same what he saw/learned [on TV or at home] and what is "true" [factual]. In this matter, my point is that children also need to be respected [for the ideas they offer].</p>

In this exchange, the boy claims that he genuinely did not understand what the teacher had explained to his peers. According to the mother, the only explanation offered by the teacher for the boy not understanding the teacher was the boy being inattentive, and therefore not understanding. From the mother's perspective, she hoped that her child will take greater responsibility for his learning in the classroom. Her expectation was that her child will ask, clarify, and/or do independent work to understand the idea/concept discussed in class. The push back, however, came from the teacher who did not trust that the child had honest intentions.

From the mother's account, the teacher assumed that the student was not paying attention, and that this was the reason why the child was confused. This interaction led to a tense exchange between the teacher and the student where the student suggests familiarity with the topic/idea. The mother stated,

Then he told the teacher, "I do know about this stuff." Then the kid [the son] told her, "I study. I study it and I know about it," and he . . . said the teacher said, "So why are you asking me about it?"

From the mother's perspective, her son was only trying to be proactive about his learning based on what she had suggested to her son made a successful learner—"To pursue another way to figure it out, and don't just accept that [a single explanation]."

This classroom interaction between the teacher and the child represents a situation in which respect is being negotiated. While situations of this nature may appear inconsequential or mundane, the accumulation of these events over the course of a student's life in school can be quite taxing. In her retelling of the incident, the mother describes this interaction where respect and acknowledgment of her child's inquisitiveness are being challenged.

At the most basic level, the mother was asking for the teacher to "darle su lugar"—give him his place—as in a social standing that merits respect. The

attempt to exert this form of agency led the teacher to deny the child from voicing an opinion, thereby dismissing other forms of home/parental knowledge and experiences. For example, the teacher did not acknowledge that the child could contribute to the construction of classroom knowledge. When the student suggested that he was familiar with the topic because he had seen television programs on the topic with his parents or that such knowledge was learned at home, the teacher's response suggests that home learning or knowledge potentially had no value (not a legitimate source of knowledge) that was not on par with school learning. The teacher responded to the child's claim by responding, "It's not always the same, what he saw/learned [on TV or at home] and what is 'true' [factual]."

Thus, this episode highlights the messages that students and parents may be interpreting from interactions in the classroom in daily exchanges. We can see how, in this small exchange, both student and parent interpreted the teacher as blaming the student for his lack of understanding and dismissing experiences at home with parents as a legitimate source of knowledge. These insights highlight how race, class, and language intersect in ways that devalue the assets and resources of students, their families and communities.

Episode 4: Constraining Expansive Conceptions of Learning

The final excerpt from a design team meeting illuminates what often happens when the complex lived understandings of nondominant parents and families come into contact with educator conceptions and deficit-based assumptions about parent capacity. The following episode presents two parents' wish for their children to not only perform academically but also to develop social skills to confront issues that might arise in school. While the two mothers recognize the broad set of issues that shape students' ability to succeed in schools, a teacher then interjects by re-interpreting their conversation in terms of school intervention programs.

Violeta [Latina parent]: I think it's because when you talk about academic [learning], there's a lot of parts that play into that, right? We have discussed health, so they're healthy. They're being fed. They're being nourished. All these parts do play into that so if we only focus on the academic achievement—it is a big part of our goal, but it is also . . . for them to be good socially . . . and all these different parts . . .

Mary [Vietnamese parent]: I've just been thinking we teach our kids how to be successful academically, but we don't teach them how to cope in the process, to resolve their own issues and understand what's happening in school. They don't feel like, "Oh, who do I ask? Or should I ask? I'm scared to ask my mom because I don't want to burden her." For

someone to go up to them and teach them how to cope with all the process of each . . . problem, anything that they're dealing with.

Sandra [teacher]: It sounds like they're talking about the social emotional fulfillment of school, the PBIS culture, Second Step, those kinds of things that fall in very well with our counseling home as well as leadership. [3.22.14]

The parents begin by articulating a conception of learning that moves far beyond conventional school discourses focused on performance on standardized assessments and core content mastery. They highlight a vision of their children's learning that speaks to broader well-being, from physical health, to social skills, from problem solving to an ability to navigate complex issues of relational and ethical responsibility. The teacher attempts to make sense of what the two mothers have shared by re-interpreting the mothers' comments through educator language. In this attempt, the teacher reduces the mothers' concerns about their children's learning broadly construed to be about socio-emotional fulfillment and how the range of programs (e.g., Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS) initiative, Second Step socioemotional curriculum) offered at the school addresses such concerns. Absent from the teacher's assessment are the connection that the two mothers are making about what it means to be able to be academically successful—the intimate connection between academic success, social development, and well-being.

Throughout the design process, we struggled with the power asymmetries between parents' language and ideas and those of educators. We brought this episode and others from the first joint parent-educator meeting back to all the design team members, and parents and teachers (but not principals) noticed a broader pattern of educators reframing parents' words and meanings into education jargon, often in ways that changed the meaning or focus. The teacher's perspective seems to presume that the two parents, both from non-dominant (culturally and linguistically) groups, did not have sufficient knowledge about schools to be able to name what they believed to be missing from their child's education. Bypassing parents' understandings and contributions to the conversation closed the possibility to enlist parents in meaningful dialogue about the necessary conditions that might ensure the long-term development of their children. Furthermore, the teacher dismissed other concerns that the mothers raised: (a) awareness that other issues might arise for their children as they progress through the educational system and (b) the importance of children learning to advocate for themselves in schools.

Discussion

Referencing back to standpoint theory, our study explicitly privileges non-dominant parent voices to reveal, from their "marginal" place in educational

equity discourses, the ways in which nondominant parents make sense of their own and their children's experiences in school. The episodes highlight not only these parents' capacity and insights into the complex systems' nature of educational inequity but also possibilities for how these contributions might help us begin to construct a new model for the role of family-based experiences, epistemologies, and solutions to inequity. We organize the discussion by naming three ways in which the parent voices resonate or converge with the leading edge of theorizing about educational equity, then we discuss how the episodes highlight distinct perspectives and possibilities for addressing inequity. Ultimately, we argue that the episodes as a whole illuminate a central question for efforts to attain educational equity: Where is the "place" of families' learning and knowledge?

First, we argue that, across the episodes, our findings suggest parents' deep understanding of the complex ways in which inequity operates in schools. Across the first three episodes, the parents in this study narrate understandings of schooling that integrate *both* structural and cultural dynamics of inequity, converging with the leading edge of scholarship in the primary "branches" of theoretical explanations for inequity. Their understandings extend beyond the limits of either structural or cultural explanations of inequity alone. Like Ladson-Billings's (2006) conception of the education debt, nondominant parents name the various levels at which educational inequity persists and place these in the context of historical and present realities. For example, in Episode 1, Natalia's lived experiences serve as the basis for understanding the complexity of school systems in relation to broad policies and how these shape the nature of the opportunities and interactions that occur in high-poverty, racially and linguistically diverse schools. While complex systems and race-critical analyses have been suggested by some researchers (Omi & Winant, 1993), nondominant parents are rarely seen as capable or as the source of such analysis.

Second, our findings also collectively illuminate schools as racialized spaces infused with power asymmetries at multiple levels, in which there are few, if any, spaces to name, question, or raise issues of racism, particularly for students, parents, and families. As the demographics of U.S. public schools have shifted, scholars have urged educators to move beyond "color muteness" (Pollock, 2009) to recognize and acknowledge the ways in which racial dynamics and implicit bias shape interactions with students. Heeding this scholarship, schools and districts have increasingly focused on educator cultural competency and equity initiatives built on frank conversations about race. However, nondominant families and communities are notably absent from these efforts. Along with students themselves, nondominant families are uniquely situated among educational stakeholders to perceive, understand,

and narrate how racism unfolds in school settings at multiple levels, from the interpersonal to the institutional and structural.

Third, our findings converge with the literature in illuminating how nondominant parent and family voices are often constrained or silenced by educators and educational systems. Yet, this study suggests that nondominant parents, if provided with a “place,” can narrate important issues that educators overlook or disregard. Educators do not always have the capacity to understand what parents narrate about daily school life and situations that are consequential for students of color. Due to turnover and the constant churn of reform in urban schools (Payne, 2008), these exchanges also point to the limitations of school systems as the only source of solutions because educational systems do not have the capacity or institutional memory to account for how inequity plays out in both everyday interactions in classrooms and schools as well as structures and policies. Educators, thus, can contradict their efforts to bring about equity by enacting one-size-fits-all policies that neglect to consider the experiences of the communities they intend to serve.

Finally, this study also begins to suggest how nondominant family expertise might contribute to possibilities for “re-mediating” issues that arise in schools that depart from the dominant repertoire, norms, or assumptions in schools. For example, early on in the design process, parents identified helping their children to develop a positive racial and cultural identity as a high priority and an essential part of their children’s learning that would enable them to be successful productive adults. This converges with the literature highlighting high-performing students’ positive racial identities (D. J. Carter, 2008) as well as research regarding how parents of color—especially African American parents—socialize their children to prepare them for a racialized society (Wang & Huguley, 2012). Beyond merely proving that parents have the capacity to engage in these conversations, then, these findings suggest that nondominant parents may have insights, knowledge, and expertise that can be a source of professional learning for educators in creating more inclusive and holistic learning environments.

Implications

A major component of this study was to privilege nondominant parents’ voice and standpoint (Harding, 1993). More specifically, we attended to parents’ counternarratives of schooling to understand how families made sense of the dynamics of racial inequities in schools. In consideration of the insights that parents and families offer, educators and researchers might enlist the help of nondominant parents to better understand and address the complexity of inequity in school systems. Traditionally, the onus of “change” has been on

families and communities to adhere to reform efforts that often narrowly focus on testing accountability. Family expertise and agency have been largely absent from current reform efforts in education and are seldom drawn into discussions on teaching and learning (Fine, 1993). While most parents have been in the margins of important educational decisions and debates, nondominant parents, in particular, have been subjected to a lower status and deficit views regarding their capacity for engaging in intellectual work around the core issues of education and schooling. The default practices toward nondominant parents in schools may structure opportunities that constrain and—unintentionally—deter their contributions and engagement (Cooper, 2009).

How do we tap the insights, expertise, and resources that these nondominant families can bring to the work of educating students in schools? One way to begin to create a “place” for nondominant families is by expanding on conceptions of funds of knowledge, or knowledge and skills possessed by family households (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). However, we suggest the need to move beyond instrumental knowledge for learning about culture in service of potential connections to existing school curricula and outcomes. Our aim would be to enlist parental and community expertise about the complex systems that play out in schools and the types of learning environments, structures, systems, and policies that will ensure the long-term holistic development and well-being of their children. Nondominant parents and communities do more than identify problems and issues in educational systems; they also offer insightful and timely solutions to what their children experience in schools. Schools too can learn from nondominant families. And yet, as Mapp and Kuttner (2013) highlighted, educators typically receive little training and support for more meaningful engagement, and thus lack the capacity to leverage the insights, understandings, and expertise of nondominant families. Efforts like parent–teacher home visits (www.ptvhp.org) and neighborhood walks are beginning to reposition educators as learners in their students’ homes and communities. These are important steps but on their own, often do not center issues of power and epistemology in efforts to understand and move toward educational equity (Artiles, 2011).

Emerging forms of educational research–practitioner partnerships—such as participatory–design–based research—offer promising approaches for drawing on the expertise of nondominant families and communities alongside educators and other professionals. Such efforts can serve as a starting point for understanding, dignifying, and sustaining the role that parents play as their children’s first teachers. We believe that there is much fertile research ground to be explored in understanding how to engage nondominant families in co-constructing culturally responsive, engaging learning environments with school-based educators.

This study suggests that new possibilities open up when we begin the discussion of educational inequity with the lived experiences of nondominant families and their children. Future research and practice in this vein offer hope that transformed institutional arrangements and practices to address structures, coupled with close attention to powered relations and interactions that address cultural dynamics, can begin to shape a meaningful “place” for nondominant students, families, and communities. In such a “place,” nondominant families are no longer problems to be fixed, but theorists, co-designers, and fellow educational leaders in transforming our educational systems toward equity.

Acknowledgment

The authors acknowledge support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation for conducting this research. The authors would like to acknowledge Dr. Mark Windschitl, Dr. Joe Lott and the members of the Equitable Parent-School Collaboration Research Project as well as the anonymous reviewers for their invaluable feedback.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. By nondominant, we follow Gutiérrez (2008) and others in highlighting the role of power in the dynamics of marginalization by dominant institutions, policies, and practices. Although their particular experiences are distinct, low-income communities, those from immigrant or refugee backgrounds, and communities of color do share some experiences of being poorly served by dominant educational systems.
2. The design process resulted in a curriculum of seven lessons, *Families in the Driver’s Seat: Parent-Driven Lessons and Guidelines for Collective Engagement* (2015).
3. All district, school, and individual names are pseudonyms.

References

- Alemán, E. (2006). Is Robin Hood the “prince of thieves” or a pathway to equity? Applying critical race theory to school finance political discourse. *Educational Policy, 20*, 113-142.

- Anderson, T., & Shattuck, J. (2012). Design-based research: A decade of progress in education research? *Educational Researcher*, *41*, 16-25.
- Anyon, J. (2014). *Radical possibilities: Public policy, urban education, and a new social movement*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Artiles, A. J. (2011). Toward an interdisciplinary understanding of educational equity and difference: The case of the racialization of ability. *Educational Researcher*, *40*, 431-445.
- Auerbach, S. (2007). From moral supporters to struggling advocates: Reconceptualizing parent roles in education through the experience of working-class families of color. *Urban Education*, *42*, 250-283.
- Bang, M., Marin, A., Faber, L., & Suzukovich, E. S. (2013). Repatriating indigenous technologies in an urban Indian community. *Urban Education*, *48*, 705-733.
- Bang, M., Medin, D., Washinawatok, K., & Chapman, S. (2010). Innovations in culturally based science education through partnerships and community. In M. Khine & I. Saleh (Eds.), *New science of learning: Cognition, computers and collaboration in education* (pp. 569-592). New York, NY: Springer.
- Bang, M., & Vossoughi, S. (In press). Participatory design research and educational justice: Studying learning and relations within social change making. *Cognition and Instruction*.
- Baquedano-López, P., Alexander, R. A., & Hernandez, S. J. (2013). Equity issues in parental and community involvement in schools: What teacher educators need to know. *Review of Research in Education*, *37*, 149-182.
- Bell, P. (2004). On the theoretical breadth of design-based research in education. *Educational Psychologist*, *39*, 243-253.
- Bolivar, J. M., & Chrispeels, J. H. (2011). Enhancing parent leadership through building social and intellectual capital. *American Educational Research Journal*, *48*, 4-38.
- Brayboy, B. M. J., Castagno, A. E., & Maughan, E. (2007). Equality and justice for all? Examining race in education scholarship. *Review of Research in Education*, *31*, 159-194. doi:10.3102/0091732X07300046159
- Callahan, R., Wilkinson, L., & Muller, C. (2010). Academic achievement and course taking among language minority youth in US schools: Effects of ESL placement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *32*, 84-117.
- Carreón, G. P., Drake, C., & Barton, A. C. (2005). The importance of presence: Immigrant parents' school engagement experiences. *American Educational Research Journal*, *42*(3), 465-498.
- Carter, D. J. (2008). Achievement as resistance: The development of a critical race achievement ideology among Black achievers. *Harvard Educational Review*, *78*, 466-497.
- Carter, P. L. (2005). *Keepin' it real: School success beyond Black and White*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., . . . York, R. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.
- Collins, A., Joseph, D., & Bielaczyc, K. (2004). Design research: Theoretical and methodological issues. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, *13*, 15-42.

- Cooper, C. W. (2009). Performing cultural work in demographically changing schools: Implications for expanding transformative leadership frameworks. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45, 694-724.
- Crossland, K. (2004, April). *Color-blind desegregation: Race neutral remedies as the new "equal opportunity."* Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Dabach, D. B. (2015). Teacher placement into immigrant English learner classrooms: Limiting access in comprehensive high schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 52, 243-274.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Delgado-Gaitan, C. (2004). *Involving Latino families in schools: Raising student achievement through home-school partnerships*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Delpit, L. D. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58, 280-299.
- Diamond, J. B. (2012). Accountability policy, school organization, and classroom practice: Partial recoupling and educational opportunity. *Education and Urban Society*, 44, 151-182. doi:10.1177/0013124511431569
- Diamond, J. B., & Lewis, A. (2015). *Despite the best intentions: Why racial inequality thrives in good schools*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Engeström, Y., & Sannino, A. (2010). Studies of expansive learning: Foundations, findings and future challenges. *Educational Research Review*, 5, 1-24.
- Epstein, J. L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, 701-712.
- Fine, M. (1993). A parent involvement. *Equity and Choice*, 9(3), 4-8.
- Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of 'acting White.'" *The Urban Review*, 18, 176-206.
- Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational Researcher*, 39, 59-68.
- Guinier, L. (2004). From racial liberalism to racial literacy: *Brown v. Board of Education* and the interest-divergence dilemma. *The Journal of American History*, 91(1), 92-118.
- Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43, 148-164.
- Gutiérrez, K. D., & Jaramillo, N. E. (2006). Looking for educational equity: The consequences of relying on Brown. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 105(2), 173-189.
- Harding, S. (1993). Rethinking standpoint epistemology: What is "strong epistemology?" In L. Alcoff & E. Potter (Eds.), *Feminist epistemologies* (pp. 49-82). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Harding, S. G. (Ed.). (2004). *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement. Annual synthesis 2002*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

- Hong, S. (2011). *A cord of three strands: A new approach to parent engagement in schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NJ: Routledge.
- Howard, T., & Navarro, O. (2016). Critical race theory 20 years later: Where do we go from here? *Urban Education, 51*(3), 253-273.
- Ippolito, J. (2010a). In(formal) conversation with minority parents and communities of a Canadian junior school: Findings and cautions from the field. *School Community Journal, 20*, 141-157.
- Ippolito, J. (2010b). Minority parents as researchers: Beyond a dichotomy in parent involvement in schooling. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 114*, 47-68.
- Ippolito, J. (2015). Reading interventionist research in two urban elementary schools through a discursive lens. *Urban Education, 25*. doi:10.1177/0042085915613550
- Ishimaru, A.M. (2014). Rewriting the rules of engagement: Elaborating a model of district community collaboration. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(2), 188-216.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relation of parental involvement to urban elementary school student academic achievement. *Urban Education, 40*, 237-269.
- Jeynes, W. H. (2007). The relationship between parental involvement and urban secondary school student academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Urban Education, 42*, 82-110.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher, 35*(7), 3-12.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record, 97*, 47-68.
- Lareau, A., & Horvat, E. M. N. (1999). Moments of social inclusion and exclusion: Race, class, and cultural capital in family-school relationships. *Sociology of Education, 72*, 37-53.
- Lawson, M. A., & Alameda-Lawson, T. (2012). A case study of school-linked, collective parent engagement. *American Educational Research Journal, 49*, 651-684.
- Lee, C. D. (2001). Is October Brown Chinese? A cultural modeling activity system for underachieving students. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*, 97-141.
- Lewis, O. (1961). *The children of Sánchez: Autobiography of a Mexican family*. New York, NY: Random House.
- López, G. R. (2001). The value of hard work: Lessons on parent involvement from an (im)migrant household. *Harvard Educational Review, 71*, 416-437.
- López, G. R., Scribner, J., & Mahitivanichcha, K. (2001). Redefining parental involvement: Lessons from high-performing migrant-impacted schools. *American Education Research Journal, 38*, 253-288.
- Mapp, K. L., & Hong, S. (2010). Debunking the myth of the hard to reach parent. In S. Christenson & A. Reschly (Eds.), *Handbook of school-family partnerships* (pp. 345-361). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Mapp, K. L., & Kuttner, P. J. (2013). *Partners in education: A dual capacity-building framework for family-school partnerships*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Martin, D. B. (2010). Not-so-strange bedfellows: Racial projects and the mathematics education enterprise. In U. Gellert, E. Jablonka & C. Morgan (Eds.), *Proceedings of the sixth international mathematics education and society conference* (Vol. 1, 57-79). Berlin, Germany: Freie Universität Berlin.
- Milner, R. (2012). But what is urban education? *Urban Education, 47*, 556-561.
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 31*, 132-141.
- Nasir, N. S. (2011). *Racialized identities: Race and achievement among African American youth*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Núñez, A. M. (2014). Employing multilevel intersectionality in educational research: Latino identities, contexts, and college access. *Educational Researcher, 43*, 85-92.
- Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Oakes, J. (2004). Investigating the claims in Williams v. State of California: An unconstitutional denial of education's basic tools? *The Teachers College Record, 106*, 1889-1906.
- Olivos, E. M. (2006). *The power of parents: A critical perspective of bicultural parent involvement in public schools* (Vol. 290). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1993). On the theoretical status of the concept of race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crackle (Eds.), *Race, identity and representation in education* (pp. 3-10). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Orfield, G., & Frankenberg, E. (2014). *Brown at 60: Great progress, a long retreat and an uncertain future*. Los Angeles, CA: Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles.
- Payne, C. M. (2008). *So much reform, so little change: The persistence of failure in urban schools*. Cambridge, UK: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Pollock, M. (2009). *Colormute: Race talk dilemmas in an American school*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Pomerantz, E. M., Moorman, E. A., & Litwack, S. D. (2007). The how, whom, and why of parents' involvement in children's academic lives: More is not always better. *Review of Educational Research, 77*, 373-410.
- Pushor, D., & Murphy, B. (2004). Parent marginalization, marginalized parents: Creating a place for parents on the school landscape. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 50*, 221-235.
- Rothstein, R. (2015). The racial achievement gap, segregated schools, and segregated neighborhoods: A constitutional insult. *Race and Social Problems, 7*(1), 21-30.
- Shirley, D. (1997). *Community organizing for urban school reform*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London, England: Zed books.

- Solórzano, D. G., & Delgado Bernal, D. (2001). Critical race theory and transformational resistance: Chicana/o students in an urban context. *Urban Education, 36*, 308-342.
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. (2002). Critical race methodology: Counter-storytelling as an analytical framework for education research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 8*, 23-44.
- Sullivan, A.L., Artilles, A. J., & Hernandez-Saca, D.I. (2015). Addressing Special Education Inequity Through Systemic Change: Contributions of Ecologically Based Organizational Consultation. *Journal of Education and Psychological Consultation, 25*(2-3), 129-147.
- Valdés, G. (1996). *Con respeto: Bridging the distances between culturally diverse families and schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Valencia, R. R., & Black, M. S. (2002). "Mexican Americans don't value education!" On the basis of the myth, mythmaking, and debunking. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 1*, 81-103.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: Issues of caring in education of US-Mexican youth*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Wang, M. T., & Huguley, J. P. (2012). Parental racial socialization as a moderator of the effects of racial discrimination on educational success among African American adolescents. *Child Development, 83*, 1716-1731.
- Warikoo, N., & Carter, P. (2009). Cultural explanations for racial and ethnic stratification in academic achievement: A call for a new and improved theory. *Review of Educational Research, 79*, 366-394.
- Warren, M., Hong, S., Rubin, C. H., & Uy, P. (2009). Beyond the bake sale: A community-based relational approach to parent engagement in schools. *Teachers College Record, 111*(9), 2209-2254.

Author Biographies

Filiberto Barajas-López is an assistant professor in Curriculum & Instruction in the College of Education at the University of Washington, Seattle. He researches the role of race, culture, and language in mathematics learning and educational equity.

Ann M. Ishimaru is an assistant professor of Educational Policy, Organizations, and Leadership at the University of Washington, Seattle. Her scholarship focuses on the intersection of leadership, school-community relationships, and educational equity in P-12 systems.