2022 STATE OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS REPORT

October 2022

Susan Groundwater, Brittney Becker, Fan Jiang, Joy Gitter, Leila Nuland, & Marriam Ewaida

HANOVER RESEARCH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DOWNLOAD A COMPLETE APPENDIX OF
THE DATA COMPILED FOR THIS REPORT

PREFACE: A SYSTEMIC APPROACH TO DEI

For years, K–12 districts have faced a difficult and delicate mandate: How can they support the needs of each student, despite myriad disparities and despite a climate where education is increasingly politicized? It's a subject that K–12 leaders grappled with long before the pandemic and long before the events of 2020 forced conversations about racial inequality to the surface. Today, however, these discussions have become more prominent and more imperative than ever.

Over the past years, the Hanover K–12 Research and Professional Services team has supported hundreds of district leaders as they navigate these challenges. We are constantly inspired by their efforts and their commitment to school transformation and continuous improvement — work that often directly translates to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI).

Throughout this work, one of the most critical lessons learned is that a commitment to DEI cannot simply be an initiative: It has to be a way of thinking about an entire system.

While the subject may be sensitive and emotionally charged, we would be remiss not to acknowledge the current political climate in which district leaders are operating. Whether we call it DEI, school transformation, or continuous improvement, school systems are charged with educating and preparing the children in their communities. To uncover opportunity gaps, district leaders must ensure they are asking the right questions and leveraging the right tools. This can be particularly challenging when the research and literature don't always align to provide consistent, proven best practices and recommendations.

In fall 2020, Hanover's team identified a lack of consensus in the academic literature around tools and methodologies appropriate for identifying inequities in K–12 school systems. As a research team, we seized this opportunity to build a methodology for equity audits grounded in previous research.

The methodology and tools described in this report provide a framework for holding systems accountable to ensure they're meeting the needs of each individual child. This report also outlines findings from two of the tools our team designed to help district leaders measure the inclusiveness of their school environments and to reveal opportunity gaps that cause inequities. Ultimately, this paper is intended to help district leaders understand the current perception of school systems and to provide recommendations for improving policy and practice in public schools.

Leila Nuland

Marriam Ewaida

OVERVIEW

The need for systemic equity that ensures every child has the greatest opportunity to develop to their full academic and social potential has evolved over the past several years to become a core focus in many school districts across the United States. Within this landscape, equity-minded leaders recognize the importance of a holistic approach to understanding equity perspectives and processes through an equity audit that collects and examines district data to uncover outcomes, access, opportunity, and resource disparities. Equity audits support proactive leaders by providing them with an accurate assessment of disproportionalities based on a combination of quantitative and qualitative data.

As part of a broader equity audit, Hanover Research designed the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Diagnostic survey to help district leaders measure stakeholder perceptions of related constructs, including beliefs about equity, the school environment, staff perceptions, engagement and outreach, and district priorities. In total, the data collected from districts across the United States and presented in this report represent the views of 100,000 students, parents, and staff. The data also includes results from historically underrepresented respondents such as those who are gender non-binary, American Indian or Alaska Native, and Middle Eastern or North African.

Hanover Research also developed an Equity Scorecard, a data visualization tool intended to support districts in identifying and explaining proportionalities and disproportionalities across multiple data points. Over the past several years, Hanover collected student data from a five-year period (2017–2021) from 44 member districts across the country, describing almost one million students. This dataset represents students that attend schools in districts of varying size, regions, urbanicity, and demographic makeup. For each member analysis, Hanover created an interactive dashboard that allows the user to filter by specific subsets across fixed segmentations of interest.

This report draws on the data from the analyses conducted for members representing every region of the country to create aggregated datasets from the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Diagnostic and Equity Scorecard. Hanover recognizes that the rhetoric surrounding how we discuss equitable teaching and learning is everchanging, with some districts and departments of education now banning the use of the word equity. Regardless of the terminology, it is imperative to remember that educational diversity, equity, and inclusion are inherently connected to critical topics and current trends in education including: culture and climate, social-emotional learning, mental health, and teacher recruitment and retention. To bring about systemic change, these priorities must work together and in tandem, not siloed as separate initiatives. District leaders can use the findings and insights presented in this report to support planning for an equity audit, inform strategic planning, select key performance indicators, and implement continuous improvement initiatives.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Achieving educational equity requires that across all district policies and practices, students of all identities feel safe, supported, and like they belong at school. Further, students must have access to high-quality resources, rigorous instruction and advanced course pathways, and diverse staff who feel supported and valued.[i]

ENSURING BELONGING

Ensuring that all students feel a sense of belonging in school is paramount, as belonging contributes to school success, social-emotional wellbeing, and positive academic outcomes. A sense of belonging can positively predict student achievement, and students with a strong sense of belonging are also more likely to exhibit positive behaviors, beliefs, and confidence; contribute positively to the school community; and report an interest in helping others and the importance of treating all people with respect.[ii]

While feeling included is a fundamental human need and positively affects students' learning and wellbeing, many students feel disconnected from their school community and students experience varying levels of belonging and connectedness depending on their demographic identities.[iii] Data on student belonging and inclusivity reveal a racial school climate gap in which students from different racial backgrounds experience differences in expectations, safety, relationships, respect, connectedness, and engagement opportunities.[iv] Students with diverse racial or ethnic backgrounds, who identify as part of the LGBTQIA+ community, who have a disability, or who are overweight are also often targeted by other students and bullies more than their peer groups.[v] District and school leaders must prepare teachers and staff to support the safety and belonging among students of diverse backgrounds and identities. Notably, teachers and support staff members indicate needing support and training for engaging in issues involving sexual orientation, gender, and race.[vi]

ACCESS TO ADVANCED COURSES AND HIGH-QUALITY RESOURCES

Students who take rigorous, advanced courses are more likely to attend school, have higher engagement and effort, graduate high school, and attend and succeed in college, yet not all students have access to rigorous learning opportunities.[vii] Black, Hispanic, and economically disadvantaged students are underrepresented in and denied meaningful access to rigorous instructional opportunities in gifted and talented programs in elementary school and in advanced courses in middle and high school.[viii] Evidence shows that when given opportunities to participate in advanced courses, Black and Hispanic students succeed. Preventing access to advanced courses, rigorous instruction, and high-quality resources inhibits student achievement, blocks access to advanced pathways that lead to college, and sends students the message that they do not belong in advanced courses.[ix]

Advanced Coursework Includes:

- Gifted and talented programs
- Grade 8 Algebra I
- Advanced Placement (AP) courses
- Dual or concurrent enrollment courses (which count for high school and college credit)
- Honors courses
- International Baccalaureate (IB) courses

Creating equitable learning experiences and outcomes for students also requires resource equity within and among schools.[x] Advanced courses are one component of resource equity, which encompasses teaching quality, empowering, and rigorous content; instructional time and attention; early intervention; early learning; whole child approach; family academic engagement; school funding; school leadership quality; diverse and inclusive schools; and learning-ready facilities.[xi] Economically disadvantaged students, students of color, students with disabilities, and English learner students receive access to fewer high-quality resources and rigorous instruction than their peers.[xii]

SUPPORTING STUDENTS OF ALL GENDER IDENTITIES, GENDER EXPRESSIONS, AND SEXUAL ORIENTATIONS

Schools must actively ensure that students of all gender identities, gender expressions, and sexual orientations feel safe, supported, and valued at school. Nationwide, the majority of LGBTQIA+ students encounter an unaccepting, unwelcoming, and hostile school climate in which they experience discrimination based on their sexual orientation or gender identity or expression, including anti-LGBTQIA+ language, discriminatory school policies and practices, and physical, verbal, sexual, and electronic harassment and assault .[xiii] However, most students do not report these incidents to school staff because of experiences when reporting resulted in no action, they were told to ignore the actions, or they were met with victim-blaming language (e.g., to change the way they dress or not "act 'so gay'").[xiv]

LGBTQIA+ students' negative school experiences — which make students feel unsafe, cause students to miss school and avoid extracurricular activities and school functions, and contribute to lower student achievement and negative mental health effects — are unacceptable.[xv] District and school leaders have a reasonability to create safe, supportive learning environments for all students, regardless of their gender identity, gender expression, or sexual orientation.

Furthermore, transgender students experience particularly hostile school environments and outcomes, and compared to non-transgender students, are more likely to experience bullying and victimization; report negative perceptions of school climate, school safety, and school connectedness; and be absent or miss school because of safety concerns or substance use.[xvi] In one study a "majority of transgender students did not believe that staff cared about them or that staff treated students fairly."[xvii] Additionally, one study found that school counselors report a desire for additional training to best support transgender and gender non-conforming students, and that counselors with experience working with transgender students report a greater understanding of the psychological and social challenges they face, along with a higher level of comfort and confidence in working with transgender students.[xviii]

THE IMPORTANCE OF DIVERSE STAFF

A diverse teacher workforce contributes to equitable outcomes for all students, because racially diverse staff benefit the academic and non-academic outcomes of all students, particularly students of color.[xix] Empirical research finds that students of color with a teacher of the same race have higher academic achievement; fewer absences; are more likely to enroll in gifted, honors, and AP classes; and are more likely to graduate high school and enroll in college.[xx] Studies also show that Black teachers have higher expectations for Black students than white teachers.[xxi] Additionally, students of color who have a teacher of the same race experience lower levels of exclusionary discipline (e.g., suspensions and expulsions), and teachers of color serve as positive role models for all students, help counter negative racial and cultural stereotypes, and help develop students' cultural competencies.[xxii]

However, while the percentage of racially diverse teachers has grown in recent years, school districts haven't kept pace with the increasing racial and ethnic diversity of students: In 2018 (the latest year of national data), nearly 80 percent of K–12 public school teachers were white compared to 47% of public-school students.[xxiii] District leaders can improve the recruitment of diverse educators by implementing fair and equitable hiring practices, partnering with higher education institutions and alternative teacher preparation programs, and ensuring job postings are inclusive and contain language that welcomes all individuals regardless of background.[xxiv] Successfully supporting diverse educators is also critical to effective teacher retention, as teachers of color often experience unfavorable working conditions, a lack of autonomy, and antagonistic school cultures that contribute to feeling undervalued.[xxv]

CONTINUOUS RESEARCH AND EQUITY AUDITS

A commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion requires district-wide reform efforts and a continual review of data to ensure alignment with equity goals. Accordingly, based on a review of empirical literature and best practices shared within equity audit frameworks, Hanover has designed a multi-year mixed methods audit approach to help district leaders build a more diverse, equitable, and inclusive system using the following research questions:

1. To what extent is the district offering a diverse, equitable, and inclusive environment?

2. To what extent do the district's administrative and fiscal policies and practices ensure an equitable work and learning environment?

3. To what extent do the district's resource practices ensure an equitable work and learning environment?

4. To what extent do the district's curriculum and instruction policies and practices cultivate an equitable work and learning environment?

5. In what ways can the district support changes to school and classroom curricula and practices?

The research questions intentionally investigate both learning and work environment based on the assertion that school districts cannot provide an equitable and inclusive learning environment that recognizes diversity without examining the work environment in which the school and district operate.

Hanover's mixed-methodology approach to equity audits draws on annual results of both the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Diagnostic and the Equity Scorecard (both described in this report), in addition to other research studies and analyses. Additional studies are tailored to individual district needs and may include: a course sequencing analysis to understand trends and barriers to completing advanced courses; a staff recruitment, retention, and attrition analysis to analyze teacher tenure; and in-depth interview and focus group studies to uncover perceptions and experiences within the school community.

DEI DIAGNOSTIC ANALYSIS

METHODOLOGY

INSTRUMENT DESIGN

Hanover developed the DEI Diagnostic survey (See Appendix B) to assess district community members' (i.e., students, parents, and staff) perceptions of DEI in their school and district. Content experts and survey methodologists at Hanover examined relevant literature; resources developed by organizations dedicated to DEI; and trends in DEI instruments designed by Hanover for our K-12 education clients. Based on this comprehensive review, we identified the following core sections to measure:

- **Beliefs About Equity,** which focuses on the extent to which respondents agree that students should engage in classroom behaviors that are associated with an equitable learning environment. For example, do staff and parents want their students at different ability levels to collaborate? This is to understand whether, aside from wanting equitable classrooms, respondents support actions necessary to achieve equity in the classroom.

- **School Environment,** which focuses on student belonging in school. Respondents indicate how much they agree with statements like "I feel welcome at school" or "I feel like I am a part of my school community." For these items, students rate their perceptions of their own sense of belonging, while parents rate items with their child in mind, and staff report their perceptions of students' experiences.

- **Academic Environment,** which encompasses three smaller subconstructs: instructional climate, student support and resources, and grading. Together, these subconstructs address how diversity and equity are reflected and practiced in the classroom through staff diversity, instructional practices, classroom discussions, and teaching materials. Furthermore, the construct endeavors to determine whether students have equitable access to extra- and co-curricular activities, college and career support, and classes, and whether grading is performed equitably within and across classrooms. Finally, staff are asked if they believe resources, student diversity, and staff diversity are similar across all district schools.

- **Social Environment,** which is also divided into subconstructs (students' positive relationships and discipline and safety). Respondents indicate how much they agree with items related to students' positive interactions with adults and each other at school (e.g., treated fairly and with respect), to school safety (including building maintenance and proper accommodations such as wheelchair ramps), and to disciplinary practices. Respondents are also asked about the frequency with which students engage with other students from different backgrounds in and out of school.

- **Staff Perceptions** survey questions ask staff to reflect on school and district practices that support an equitable environment. For example, respondents are asked if their school or their district supports culturally sustaining practices and pedagogies, provides staff time to collaborate on strategies for equitable instruction, and provides enough quality professional development on equity-related topics. Staff also indicate whether their school and district treat staff members from all backgrounds with respect.

- **Engagement and Outreach** survey questions ask parents and staff about how their school engages families in the community. For example, do families feel welcome and valued by their child's school? These items also address how involved parents and guardians are in student learning and the school environment.

- Finally, **District Priorities** survey questions ask parents and staff how they believe the district should prioritize different equity initiatives.

The final survey instrument is developmentally appropriate for students grade 6 and above. It uses survey flow and display logic to ensure that respondent groups only see questions relevant and appropriate for their age and relation to the district.

ANALYSIS

Analysis of Hanover's DEI Diagnostic survey data involved three main processes: data cleaning, topline analysis, and segmentation analysis.

Data cleaning is a rigorous process designed to eliminate low-quality data. It involves a thorough review of responses for thoughtfulness, logical consistency, and attention to detail. Responses that trigger "flags" on several measures of these constructs are removed from the dataset. The DEI Diagnostic survey data was cleaned at the district level, and the clean data was compiled into the final national-level dataset.

Topline analysis explores patterns across all responses in all districts. It's particularly useful for identifying topics or issues upon which there is broad consensus. Segmentation analysis explores differences by respondent or district characteristic.

In this analysis, responses by district type are segmented by enrollment, geography, and affluence. An interactive dashboard of survey results allows for additional segmentation analysis, including results by district characteristics. District characteristics were identified through data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). For enrollment, we chose two measures: total student enrollment and percentage of diverse students. NCES defines this group as students who are Black, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, or two or more races. For geography, we use two measures: region (Northeast, South, Midwest, or West), urbanicity (city, suburb, town, or rural). To classify affluence, we use the percentage of students who receive free or reduced-priced lunch (FRL). Respondents are also segmented by role (i.e., student, parent, staff), gender, grade-level, race/ethnicity, and participation in English language (EL) programs and/or special education (SPED) programs.

One of the most important advantages to the size of this DEI Diagnostic dataset (n=109,317) is that we can make meaningful comparisons that involve respondents with characteristics that are relevant to diversity, equity, and inclusion but who frequently lack sufficient representation at the district level to be included in the district-level segmentation analysis. For example, this dataset includes more than 3,500 respondents whose gender identity is non-binary and more than 700 respondents from racial groups with typically smaller populations, including American Indian or Alaska Native (n=767) and Middle Eastern or North African (n=1,103). Also, as the sample size increases, the probability decreases that the difference we observe between segments exists by chance. The segmentation analysis in this report reflects their perspectives.

KEY FINDINGS

This report summarizes key findings and trends identified in the results of the DEI Diagnostic national dataset developed by Hanover Research. These results are not nationally representative: The analysis does not add weighting to the data when presenting the results. However, the data include survey results from districts across all regions in the United States and with a range of enrollment sizes and urbanicities.

PRIORITIES FOR SUPPORTING DIVERSITY AND EQUITY IN EDUCATION

Parents and staff generally agree on what areas should be a priority for supporting diversity and equity in education for students of diverse backgrounds: ensuring a welcoming and safe school environment, ensuring that high quality resources (such as teachers, learning materials, and programs) are available across schools, promoting access to all courses (including advanced courses), and promoting access to all extracurricular activities (Figure A.3).

Over four-fifths of parent and staff respondents indicate that ensuring a welcoming and safe school environment for students of diverse backgrounds is a high priority or essential. Overall, schools appear to be successful in these areas currently (Figures A.3, B.1a, G.2a).

- **Generally, respondents agree that students feel welcome at school (81%).** However, students are less likely to agree that they feel welcome at school (77%) compared to parents or staff agreeing that their child/students feel(s) welcome at school (83% and 87% respectively). Similarly, students less frequently agree that they feel like a part of their school community (68%) compared to the percentage of parents and staff who think their children/students feel like they are a part of their school community (73% and 76% respectively).

- **About three-fourths of respondents agree that they/their child feel(s) safe at school (79%), the school meets the needs of all students (79%), and the school is well-maintained (74%).** However, 36% of respondents agree that bullying is a problem at school. Staff less frequently agree that bullying is a problem (25%), compared to parents (35%) or students (41%). Also, they more often agree that they feel safe at school (87%) when compared to parents (83%) or students (75%).

Over 70% of parent and staff respondents say that ensuring high-quality resources (such as teachers, learning materials, and programs) are available across schools and promoting access to all courses and extracurricular activities to students of diverse backgrounds should be high priority or essential (Figure A.3, C.3a, D.1a, D.2a).

- Most students agree that their teachers encourage them to take challenging classes (59%), and 73% of student respondents agree their teachers help them feel confident that they can do well in school.

- At least 75% of all respondent groups (i.e., students, parents, and staff) agree that students from all backgrounds have access to extra-curricular activities (84% overall), access to co-curricular activities (83% overall), and access to all classes (81% overall).

- Agreement is slightly lower for college and career support at school. Most staff agree that, at school, students from all backgrounds have effective college and career support to meet their goals (82%). However, only 70% of students and 65% of parents agree that they/their child has effective support.

- Fewer than half of staff respondents agree that resources are equally distributed across all district schools (40%). Meanwhile, only 42% of staff agree that staff diversity is similar across all district schools, and 34% agree that student diversity is similar across all district schools.

DIFFERING PERSPECTIVES ON DEI

Individuals who identify/whose children identify as female or male express notably different perceptions from individuals who do not (e.g., non-binary, gender non-conforming) (Figure A.1b, B.1b, G.2b, H.2b).

- Most female and male respondents agree that, overall, their school supports students, families, and staff from all different gender identities or expressions (71% and 73% respectively). However, only 46% of respondents who identify as non-binary/gender non-conforming[1] or whose child identifies as non-binary/gender non-conforming agree with this statement.

- Fewer respondents who identify or whose child identifies as non-binary/gender non-conforming agree that they, their child, or students in general feel welcome at school (59%); are proud of their school (51%); feel like a part of their school community (51%); or like school (45%), compared to respondents who identify or whose child identifies as female or male, whose agreement rates are around 20% or more higher for each item.

  Similarly, only 56% of respondents who identify or whose child identifies as non-binary/gender non-conforming agree that they/their child feel(s) safe at school, and 50% agree that bullying is a problem. By comparison, about 80% of respondents who identify or whose child identifies as female or male agree that they/their child feel(s) safe at school, and only 35% agree that bullying is a problem at school.

- Staff who identify as gender non-binary/gender non-conforming less frequently agree that their school (58%) and the district (50%) treats staff members from all backgrounds with respect compared to female and male staff members (about 90% at the school level school and about 80% at the district level district).

Staff express markedly differing perceptions of distribution of resources, student diversity, and staff diversity across district schools; equitable assessment practices; and treatment by their school and district depending on their race/ethnicity (Figures D.2b, E.1a, E.1b, H.2c).

- Around three out of five Asian staff respondents agree that staff diversity (58%) and student diversity (57%) is similar across all districts and that resources are equally distributed across all district schools (61%). Similarly, around half of Hispanic or Latin(o/a/x) respondents agree with these statements (52%, 48%, and 50% for each item respectively). However, closer to one-third of Black or African American staff respondents agree with these three statements (31%, 34%, and 34% respectively).

- Overall, most staff agree that they or teachers at their school ensure assessments are taken in equitable conditions (86%), are equitable (82%), and are not culturally biased (77%). However, Black/African American staff less frequently agree with these statements (75%, 70%, and 61% respectively).

  Compared to Asian, Hispanic or Latin(o/a/x), and White staff; Black or African American staff less frequently agree that their school (79% vs. about 90%) or district (67% vs. about 80%) treats staff members from all backgrounds with respect.

---

[1] In this report, "non-binary/gender non-conforming" includes individuals who indicated that their gender was not one of the listed options or that they prefer to self-describe their gender identity. This designation is used for brevity.

English learners (ELs) and parents of ELs typically express views that are similar to or more positive than non-ELs and non-ELs' parents (Figures C.2b, C.3b).

- Notably, compared to non-ELs and their parents, ELs and their parents more frequently agree that teachers adjust lessons to fit their/students' different learning style(s) (75% vs. 59%) and can help all students succeed (84% vs. 77%).
- Furthermore, student ELs more frequently agree that their teachers encourage them to take challenging classes (63% vs. 59%) and help them feel confident that they can do well in school (82% vs.

Students enrolled in special education (SPED) and their parents express positive views of teacher support for students, but there may be barriers to classes and activities (Figures C.2c, C.3c, D.1b).

- Compared to students who are not enrolled in special education (SPED) and their parents, SPED respondents more frequently agree that teachers adjust lessons to fit their/students' different learning styles (70% vs. 60%); that teachers can help all students succeed (78% vs. 77%); and that their teachers help them feel confident that they can do well in school (78% vs. 73%).
- However, slightly fewer student SPED respondents agree that their teachers encourage them to take challenging classes compared to non-SPED students (54% vs. 60%). For parents and students, SPED respondents also less frequently agree that they have/their child has access to all classes (67% vs. 83%); access to co-curricular activities (74% vs. 84%); access to extra-curricular activities (75% vs. 85%); or effective college and career support to meet their goals (64% vs. 70%).

EQUITY SCORECARD ANALYSIS

METHODOLOGY

DATA

Hanover Research collected student-level data from 44 member districts across the country for the five-year period from 2016–17 (2017) to 2020–21 (2021) to create individual Equity Scorecards. This data was then aggregated to create the national dataset analyzed in this report. Participating districts vary in size, region, urbanicity, and the demographic makeup of their students. However, this analysis does not include weighting for representation, and the national dataset might not form a representative sample of students across the country. The combined national dataset has more limited representation among smaller districts, districts in towns and rural areas, and districts in the Northeast. Overall, these data describe almost 1 million students in each year of data between 2017 and 2020 (highest in 2019, n=977,328) and 652,154 students in 2021. Thirty of the 44 districts provided data for the most recent year at the time of this analysis, compared to 40–44 districts from 2017 to 2020. Hanover is continuing to expand on this dataset over time.

The dataset also includes district and student characteristics to allow for a comparative analysis by student group and district type. **District characteristics** are enrollment, region (Northeast, South, Midwest, or West), urbanicity (city, suburb, town, or rural), the percentage of diverse students, and the percentage of economically disadvantaged students (i.e., students received free or reduced-price meals). **Student characteristics** describe gender, race/ethnicity, economic disadvantage (FRL) status, English Learner (EL) status, participation in Special Education (SPED), and Section 504 plan status.

MEASURED STUDENT OUTCOMES

Hanover's Equity Scorecard tracks student outcomes within two broad categories: success outcomes and risk outcomes Hanover groups desirable or positively framed outcomes (e.g., proficiency on state standardized assessments) as "success" outcomes and undesirable or negatively framed outcomes as "risk" outcomes. The national dataset compiles common and comparable outcomes from individual districts. The table below summarizes student outcomes included in the national dataset and in this analysis.

Success Outcomes	Risk Outcomes
Academic	**Academic**
• **Advanced Course Enrollment** • **GPA > 3.0** • **Graduation within 4 years** • **Postsecondary Enrollment**	• ELA/Math Course Failure
Proficient on State Assessments*	**Behavioral**
• **Algebra 1** • **Math** • **Reading ELA** • **Science** • **Social Studies**	• Chronically Absent • Had a Suspension • Had Disciplinary Incident
Local Assessments**	
• **Met Projected Growth on MAP Math** • **Met Projected Growth on MAP Reading**	

* State assessments were waived in 2020 and administered in fewer districts in 2021, thus most assessment data are from 2017 to 2019.

**The most administered local assessment across the 44 districts included in this analysis is the NWEA-MAP assessment in reading and math, which applies to students from six districts only.

THE REPRESENTATION INDEX

To identify disproportionalities in the data, Hanover calculated representation indices (RI), also known as disproportionality indices. These indices compare the share of students in a particular group among students who achieve a given outcome with that same group's share of the general student population. For example, consider the following hypothetical representation of Black students among students achieving a GPA of 3.0 or higher:

- **Proportional Representation (RI = 1)**: If the percentage of Black students among students with a GPA > 3.0 is equal to the percentage of Black students among all students, then Black students are *proportionally represented* for this outcome.
- **Underrepresentation (RI < 1)**: If the percentage of Black students among students with a GPA > 3.0 is less than the percentage of Black students among all students, then Black students are *underrepresented* for this outcome.
- **Overrepresentation (RI > 1)**: If the percentage of Black students among students with a GPA > 3.0 is more than the percentage of Black students among all students, then Black students are *overrepresented* for this outcome.

DATA SUPPRESSION

The total number of students represented in data from Hanover members approach one million per year. However, some data and results are suppressed to avoid identifying districts and/or students. To this end, Hanover does not include results for a group of fewer than five districts or fewer than 30 students. This restriction has suppressed any findings for the Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander student group for all observed outcomes and for the American Indian or Alaska Native student group for a subset of outcomes.

KEY FINDINGS

Across Hanover's diverse set of member districts, student data reveal some broadly apparent gaps in success outcomes. Students that are American Indian or Alaska Native, Black, Hispanic or Latin(o/a/x), multiracial, economically disadvantaged [as determined by free or reduced lunch (FRL) status], English Learners (ELs), and students receiving Special Education (SPED) services are underrepresented in many success outcomes like proficiency on standardized assessments, enrollment in advanced courses, and achieving an annual GPA of 3.0 or higher. These student groups were underrepresented in these success outcomes during each of the years from 2017 to 2021, though state assessments were waived in 2020 and administered in fewer districts in 2021. Throughout the key findings, we highlight specific data from 2019 as this represents that last full year of data before COVID-19 disruptions. Many 2020 and 2021 outcomes are suppressed at the student group level due to small counts.

- In 2019, Black, Hispanic, and Multiracial students were less likely than their White peers to enroll in advanced courses (30–35% vs. 45%) and to achieve a 3.0 GPA (51–56% vs. 69%).
- In the same year, American Indian or Alaska Native students were less likely than their White peers to be proficient on state assessments in reading/ELA and math (about 24% in both areas compared to 63% and 59% respectively, among White students).
- About 36–39% of FRL students were proficient on state ELA and math assessments in 2019, compared to 58–63% of non-FRL students. FRL students were also less likely to enroll in advanced courses (31% vs. 49%) and achieve a 3.0 GPA (51% vs. 67%).
- ELs were less likely to reach proficiency on state ELA and math assessments (34% and 38%, respectively) than non-ELs (54% and 47% respectively) in 2019. ELs were also less likely to enroll in advanced courses (28% vs. 42%) and to achieve a 3.0 GPA (48% vs. 59%).

Many of these same groups are overrepresented in undesirable risk outcomes like chronic absenteeism, involvement in disciplinary incidents or suspensions, or failure in an ELA or math course in high school, which hinders on-time graduation. The degree of overrepresentation in risk outcomes is the most apparent for Black students and FRL students. Students receiving SPED services are also overrepresented in chronic absenteeism,

disciplinary incidents, and suspensions. Hispanic or Latin(o/a/x) students are overrepresented in failing an ELA or math course. American Indian or Alaska Native students are an exception to this trend and are underrepresented in chronic absenteeism, incidents, and suspensions. There is not a notable gap in attendance and behavior outcomes by EL status.

- In 2019, American Indian or Alaska Native students (32%), Black students (24%), and multiracial students (26%) were more likely to be chronically absent than White students (18%). Overall, Hispanic or Latin(o/a x) students were about as likely to be chronically absent (17%) as White students.

- Over the five-year period, Black students are almost three times as likely to be cited for disciplinary infractions as White students and more than three times as likely to be suspended. American Indian or Alaska Native students, Hispanic or Latin(o/a/x) students, and multiracial students had smaller differences in these outcomes from White students. In 2019, about 38% of Black students had an incident, and about 32% had a suspension in 2019, compared to 16% and 10% respectively, among White students.

The scale of Hanover's national dataset also allows for analysis of success and risk outcomes by district characteristics. We identified several notable differences in representation by district size, urbanicity, percentage of economically disadvantaged students (FRL), and percentage of students of color.

- **District Size:** Larger districts that serve more than 10,000 students have higher representation of Black students, Hispanic students, FRL students, ELs, and students with Section 504 accommodations in success outcomes than smaller districts. Smaller districts that serve fewer than 20,000 students had lower representation of Black students in risk outcomes than larger districts, especially when compared to districts that serve more than 20,000 students. For example, 33% of Black students in districts with fewer than 10,000 students had a disciplinary incident in 2019, and 19% were suspended. In districts with more than 20,000 students, these rates were 41% and 34% respectively. Larger districts had lower representations of FRL students in the suspension outcome than smaller districts, but similar rates of chronic absenteeism and disciplinary incidents.

- **Urbanicity**: Districts in cities have higher representation of Black students and ELs who enrolled in advanced courses than districts in suburbs. In 2019, 33% of Black students and 30% of ELs at city districts enrolled in advanced courses, compared to 43% of White students and 43% of non-ELs in the same districts. In suburban districts, these rates were 24% for Black students and 15% for ELs, compared to 48% of White students and 41% of non-ELs. Black students in suburban districts have lower representation in some risk outcomes — chronic absenteeism and disciplinary incidents — than in city districts. However, Black students in suburban districts also have higher representation in ELA or math course failure and suspensions compared to those in city districts.

- **Percentage of Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Students:** In districts comprised of a majority of FRL students, students in many underserved groups have greater representation in success outcomes than the same groups in districts with a minority of FRL students. The gaps in proficiency on state assessments in reading/ELA and math between Black students, Hispanic students, FRL students, ELs, and students receiving SPED services and their comparison groups (White students, non-FRL students, non-ELs, and students not receiving SPED services) are smaller at majority-FRL districts than at minority-FRL districts. For example, at majority-FRL districts in 2019, about 45% of FRL students were proficient on the state reading/ELA assessment, compared to 63% of non-FRL students. At minority-FRL districts, the reading/ELA proficiency rates for FRL and non-FRL students are 29% and 63% respectively. Similarly, Black students, FRL students, and students who received SPED services have less representation in risk outcomes at majority-FRL districts than the same groups at minority-FRL districts.

- **Percentage of Students of Color**: The differences found between majority-FRL and minority-FRL districts are also present for some student groups when comparing districts where students of color form the majority of students and districts where they form the minority. The gaps in proficiency on state assessments and advanced course enrollment between FRL students, ELs, and their comparison groups are smaller in districts where students of color make up the majority of the population,

compared to districts where they are not the majority. The gaps in chronic absenteeism, incidents, and suspensions between Black students, FRL students, and their comparison groups are smaller in districts where students of color represent the majority, compared to districts where they do not. While the gap in chronic absenteeism between ELs and non-ELs is smaller in districts where students of color are in the majority, the gaps in discipline and suspension are similar.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

The data presented in this report suggests that the work of empowering students to develop talents and skills to their greatest potential is not done. There are many barriers that prevent students, regardless of their socioeconomic or racial status, or gender identity from achieving equitable results in the K-12 space. It is therefore incumbent upon everyone involved in education to prioritize and examine the policies, programs, and practices that create barriers to students' academic and emotional success. But the need goes beyond students and must be inclusive of staff and families as well. There are no simple or expeditious solutions. Rather, it requires an intentional effort by education leaders, the resilience to persist and facilitate consensus-building, a disruption of a deficit view of equity, and a reliance on shared experiences to move a system forward. To support this effort, we offer the following strategies, implications for practice, and future research recommendations.

- **District and school leaders should examine barriers to creating a sense of belonging for all students and staff and make an intentional effort to support feelings of value and connectedness in the school setting.** A sense of belonging correlates with an increased sense of well-being for both students and staff and greater academic engagement for students. According to survey results, most respondents indicate that ensuring a welcoming and safe environment, particularly for students and staff who identify as non-binary/gender non-conforming, as a high priority. At the same time, students and staff with these identities indicate that bullying is problematic and feeling respected is an obstacle to well-being. It is important for districts to continue to gather stakeholder perceptions through DEI or culture and climate surveys. Giving students and staff voice by leveraging qualitative data collection in the form of interviews or focus groups can provide a deeper understanding of the "why" behind perceptions. Also, continued data collection around student academic outcomes, course access, attendance, and behavior incidents can provide the district with valuable information on progress toward goals and mitigating disparities.

- **Education leaders should be intentional in providing equity-related professional development that supports educators in adopting strategies and conditions to support a culturally responsive pedagogy and challenges them to critically examine their classroom environment and interactions with students.** Professional development intended to support culturally responsive teaching and learning, and to develop classroom environments that are supportive of all students, demonstrates a district's commitment to creating a culture of equity and inclusiveness. This is important because survey results indicate Black or African American staff are less likely to agree that their school engages in equitable practices for students or staff. Staff will benefit from professional learning that focuses on cultural responsiveness, differentiation, and supporting special populations.

- **District leaders should recruit a diverse teacher workforce that is representative of the racial and ethnic composition of the student population**. Survey results indicate that less than half of staff respondents agree that staff diversity is similar across all district schools and even fewer believe that student diversity is similar across all district schools. Access to a racially and culturally diverse staff has powerful implications for the success of all students, but particularly for students of color. Steps that districts can take to diversify the candidate pipeline include using data to determine underrepresentation and to forecast staffing needs. Additional strategies include setting achievable hiring goals, partnering with local colleges, universities, and alternative teacher preparation programs, provide staff who are involved in recruitment with implicit bias training, and establish fair and competitive compensation practices.

- **School leaders should build frameworks to ensure equitable opportunities for all students, including people of color, non-native English speakers, and those from low socio-economic households**. The quantitative analysis highlighted in this report reveals persistent gaps in enrollment in advanced courses with Black, Hispanic, and Multiracial students less likely than White peers (30–34% vs. 42%) to take advantage of advanced course offerings. A wider gap exists for students who qualify for free and reduced-price lunch (FRL) when compared to non-FRL students (30% vs. 48%) and is also evident for English Learners (EL) versus non-Els (31%–41%). Opportunity gaps underscore the obstacles that some

students encounter throughout their education, placing the responsibility with inequitable systems. It is therefore imperative that districts engage in a process of identifying the root causes of these disproportionalities to accurately identify effective solutions.

- **School districts should update equity audits on an annual basis and continue to support additional quantitative and qualitative research that examines policies, programs, and practices, and which gives voice to all education stakeholders**. Ongoing data collection is critical to identifying systemic patterns that highlight successes and areas for improvement. Identifying and utilizing key performance indicators as a measure of the district's responsibility to ensure diversity and equity, also demonstrates its commitment to systemic change. A critical component of this process is to be transparent in the process by informing students, families, and staff of research outcomes such as those highlighted in this paper. Research summaries in the form of infographics can be posted on district websites or disseminated through email and other common district communication modalities.

DOWNLOAD A COMPLETE APPENDIX OF
THE DATA COMPILED FOR THIS REPORT

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

CREATING SAFE LEARNING AND WORKING ENVIRONMENTS

Systematizing Climates that Elevate Student Voice and a Sense of Safety and Belonging

Explores reasons why students do not report bullying, explores systematized structures for positive school climates, and presents strategies for improving students' emotional security.

Fostering Safe and Inclusive Workplace Communities

Describes models for ideal inclusive workplace environments and examines strategies for embedding inclusiveness in the workplace.

Inclusive Classrooms Toolkit
(Member only access)

Explains the benefits of students participating in an inclusive classroom, provides strategies for implementing an inclusive environment, and explores how to navigate conversations on controversial topics.

Best Practices for Elevating Student Voice

Provides strategies for encouraging student voice and self-efficacy in decision-making processes.

Best Practices in Staff Recognition

Summarizes the importance of staff recognition and provides examples of staff recognition at the district and school levels.

Building a Diverse, Equitable, Inclusive Environment Toolkit

Synthesizes existing research literature and policy guidance related to educational equity and culturally sustaining pedagogies and policies.

SUPPORTING STUDENTS AND POSITIVE STUDENT OUTCOMES

Best Practices for Equitable Advanced Course Participation and Supports

Describes effective strategies for increasing enrollment in advanced courses among underrepresented groups and describes effective supports for student success.

Strategies for Improving Student Attendance: Policies and Practices

Explores attendance policies and implementation practices that encourage students to attend school and remain engaged.

Supporting Transgender and Non-Binary Students Toolkit

Provides strategies and resources to education school community members, identifies school-based social-emotional support structures, and outlines steps for creating awareness of community-based services and resources.

Maximizing SEL Through an Equity Lens
(Member only access)

Provides SEL practices that align with equity-focused priority and outlines strategies to implement SEL and guide equity-focused conversations districtwide.

PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING AN EQUITY AUDIT

K–12 Climate Survey
(Member only access)

Provides leaders with a lens into the current state of school climate in their district, with results reportable by demographic characteristics.

Research Brief: Equity Statement Development

Outlines recommended practices for the content and structure of a positional statement aligned with a district's short- and long-term DEI goals.

Systemic Implementation of Equity: Guide
(Member only access)
A sample from Hanover's Educator Learning Center with strategies for school and district leaders to introduce an equity mindset across their organization and begin alignment of decision-making with equity goals.

Benchmarking Equity KPIs

Presents a benchmarking analysis of districts' strategic plans for equity focused key performance indicators and measures.

Preparing for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Strategic Planning

Provides an overview of best practices for diversity, equity, and inclusion strategic planning and goal development.

Systemic Implementation of Equity: Toolkit

Supports district leaders and equity committee members in guiding initial conversations around equity to support a district's first steps to prioritize equity across the district.

District Equity Document Development

Analyzes seven in-depth interviews with equity leaders and other education organizations to understand how each approaches the development of foundational equity documents.

ENDNOTES

i [1] "Educational Equity." Center for Public Education, 2016. https://www.nsba.org/-/media/NSBA/File/cpe-educational-equity-research-brief-january-2016.pdf [2] Travers, J. "What Is Resource Equity?" Education Resource Strategies, October 2018. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED593369.pdf [3] Patrick, K., A. Rose Socol, and I. Morgan. "Inequities in Advanced Coursework." Education Trust, The Education Trust, 2020.

ii [1] Reynolds, K.J. et al. "How Does School Climate Impact Academic Achievement? An Examination of Social Identity Processes." *School Psychology International*, 38:1, February 1, 2017. Retrieved from Sage Journals. [2] "The Importance of Belonging - A Nationwide Look at Adolescent Students' Sense of Belonging." EVERFI. pp. 4–6. https://2gag5314usvg3k1yhz13gzy4-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Belonging_11_17.pdf

iii [1] Healey, K. and C. Stroman. "Structures for Belonging: A Synthesis of Research on Belonging-Supportive Learning Environments." Student Experience Research Network, February 2021. http://studentexperiencenetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Structures-for-Belonging.pdf [2] "The Importance of Belonging-A Nationwide Look at Adolescent Students' Sense of Belonging," Op. cit.

iv [1] Voight, A. et al. "The Racial School Climate Gap: Within-School Disparities in Students' Experiences of Safety, Support, and Connectedness." American Journal of Community Psychology, 56, September 17, 2015. pp. 9, 13–14. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282040467_The_Racial_School_Climate_Gap_WithinSchool_Disparities_in_Students'_Experiences_of_Safety_Support_and_Connectedness [2] Voight, A. "The Racial School-Climate Gap." Region IX Equity Assistance Center at WestEd, 2013. p. 4. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED580366.pdf

v Bradshaw, C.P. et al. "Teachers' and Education Support Professionals' Perspectives on Bullying and Prevention: Findings From a National Education Association Study." *School Psychology Review*, 42:3, September 2013. p. 280. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

vi Ibid., pp. 280, 289–291.

vii [1] Morgan, T.L., D. Zakhem, and W.L. Cooper. "From High School Access to Postsecondary Success: An Exploratory Study of the Impact of High-Rigor Coursework." *Education Sciences*, 8:4, 2018. https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/8/4/191/pdf [2] Patrick, Rose Socol, and Morgan, Op. cit., pp. 2–14. [3] "The Opportunity Myth." TNTP, 2018. https://tntp.org/assets/documents/TNTP_The-Opportunity-Myth_Web.pdf "5 Things to Advance Equity in Access to and Success in Advanced Coursework." The Education Trust, December, 9, 2019. https://s3-us-east-2.amazonaws.com/edtrustmain/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/17121031/5-Things-State-Leaders-Should-Do-to-Advance-Equity-Access-to-and-Success-in-Advanced-Coursework-November-2019.pdf

viii [1] Grissom, J.A. and C. Redding. "Discretion and Disproportionality: Explaining the Underrepresentation of High-Achieving Students of Color in Gifted Programs." *AERA Open*, 2:1, January 2016. Retrieved from SAGE Publications. [2] Patrick, Rose Socol, and Morgan, Op. cit. [3] "The Opportunity Myth," Op. cit. [4 Wright, B.L., D.Y. Ford, and J.L. Young. "Ignorance or Indifference? Seeking Excellence and Equity for Under-Represented Students of Color in Gifted Education." *Global Education Review*, 4:1, 2017. https://eric.ed.gov/?q=Ignorance+or+Indifference%3f+Seeking+Excellence+and+Equity+for+Under-Represented+Students+of+Color+in+Gifted+Education&id=EJ1137997 [5] Siegel-Hawley, G. et al. "Segregation within Schools: Unequal Access to AP Courses by Race and Economic Status in Virginia." Center for Education and Civil Rights, PennState College of Education and Virginia Commonwealth University School of Education, April 2021. https://cecr.ed.psu.edu/sites/default/files/Segregation_within_Schools_Unequal_Access_Virginia_2021.pdf

ix [1] Patrick, Rose Socol, and Morgan, Op. cit., p. 7. [2] "The Opportunity Myth," Op. cit., pp. 4–5, 21–27, 30–42.

x Travers, Op. cit., p. 1.

xi Ibid., pp. 2–3.

xii "The Opportunity Myth," Op. cit., pp. 4–5, 21–27, 30–42.

xiii Kosciw, J.G. et al. "The 2019 National School Climate Survey: The Experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Youth in Our Nation's Schools." GLSEN, 2020. pp. 15–49. https://www.glsen.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/NSCS19-FullReport-032421-Web_0.pdf

xiv Ibid., pp. 31–33.

xv Ibid., pp. 15–49.

xvi [1] Pampati, S. et al. "School Climate among Transgender High School Students: An Exploration of School Connectedness, Perceived Safety, Bullying, and Absenteeism." *The Journal of School Nursing*, 36:4, 2020. https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/105974/cdc_105974_DS1.pdf [2] Day, J.K., A. Perez-Brumer, and S.T. Russell. "Safe Schools? Transgender Youth's School Experiences and Perceptions of School Climate." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 47:8, August 2018. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7153781/pdf/nihms-1571076.pdf

xvii Pampati et al., Op. cit.

xviii Ausloos, C.D. et al. "A Call for Action: School Counselor Competence in Working With Trans Students." *Professional Counselor*, 12:1, January 2022. Accessed via EBSCOhost.

[xix] Blazar, D. "Teachers of Color, Culturally Responsive Teaching, and Student Outcomes: Experimental Evidence from the Random Assignment of Teachers to Classes." *Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University*, EdWorkingPaper No. 21-501., December 2021. https://www.edworkingpapers.com/sites/default/files/ai21-501.pdf

[xx] [1] Grissom and Redding, Op. cit. [2] Gershenson, S. et al. "The Long-Run Impacts of Same-Race Teachers." *National Bureau of Economic Research*, Working Paper 25254, 2018. https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w25254/w25254.pdf [3] Lindsay, C.A. and C.M.D. Hart. "Exposure to Same-Race Teachers and Student Disciplinary Outcomes for Black Students in North Carolina." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 39:3, September 1, 2017. Accessed via SagePub. [4] Carver-Thomas, D. "Diversifying the Teaching Profession: How to Recruit and Retain Teachers of Color." Learning Policy Institute, 2018. https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/sites/default/files/product-files/Diversifying_Teaching_Profession_REPORT_0.pdf [5] Rafa, A. and M. Roberts. "Building a Diverse Teacher Workforce. Policy Brief." Education Commission of the States, ERIC, 2020. https://www.ecs.org/wp-content/uploads/Building_a_Diverse_Teacher_Workforce.pdf

[xxi] [1] Egalite, A.J., B. Kisida, and M.A. Winters. "Representation in the Classroom: The Effect of Own-Race Teachers on Student Achievement." *Economics of Education Review*, 45, April 1, 2015. https://racce.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/eer-representation-in-the-classroom.pdf [2] Joshi, E., S. Doan, and M.G. Springer. "Student-Teacher Race Congruence: New Evidence and Insight From Tennessee." *AERA Open*, 4:4, October 1, 2018. Accessed via SagePub. [3] Yarnell, L.M. and G.W. Bohrnstedt. "Student-Teacher Racial Match and Its Association With Black Student Achievement: An Exploration Using Multilevel Structural Equation Modeling." *American Educational Research Journal*, 55:2, April 1, 2018. Accessed via SagePub. [4] Gershenson, S., S.B. Holt, and N.W. Papageorge. "Who Believes in Me? The Effect of Student–Teacher Demographic Match on Teacher Expectations." *Economics of Education Review*, 52, June 1, 2016. Accessed via ProQuest

[xxii] [1] Lindsay and Hart, Op. cit. [2] Wright, A., M.A. Gottfried, and V.-N. Le. "A Kindergarten Teacher Like Me: The Role of Student-Teacher Race in Social-Emotional Development." *American Educational Research Journal*, 54:1_suppl, April 1, 2017. Accessed via SagePub. [3] Shirrell, M., T.J. Bristol, and T.A. Britton. "The Effects of Student-Teacher Ethnoracial Matching on Exclusionary Discipline for Asian American, Black, and Latinx Students: Evidence From New York City." *Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University*, EdWorkingPaper No. 21-475, October 8, 2021. https://edworkingpapers.com/sites/default/files/ai21-475.pdf [4] Nevarez, C., S. Jouganatos, and J.L. Wood. "Benefits of Teacher Diversity: Leading for Transformative Change." *Journal of School Administration Research and Development*, 4:1, July 20, 2019. https://www.ojed.org/index.php/JSARD/article/view/1940 [5] Casey, L. et al. "The State of Teacher Diversity in American Education. Washington, DC: Albert Shanker Institute." Albert Shanker Institute, 2015. [6] Carver-Thomas, Op. cit. [7] Gershenson et al., Op. cit.

[xxiii] [1] "Race and Ethnicity of Public School Teachers and Their Students." U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, September 2020. https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2020/2020103.pdf [2] Schaeffer, K. "America's Public School Teachers Are Far Less Racially and Ethnically Diverse than Their Students." Pew Research Center, December 2021. https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/12/10/americas-public-school-teachers-are-far-less-racially-and-ethnically-diverse-than-their-students/

[xxiv] [1] Ellison, J. "Hiring for Cultural Responsiveness – A Necessary Consideration." Aurora Institute, April 11, 2018. https://aurora-institute.org/cw_post/hiring-for-cultural-responsiveness-a-necessary-consideration/ [2] Partee, G.L. "Retaining Teachers of Color in Our Public Schools." Center for American Progress, June 2014. https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Partee-TeachersOfColor-report2.pdf [3] "The State of Teacher Diversity in American Education." Albert Shanker Institute, 2015. https://www.shankerinstitute.org/resource/teacherdiversity [4] Carver-Thomas, Op. cit. [5] Baeza, C. "An Inclusive Workplace Begins with the Wording of Job Ads." BBVA, March 7, 2019. https://www.bbva.com/en/an-inclusive-workplace-begins-with-the-wording-of-job-ads/ [6] Cort, J. "A 5-Step Approach to Aligning Hiring and Diversity Goals." National Association of Independent Schools, 2018. https://www.nais.org/magazine/independent-school/fall-2018/a-5-step-approach-to-aligning-hiring-and-diversity-goals/ [7] "Prohibited Employment Policies/Practices." U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. https://www.eeoc.gov/prohibited-employment-policiespractices [8] Arigbe, O. "Can Your Job Posting Attract Diverse Candidates?" The SHRM Blog-Society for Human Resource Management, August 6, 2020. https://blog.shrm.org/blog/can-your-job-posting-attract-diverse-candidates

[xxv] Dixon, D., A. Griffin, and M. Teoh. "If You Listen, We Will Stay: Why Teachers of Color Leave and How to Disrupt Teacher Turnover." *Education Trust*, 2019. https://edtrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/If-You-Listen-We-Will-Stay-Why-Teachers-of-Color-Leave-and-How-to-Disrupt-Teacher-Turnover-2019-September.pdf