Chapter 5

Community Schools as a Vehicle for Social Justice and Equity

Monica A. Medina

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, USA

Khaila H. Murtadha

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, USA

Jim Grim

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, USA

ABSTRACT

A deficit narrative of academic success in low-performing schools is articulated in cultural norms set by those who fail to understand how poverty and racial inequality manifests through daily interactions, beliefs, and biases. Work to address race and poverty are emotional, complicated, and challenging because the concepts are avoided, minimized, or disputed by a dominant narrative and privileged cultures that oppress students of color. This chapter is not about a study of race or poverty nor does it seek to forward understanding of how race and class intersect. Instead, it focuses on the ways a university has promoted social justice and equity in the development of community schools. This work encompasses: the influence of change through advocacy and policy, issues of school culture and climate, and shared leadership. It recognizes emerging perceptions impacting health, violence, and food security that cause socio/emotional issues not considered when critically addressing issues of race and poverty. Therefore, community schools are a vehicle for social justice and equity.

INTRODUCTION

Working with communities to improve schooling – and thereby democracy – is a central premise of the growing community schools movement. A century-old idea that originated with social reformers Jane Addams and John Dewey, community schools are neighborhood hubs that bring together families, educators, government agencies, and community groups and organizations to provide all the opportunities

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-7998-0280-8.ch005

and services young people need to thrive. The movement has experienced a renaissance of sorts, tied to the broader 'new localism' (Hunter Quartz, 2019).

For decades, education reformers and politicians have attempted to improve schools by creating a competitive market-driven approach to education. Despite these efforts, many school communities are limited by social and political situations, often wrestling with extreme gaps in wealth and resources. Researchers note how the complexity and multiplicity of impediments point to inequitable resources, racial bias, disparities in school funding, and a curriculum that fails to acknowledge the histories, contributions, and learning styles of students of color (Delpit, 2006, Ladson-Billings, 1995; Nieto & Bode, 2012; Valenzuela, 1999).

UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The need for community engagement to challenge the interpretation of these issues warrants the authentic collaboration and application of resources by colleges and universities (Harkavy & Hartley, 2009). The need for partnerships with institutions of higher education can contribute to the coordination and alignment of P-12 and higher education goals by establishing a continuum of resources that address the holistic needs of children and their families and proactively address issues of race and privilege and the social context in which families live. The concerns prevalent in urban school communities are historical, complex, enduring, and multifaceted. Thus, the partnerships of universities and school communities can help by addressing the challenges and barriers in schools that prevent students from becoming academically successful and identifying the cultural assets that pragmatically define success. Now, more than ever, these partnerships must work at preparing professionals, teachers, administrators, and community leaders who can debunk deficit notions of struggling urban schools. The partnerships provide a counter-narrative focused on research that supports accomplishments and addresses the inequities that persistently plague these schools and their communities. Through the shared leadership, this work aims to obtain equity and social justice through democratic place making.

In Indiana, the community school movement has advanced for more than 20 years and has sustained one of the nation's most comprehensive community school initiatives (Grim, Medina, & Officer, 2011) in Indianapolis. Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) champions the notion of University-Assisted Community Schools and exemplifies the model by offering valuable resources to enrich and support public education. As a mission-driven engaged anchor institution, IUPUI has learned from neighborhood schools and continues to work with community organizations to advance civic action, democratic voice, and social justice. Rather than ignoring inequities in local schools, IUPUI proactively addresses them. More than 17 university departments work with communities, demonstrating IUPUI's commitment to civic engagement in urban schools. Despite progress made, the situation compels us to critically reflect on our community school/university perspectives and deepen efforts as we renew and advance the commitment to our urban public schools and their community through an equity and social justice lens.

School reform movements often minimize the systemic issues affecting the academic achievement of students of color or economically challenged households and abate complex problems that historically plague urban communities. Models of school/community collaboration have emerged claiming to address the broader issues faced by urban schools. The results of a seven-year study of the Chicago Public Schools, conducted by Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Luppescu, & Easton (2010), suggest that

improving urban schools requires “trusting relationships across the school community” (p. 209). This study places the primary responsibility on the school principal as the collaborative broker of the school in defining success by improving teaching and learning, hiring and developing competent staff, and sustaining program coherence (Bryk et al., 2010). As a university located in the heart of a thriving urban city, our history and commitment of involvement in community schools focuses primarily on advocacy, professional development, social justice and equity, and engaged distributive leadership. In this chapter we provide an array of examples of our work and the philosophies we believe are critical to the development of effective community schools.

THE INFLUENCE OF CHANGE THROUGH ADVOCACY AND POLICY

Community schools are an evidence-based strategy for systems-level change, Laura Elliot of Asheville, North Carolina, pointed out January 23, 2019, in a Policy and Advocacy discussion hosted by the Community Schools Leadership Network of the Coalition for Community Schools (Kingston Roche, 2019). The strategy requires four pillars identified by Oakes, Maier, and Daniel (2017) to maximize the evidence-based interventions:

- Collaborative leadership practices (often called distributive leadership)
- Expanded learning time and opportunities
- Authentic family and community engagement, and
- Integrated student supports (aligned with school and neighborhood goals)

Trauma as the Fifth Pillar of our Work

In addition to the four pillars, we question how we can move beyond this foundational work to strategies that measure the extent of trauma in our schools. In addressing the socio and emotional needs of children and their families facing trauma, we must ask what the effects of trauma are and how do we create a holistic perspective that encourages caring people to work in an interprofessional manner. When schools and communities develop the knowledge and compassion for children’s needs and establish informed supportive networks, the impact of ACEs (acquired childhood experiences) can be reduced for future generations.

The Coalition for Community Schools approach to policy and advocacy is driven by shared values of democracy, equity, and harmony in a ground-up approach from local-to-federal, two-way communication and learning. Kingston Roche says advocacy is best done as a coalition, not alone, because supportive policy and funding is crucial to sustainability and successful community schools (Kingston Roche, 2019). That is one of the reasons the Coalition called for the formation of statewide networks about five years ago, and Indiana followed suit through the facilitation of IUPUI and its Office of Community Engagement. As a result, the Indiana Community Schools Network represents educators, service providers, youth and families, universities, and other school community partners from across the state who collaborate in support of learning and youth development. Driven by the notion that every child deserves every chance to succeed, a theme adapted from the Coalition for Community Schools, goals include increasing school/community/family partnerships to improve academic engagement. The

Network promotes communication, networking, evidence-based practices, advocacy, and meaningful professional development opportunities.

IUPUI's response to the urgent call for academic achievement gains is community-engaged initiatives. Steadfast in its commitment to equity education in public schools, the goal is to foster new approaches of collaborating with community partners and embrace shared leadership. We participate in community-based action research and adopt inquiry-supported practices that strengthen our school communities. Through forging powerful community partnerships, IUPUI supports programs and services in community schools while advancing an advocacy and policy agenda that sustains the spirit of community schools throughout our state.

The Value of Voice to Achieve Democratic Purpose

The legacy of IUPUI's commitment to engaged advocacy for community schools in Indianapolis is evident throughout the state and nationally with the Coalition for Community Schools. As advocates for change in how communities and schools intersect and operate collaboratively, we have supported this work beginning with the formation of Bridges to Success through the United Way of Central Indiana (UWCI) and the Indianapolis Public Schools (IPS) in 1993. Today, university-assisted advocacy takes place in the statewide network as well as an Indianapolis-based partnership group and through the Office of Community Engagement Family, School, and Neighborhood Engagement (FSNE) at IUPUI. Thus, Indiana indeed is experiencing a renaissance of community schools. Despite the former IPS administration's end to the 23-year-old Bridges to Success community schools initiative with the local United Way four years ago, the Indianapolis Coalition for Community School Partnerships (ICCSP), a group of individuals representing organizations that promote community schools throughout the city, has identified 20 schools within the district that remain steadfast community schools, including the five in a federally funded Near-Westside Community Schools project and one in the Martindale-Brightwood Education Alliance. Also, the organization Communities In Schools Indiana has established a solid foothold in the city's Metropolitan School District of Decatur Township on the city's far southwest side as a community school district, and in the Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township on the city's far east side. Formation of the ICCSP demonstrates renewed interest in the collaborative approach to school/community engagement and learning. The group spearheaded community schools as the model recommendation for public schools in the city as part of the Indianapolis bicentennial celebration road map, "Indy Plan 2020" (Indy Plan 2020, 2016).

Communities In Schools Indiana recently has established formal relationships with schools of two other cities, adding to well-established CIS programs in three other areas of the state. Also, Ball State University partners with a nearby Muncie school community, and the Evansville Vanderburgh School Corporation has been the state's first community schools district for nearly two decades. All are represented in the statewide Indiana Community Schools Network of stakeholders engaged in community schools work that formed in 2014 with support from the Coalition for Community Schools. FSNE in the Office of Community Engagement at IUPUI facilitates the statewide network. As a University of Pennsylvania Netter Center for Community Partnerships satellite site for university-assisted community schools, FSNE works with area public schools, multiple service providers, the Mayor's Office for Education Innovation, other institutions of higher education, Communities In Schools, the local United Way, neighborhood organizations, and the Indianapolis Coalition for Community School Partnerships to advocate for implementation of community school strategies. Focused on university-assisted com-

munity schools, FSNE provides professional development and technical assistance for school communities throughout the city, including township and charter schools, interested in integrated community engagement and draws upon decades of work with the Near-Westside Community Schools Project that features a high school and four area elementary schools, as well as the Martindale-Brightwood Education Alliance. IUPUI spearheaded the Alliance as lead-partner of a United States Department of Education-funded Full-Service Community Schools project with three IPS schools of the Martindale-Brightwood area in 2010-15. Recently, one of the schools became an "Innovation Network" charter managed school and severed most community engagement ties. One school remains a stable community school, despite multiple changes in principal leadership and teaching staff, and the other school has reduced its community engagement partnerships due to a reduction in coordination funding and a shifting of focus to strengthen the Montessori curriculum.

In addition, Marian University, a private Catholic university in Indianapolis, has initiated City Connects with two Innovation Network charter schools affiliated with IPS and another elementary school in nearby Wayne Township. The Marian Educator's College also developed a technical assistance and training center for City Connects and secured funding from the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration to support their community schools model. The College's Director of External Affairs serves as Chair of the Education Committee for the Indiana House of Representatives and was instrumental in securing the state funding for the evidence-based initiative.

Advocacy for Community Schools Expands Statewide

Community schools throughout the state of Indiana primarily exist in Bloomington, Indianapolis, Evansville, Muncie, East Chicago, Richmond, Clark County (directly north of Louisville, Kentucky), and Lafayette. Meanwhile, exploration is underway in northern Indiana in Mishawaka to implement community schools, and nearby in South Bend for one of its middle schools to become a community school by next fall with support from a committed local foundation, United Way of St. Joseph County, University of Notre Dame, and Indiana University South Bend. The most significant evidence of community school growth has been with CIS Indiana that recently was notified of additional financial support for growth from CIS national. CIS has grown from 42 schools throughout Indiana in 2015 to 69 total in 2019, serving more than 37,000 students and their families. The organization plans to add 15 schools by 2020. Our relationship with CIS Indiana is essential for the statewide community schools movement. The Network provides a space for like-minded organizations such as CIS and other community schools endeavors to collaborate and share best practices and advocacy. As a result, CIS Indiana keeps us up-to-date with the organization's efforts in the Indiana Statehouse to promote and secure further funding for community schools across the state.

The Mishawaka and the South Bend public school corporations' interest in implementing community schools also reflects growth in the Hoosier state. The collaboration of a committed local foundation, United Way of Saint Joseph County, University of Notre Dame, IU South Bend, and both district's leadership is inspiring. IUPUI is committed to helping them to plan, prepare, and implement their initiatives through our ongoing FSNE technical assistance and professional development services. We are also exploring a potential learning experience for the northern Indiana collaborators—and potentially others interested—with the Evansville Schools. The Evansville district's Director of Community Schools sometimes participates in our Indiana Network professional development opportunities. The relation-

ship with South Bend and Mishawaka is the result of the Indiana Community Schools Network and its affiliation with FSNE at IUPUI.

Indiana Network advocacy efforts focus on a Twitter feed and a monthly newsletter that features best practices and community engagement information with 129 individuals across the state engaged in family and community engagement work. Locally, the Indianapolis Coalition for Community School Partnerships has co-sponsored professional development discussions the past year with the Mayor's Office for Education Innovation, UWCI, and IUPUI. Topics have focused on Roles and Responsibilities for Community School Coordinators and Parent Liaisons, How to Address Trauma, How to Use Data and Evaluation Information, Best Practices in Parent and Family Engagement, the Importance of Self Care, Better Communication with Parents and Families, Marketing and Selling Your School, Connect 211, and Connecting Business and Industry to School Partnerships. While most participants have come from Central Indiana, the discussions are open to anyone interested, and highlights are featured in the monthly network newsletter.

Statewide Democratic Voice Contributes to Policy Inclusion

In 2016, through extensive deliberations and considerations that ill-conceived policies can contribute to the demise of our public schools, the Indiana Community Schools Network recommendation for the additional school accountability metrics of the Every Student Succeeds Act Indiana Plan was School Culture, Climate, and Safety, which became an official metric in the state's plan. We advocated that this metric should be measured by evidence-based surveys of school community stakeholders, specifically students, parents, educators, and community. Recommendations for consideration were:

- Engagement—cultural competence, relationships, school participation
- Safety—emotional safety, physical safety, bullying/cyberbullying, substance abuse, emergency readiness/management
- Environment—physical, instructional, basic health, mental health, discipline

However, as a Network, we vigorously advocated that this metric should be flexible enough to reflect characteristics unique to various school communities across the state (rural and urban, for example) and reflect ESSA language supporting local decision-making and control. Our collective hope was that ESSA would be far less punitive than No Child Left Behind (NCLB) policies it replaced. The punitive collateral from the NCLB policies, while likely unintended, left some community schools in Indianapolis in much worse shape than when policy mandates were implemented. Ongoing school leadership and teacher churn, for example, has resulted in lower academic achievement, a widening of the achievement gap, and dips in high school graduation and matriculation into postsecondary education. One example is George Washington Community High School (GWCHS), recipient of the inaugural National Community School Award for secondary education in 2006 by the Coalition for Community Schools.

Unintended Policy Consequences Contribute Negatively

When a new principal of GWCHS on the Indianapolis Near-Westside was appointed in 2005, only three of the 29 demographics subgroups had achieved Adequate Yearly Progress as a metric of student growth under NCLB. Five years later, all but three of the 29 subgroups had met AYP, yet the principal had to

leave his beloved school because not all AYP metrics were met and thus the school was labeled as “failing” and seriously considered for state takeover. Collective community schools efforts, led by IUPUI and other key anchor partners, helped to prevent such an outcome. At that time, standardized test passing rates had been among the highest for non-magnet schools in the district, the high school graduation rate at George Washington had reached 77 percent with 69 percent of the graduates actually matriculating into postsecondary education—and 63 percent remained in postsecondary education according to a follow-up study. By 2019, with a succession of five additional principals and two near-entire staff turnovers later, the school graduated just 62 percent of its students with 33 percent enrolled in postsecondary education, according to the Indiana Commission on Higher Education, and standardized test passing percentages had dropped to single digits. Undoubtedly, ramifications of NCLB had contributed to damaging outcomes for this particular community school. However, in 2018 the district closed three other high schools and reconstituted the remaining four, restarting George Washington as a choice high school site for careers pathways in industrial technology, advanced manufacturing and logistics, and business and finance.

Under interim leadership as of January 2019, IPS reconstituted its public relations operation to become the Office of Communication and Engagement with three full-time Family and Community Engagement liaisons hired to promote family and community engagement throughout the district. This reconstitution repositions the district back into a deliberate focus on family and community engagement, a significant void since IPS ended its relationship with UWCI and the Bridges to Success community schools initiative a few years ago. Next steps include pursuing greater collaboration with FSNE at IUPUI and the ICCSP. A first step took place in February when the district’s new Chief of Communication served on the professional development panel about marketing schools, sponsored by the ICCSP and IUPUI. University and community advocacy for greater district engagement with families and community contributed to this new district development.

University facilitation of advocacy for policy change certainly can spur significant results. Hunter Quartz says that UCLA community schools advocacy contributed to a Los Angeles Unified Schools resolution in June 2017 that led to \$10 million for 20 significantly challenged schools to become community schools. Sixteen months later, the Los Angeles teachers strike increased the proposal to \$12 million for 30 schools. “When LA teachers negotiated for more nurses and counselors, they were pushing for a pillar of the community schools movement – providing health and social services” (Hunter Quartz, 2019). Our experience here in Indiana shows that university-assisted advocacy for policy change supports both human and fiscal supports for students and families through our community schools. As anchor institutions of our communities, few responsibilities rank higher. This vibrant example of scholars working alongside practitioners in assessing program standards, questioning vexing contradictions, and addressing the pestilence of bias in poor school communities is what makes this work unique and a model for other urban districts.

PREPARING TEACHERS TO ADDRESS URBAN SCHOOL CULTURE AND CLIMATE

The vastness and complexity of the disparities are too numerous to cite in this chapter. However, it is crucial for community schools to critically examine the competencies of administrators, teachers, policymakers, and community members who are responsible for protecting students in their daily interactions related to race, language, and poverty. When broad deficit views are used to describe struggling

communities as violent, and labeling families as unsupportive of their child's education, the impact of these irrational views causes emotional and academic harm to students. Community schools that only provide resources to a school cannot abolish the educational disparities caused by poverty and the ramifications of trauma mainly when narrow views of communities overlook vibrant cultural assets and social capitals that serve as lifelines to families who live with the hope that education will become the link to a better future. Hence, the assumption that inequities in schools can miraculously eliminate disparities with resources and funding disregards how teachers and staff often ignite deficit school cultures, harsh school climates, mistrust, and cynicism in schools.

According to Freiberg (1998), assessing a school climate can be "a positive influence on the health of the learning environment or a significant barrier to learning" (p. 22). Although the term school climate is considered to be an expansive phrase, it includes several factors that encompass the total environmental quality within a school (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2004). Gurenert (2008) further defines climate as attitude, inclusive of perceptions and feelings of an environment. The school climate reflects the way people feel, and to some extent, it defines the heart and soul of a school (Freiberg & Stein, 1999).

Research studies have demonstrated how the school climate is essential to academic achievement. For example, Hoy and Sabo (1998) and Freiberg and Stein (1999) found a link between school climate and scholastic achievement and Dwivedi (2005) found that the students with a positive attitude towards school environment have significantly better academic achievements than the students having a poor attitude towards school environment. The result is that relationships between teachers and students play an essential role in the student learning process as positive relationships between teachers and students enhance the learning process through personal reflection (Barr, 1958; Good & Brophy 1995; Wubbels & Levy 1993). The patterns of norms, goals, values, and interactions that shape trustworthy relationships in schools support essential areas of school climate.

School culture is the shared beliefs, attitudes, and actions that can often characterize the district-wide policies and organizational structures. The school culture is the school's personality (Gurenert, 2008) and includes the unwritten norms, values, and beliefs that encourage group conformity. Gurenert (2008) explains, "If school leaders want to shape a new culture, they should start with an assessment of climate" (p. 58). Culture is a characteristic of a school that fits under the umbrella of the school climate and are both critical factors in determining whether students and families feel welcomed, safe, and secure in an environment that encourages learning. How administrators and teachers feel about their students, and the climate and culture they create for learning can enhance the inequities that are critical to school success.

At a time when the achievement gaps are widening, full-service community schools attempt to close the opportunity gap through the formation of cooperative partnerships with social service organizations, businesses, educational institutions, and community groups who all work collectively to establish an aligned streamline of support services and resources that enrich the intellectual and social environment for all students. While research on community-based schools and integrated services has emphasized the role of community leaders in providing resources and services to the schools, few studies have examined how practicing and preservice teachers come to understand and to engage with other professionals and members of local school communities. The notion of interprofessional practice is foreign in teacher education programs; thus, teachers play a critical role in connecting students to resources and identifying student needs sometimes not evident outside the classroom (Dryfoos, 2005).

Improving academic achievement requires the creation of inclusive school culture and climate that values urban school families and communities. It involves understanding the interactions and processes that enable teachers to successfully adapt a pedagogy that promotes the ultimate spirit of community

schools, academic achievement through a teaching practice that supports positive school culture, and an equitable school climate. Teachers who philosophically or pedagogically are not driven by equity and social justice fail to acknowledge the consequences of deficit ideologies that honor white, middle-class norms and forms of cultural assimilation that eradicate cultural heritage and community communication and knowledge.

A Pedagogy of Equity in the Practice of Community Schools

The research focused on cultural and educational justice point to the inequities in schools and the need for more community and family engagement in struggling communities. Therefore, emerging viewpoints for community schools must be inclusive of principles that intentionally honor the cultures of all students in the spirit of social and cultural justice. This work begins with teachers and administrators at different levels as we continue to question standard teaching pedagogies that fail to address deficit perspectives (Nieto, 2000) that result in the unintentional preservation of the status quo. Philosophically, the mission of community schools is inclusive as it focuses on creating the necessary conditions so that all students can thrive. A promising view includes teachers who understand the intersectionality of socioeconomic, gender, language, race, ability, and ethnicity as factors that influence student identity, motivation, and academic achievement. Therefore, teachers must know how to participate in a community school process and develop a sophisticated understanding of the relationship between social justice education and the pedagogical practice of community schools.

Accordingly, the role of teacher education programs is to prepare teachers who are grounded in the belief that the salient role of schools is to promote a more equitable and just society by giving serious attention to the principles of access, equity, and diversity in education. At the university level, we believe it is imperative that preservice teachers reflect on the importance of nonacademic barriers to learning and have opportunities to engage with community members and the human services profession during the early phases of professional preparation. Specifically, they must focus on interprofessional community-based learning to understand how the school community benefits through interprofessional education and practices.

For more than 20 years, the Indiana University School of Education at IUPUI has prepared teachers to teach in urban community schools and IPS has been the residential professional development site for many elementary and secondary preservice teachers where they learn how to establish knowledge in the act of teaching (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999), expertise through experience (Darling Hammond, 2006), and growth through questioning and action research (Auger & Wideman, 2000; Szabo, Scott, & Yellin, 2002). The foci are social justice education and the intersectionality of socioeconomic, gender, language, race, ability, and ethnicity as factors that influence student identity, motivation, engagement, and academic achievement. While teachers often bear the primary responsibility for developing core competencies that address a student's basic needs, a strong emphasis is placed on developing essential competencies for a holistic understanding of urban education. Thus, the discussion of four key concepts that complement the values of community schools are: 1) an understanding of culture, power, and oppression, 2) acknowledging cultural deficit theories, 3) reflecting on white privilege, and 4) the adoption of culturally responsive teaching critical to their professional development.

In many traditional approaches to understanding the basic needs of an urban community, the focus is on the gaps or lack of access that people have to programs and services (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993; Mathie & Cunningham, 2003), resulting in a focus that labels communities as disadvantaged, needy, and

deficient, perpetuating a deficit interpretation of the reality of the community. A focus on the strengths and assets that exist in the community can change the perceptions of preservice teachers who have a deficit frame of reference of the school community (Kretzmann, 2010; Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993). Recognizing the school community's assets can strengthen academic achievement, increase culturally relevant knowledge, and support the vision of community schools. Professors challenge preservice teachers to research community assets and decontextualize information to make informed decisions about students, school, and community. By teaching preservice teachers how to construct a critical analysis of the relationship between social justice education and traditional pedagogical practice, they can examine educational perspectives and politics that benefit dominant groups and marginalize students of color (Giroux & McLaren, 1986; Shor & Freire, 1987).

Community Schools and an Anti-Racist Pedagogy

Thriving community schools also involve teachers who adopt an anti-racist pedagogy that builds vigor and rigor in sustaining conscious and explicit engagement with race. We believe teachers and staff must examine their biases to understand how racially coded language perpetuates racist metaphors and perspectives, while simultaneously reproducing "the comfortable illusion that race and its problems are what 'they' have, not us" (DiAngelo, 2011, p. 55). DiAngelo's (2011) definition of white fragility goes beyond naming specific privileges (McIntosh, 1990) as she states how whites elevate their racialization and collective consciousness of race (Frankenberg, 1997; Morrison, 1992; Tatum, 1997). Peggy McIntosh (1990) explains that whites are carefully taught not to recognize white privilege or recognize unfair discrepancies, often leaving them feeling guilty or defensive when asked to consider how they benefit from these atrocities. Sensoy and DiAngelo (2012) suggest that helping white students realize the collective history of white privilege is key to understanding socialization and social positionality and the problematic issues that promote social inequalities.

Different from traditional teacher education programs, the IUPUI School of Education places anti-racist education at the center of our focus, giving full attention to the institutionalization of whiteness, the systemic factors that underscore its continued dominance and positionality in the reproduction of racialized culture (Leonardo, 2002) in urban schools. The major strengths of the program are the innovative approaches to examining pedagogical methods along with learning about the benefits of working in a school community that is committed, dedicated, and determined to enhance the quality of education for all students. Fundamental to our program is the concept of social justice and the critical analysis of commonly held assumptions about who can learn, how students do learn, and who benefits from unjust schools. Nieto (2000) suggests, "Analyzing school policies and practices...that devalue the identities of some students while overvaluing others" (p. 183) prepares teachers to be committed activists in transforming the "fundamental inequalities" in their schools. They intentionally revisit the inequalities inherent in their own educational experiences to understand ways they must modify their teaching of students who are from different cultural, social, and economic backgrounds, as well as ones who learn and perform differently. A conceptual understanding of critical social justice education prepares future teachers and administrators to rise to the equity challenges of teaching and champion fundamental principles that create inclusive community schools through shared leadership and trust. Without trust, teaching and learning can be futile and a lack of family engagement widens the opportunity gap to student academic achievement.

REFLECTIONS ON SHARED, ETHICAL LEADERSHIP FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

The alchemy of shared leadership, engaging in risk sharing, and the responsibilities of ethical leadership test community schools. Shared leadership is said to be needed for community schools. It suggests the fostering of differing points of involvement as several individuals come together for goal setting, problem-solving, capacity building, and decision-making. However, shared leadership is complex and mediated by commitments to collaborate, to perceptions of authority and power, as well as participants' sense of control and competence.

Moreover, when developing community schools, ethical issues confront university and K-12 school educators every day. Issues of poverty and access to resources, which is conjoined to equity and opportunity, of racism, language, and other forms of marginalization, challenge leaders, whether parent leaders, teachers, and principals, university administrators, or directors of community agencies. The ramifications and repercussions of decisions made daily affect families and the children enrolled in university-assisted community schools. It requires leaders who committed to ethics of democratic voice, acting to take a risk with urgency, and mutuality in process collaboration.

Ethical Leadership and Relationships Built on Trust

People in underserved communities collaborating with university representatives do not naturally trust one another just because they are occupying space or working together in a school. We are defining underserved communities as areas where people considered less powerful, economically deprived, and oppressed reside. These communities are provided a variety of services by educational institutions, community and neighborhood organizations, and governmental agencies to assist and hopefully empower disadvantaged, either socially, politically, or economically, residents living in these areas (Strand, 2003, p. 3). Residents and stakeholders in these communities are not always convened for reciprocal relationship building, thoughtful planning, and development of inquiry required of community-engaged researchers. Reciprocity requires that all participants in the research collective take action toward a common purpose, and in the process the parties are transformed by this collective work in a way that allows increased knowledge and resources (Henry & Breyfogle, 2006). The university and the community may share knowledge and resources held by individual members and organizations to enhance the capacity of the community school collective and co-create knowledge that transforms all parties.

Conflicts may arise, so ethical leadership and the development of trusting relationships is foundational. The ethic of mutuality suggests cooperating with other parties to understand concerns in efforts to find mutually satisfying solutions, fostering mutually respectful relationships. The relationships are the glue, the social adhesive, of university/community school partnerships. It is at the level of the interpersonal that trust begins and resists hierarchal barriers as well as political shifts or administrator change. Leaders who are working to advance community schools have the potential to withstand these inevitable pressures. This suggests the ability to be open, honest, and approachable while having faith in the abilities of colleagues who come through the schoolhouse doors, work in the community, or at the university. Leaders who demonstrate a keen interest in the welfare of the children begin to know the families as well as the assets and challenges in the communities, moving from a stance of the observer to a posture of engagement. It is a different perspective that enhances relationships and fosters both respect

and regard for the knowledges and experiences that the collaborators bring, Working successfully with other individuals and groups in order to reach mutually agreeable outcomes of further shared leadership.

Power Relationships and the Ethics of Risk

The values and vision statements of a multi-agency collaboration resulting in a community school may help participants see and define a powerful coalition, making a difference for family wellbeing. Empowering others to act on the vision, to get rid of obstacles to change, or to alter silos and structures that undermine the vision means leaders encourage risk-taking, innovation, and creativity. However, we often have little understanding about why community partners work with our university institutions or how they view the relationship (Murtadha, 2016). Any serious effort to share power also suggests not only engaging risk but also establishing a sense of urgency and “buy-in” for change. By promoting and acting as change agents, leaders shift power relationships, risk openness among participants and stakeholders, recasting the terrain of control.

Responses, which should be expected, will be complex and vital. It is likely that some individuals will want to avoid losing control or risk their authority over processes. Critical to community school shared leadership is specifying what principles will guide the multi-agency partnership in the educational setting; bringing to the table how decisions will be made; and early in the process, developing agreements stating what the main issues to address are and indicating how they will be handled, thus recognizing roles and permeable boundaries. Leaders must study the strategies of conflict resolution while understanding the stages and conditions of learning to coexist and share power. An essential question asked by Welch (2000) is: “What enables the acceptance of those formerly oppressed or ignored into a conversation?” (p. 135). Has trust been established so all voices will be heard? Welch should be quoted at length when discussing issues of minoritized, underserved communities and the desire for university/community engagement in schools:

Another way in which an unacknowledged power differential thwarts transformative interaction is the extent to which the changes sought by those who have been victimized as seen to entail only loss for the more privileged (p.135).

Ethical foundations are essential as leaders work through the quagmire of change. Careful attention to mutuality, risk, and care that impact interactions, rather than fixating exclusively on the actions of an individual leader of change, is necessary when taking a shared perspective to community school development.

EMERGING RESPONSES AND COMMUNITY SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS

Indeed, the concept of partnership and service is the core of IUPUI’s strategic mission as is engagement, creativity, and innovation in school communities. In a time of austere rigorousness and scrutiny in public services, we continue to rise to the challenge of helping communities and connecting within communities – creating relationships that link people to other people and institutions to organizations – and responding to emergent issues in communities fraught with challenges. The challenges in our school communities include mental health issues like trauma, addiction (opioid crisis), deadly violence, suicide, food insecurity, environmental sustainability, and high rates of depression, anxiety, and suicide in teens. Embracing community means taking on new approaches to delivering services, such as working directly

with members of the community in creating partnerships between university faculty, educators, family health service organizations, and other providers.

An example at IUPUI is a Culture of Health Leadership Team convened by FSNE in March 2017 that features university representatives from the schools of Medicine, Public Health, Dentistry, Nursing, Education, Social Work, and Optometry, in collaboration with Interprofessional Education, public schools and 10 key community groups. Sponsored by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the Coalition for Community Schools, the Culture of Health team in Indianapolis focuses on the five Near-Westside community schools, all in the neighborhoods just west of campus across White River. Efforts have transpired to focus on creating trauma-responsive school communities, and a professor from Nursing and another from Social Work formed a clinical team and received \$420,000 in Robert Wood Johnson Foundation funding for a three-year project to help school communities to create the trauma-responsive environments the school communities seek. Their project engages doctoral and nursing students in this work, demonstrating the community-engaged, university-assisted approach to helping neighborhoods solve problems they identify.

Addressing the social-emotional needs of students and their families is an emerging inter-professional response to trauma that is exasperated by high rates of crime, drug abuse, and related familial dysfunction demonstrated by a study on adverse childhood experiences findings both here and throughout the country. ACEs are traumatic events occurring before age 18 that include all types of abuse and neglect as well as parental mental illness, substance use, divorce, incarceration, and domestic violence. A study conducted by Kaiser Permanente in the 1990s found a significant relationship between the number of ACEs a person experienced and a variety of adverse outcomes in adulthood, including poor physical and mental health, substance abuse, and other risky behaviors. The more ACEs experienced, the higher the risk for the outcomes (Center for Disease Control, 2016).

Another example of partnerships is the "Community Engaged Research Group" (CERG). In 2017 faculty, staff, and students from multiple schools across campus formed the multidisciplinary assembly and developed an organizing statement for IUPUI research and creative activity that would contribute to urban community wellbeing by critically approaching community-engaged research, community-based participatory research, and creative activity with community residents and agency stakeholders. Arguing against research with community partners in a colonizing stance, the group discussed its values of democratic voice, equity through ethical reciprocity and social justice, community self-determination, and the need of shared spaces for dialogue and effective mentoring. They collaborate with community partners so that the engagement can lead to co-created knowledge. The long-term goal of CERG is to develop further statewide, IU community-engaged research and to increase the capacity of current IU campuses' community-engaged scholars, while catalyzing the next generation of engaged researchers through organizing, with underserved communities, public conversations about community-engaged research in concert with IU's centers for service and community engagement, diverse faith organizations, the Neal Marshall Alumni Association, the Latinx Community-University Research Association, and other neighborhood-serving groups.

As of 2019, co-created knowledge is disseminated through a journal, ENGAGE! The journal increases the documentation and dissemination of community-engaged scholarship through a magazine format. ENGAGE! is committed to advancing the field of community-engaged research (CER) and community-based participatory research (CBPR) across the state, nationally, and beyond. The publication invites discussion and development of empirical, conceptual, and theoretical articles that make substantial contributions to the field in all areas of community-engaged research, evaluation, and assessment. The

journal also provides a forum for community scholars and university scholarly exchange of research findings and ideas that advance knowledge to make a societal impact. Manuscripts that demonstrate the central involvement of community partners that advance community engagement scholarship are given favorable consideration. The IUPUI Office of Community Engagement in partnership with the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research has initiated the publishing of ENGAGE! and the Center for Digital Scholarship in the IUPUI Library assists in the publishing process so that articles are made immediately open-access online.

A growing body in Indiana and the IUPUI campus is the Latinx community. In 2017, university faculty and community organizations formed the Latinx Community-University Coalition of Indiana. The group aims to connect university faculty, students, and staff interested in working with Latinos and community organizations that serve this population. The purpose of the Latinx Coalition aims to address equity and wellbeing in Indiana through interdisciplinary collaborations for research and programmatic service to improve the wellbeing of Latino people. The Latinx Community-University Coalition of Indiana is the largest of efforts achieved in the past to connect researchers and scholars interested or currently involved in community-engaged research with Latino populations, community leaders, policy leaders, and Latino serving organizations throughout the state. An annual conference provides a forum where researchers and community members share significant findings of the most recent research efforts conducted in the state involving Latino populations. A key goal is to bring together faculty, staff, policy leaders, community organizations, and community leaders interested in the wellbeing of Latino populations across Indiana to catalyze and advance community-engaged research and programmatic collaborations that are respectful of the needs, cultural identity, and interests of these populations, and help remove barriers to resources and services. Faculty from the School of Education work with Latinx community organizations to foster greater family involvement in community schools.

Connecting the dots and engaging in community partnerships is not new to our campus. IUPUI has a long history of preparing students to work among K-12 school/university partnerships to address issues in school climate and socialization as impacted by differences in culture and leadership through interdisciplinary understanding (Murtadha-Watts, Belcher, Iverson, & Medina, 1999). We encourage "interdisciplinary understanding" through interdisciplinary education (IPE) as the capacity to integrate knowledge and modes of thinking drawn from two or more disciplines to produce a cognitive advancement in ways that would have been unlikely through single disciplinary means (Boix Mansilla, 2005, p. 16). The goal is to recognize how an interdisciplinary perspective can reveal a more comprehensive, holistic understanding of the complex issues in community schools to break down the barriers that practitioners encounter as they redefine their roles in professional domains that foster an attitude of collaboration that benefits youth and schools (Murtadha-Watts, Belcher, Iverson, & Medina, 1999).

IPE emerges from a health care tradition that creates spaces for collaborative practice that enables the combination of several professions to learn from and about others (Hammick et al., 2007), which is critical to communicating with different professions in a community school. While some professionals see it as a strategy that allows professionals to learn better together, it is also an ideology that invites a collective view of community school practices and policies to lead to an authentic pathway for academic achievement. Developing the skill sets necessary for collaboration with teachers, administrators, policymakers, service providers, community organizations, and parents can be the start of a dynamic and innovative way to overcome cultural and racial challenges in schools and to respond to emerging problems faced by struggling school communities. Interprofessionality not only enhances practitioners' capacity to think holistically, but also allows them to reflect critically on social justice issues from multiple perspectives.

CONCLUSION

Place is space imbued with meaning. Democratic placemaking between universities and K-12 schools attempts to bring to the foreground the understandings that race, class, and gender as well as language and ability inequities surface every day in places of engagement. A robust reframing of engagement asks: Who speaks for a neighborhood? Who defines the acceptable meanings of terms used to describe a neighborhood? Who is silent and who is not heard? If the university adheres to notions of community self-determination then a great deal of work is needed to arrive upon plans and decisions that strive for justice with school and community leaders. Democratic place making requires these questions. It also means hearing, with respect and care, individuals who live their daily experiences – not just the good, but the bad and the ugly.

Harkins (2013) suggests that learning to civically engage with schools and communities “. . . without perpetuating inequalities is higher education’s central challenge” (p. 38). Consulting with, listening to, and approaching communication with transparency in this way means taking much needed time for dialogue in place. When community members are invested and actively sought for their solutions to problems, to challenges, and issues, then the result may be answers developed in places, in schools, that can be systematically implemented and evaluated.

The goals and values of a university/community school collaboration also must be clear at its onset. Striving for relationships of trust, for equity of opportunity as a driving value and benchmark, with justice as the goal, is arduous work with peaks and valleys. University-assisted community schools are built upon trusting relationships, and that trust is grounded in social respect that comes from the kinds of discursive practices taking place across the school/university borders and within the school community. Without trust, it is difficult to establish practices that can be sustained to impact teaching and learning as well as family and stakeholder engagement.

As school reform movements further develop and work to lessen the systemic issues affecting the academic achievement as well as social and emotional well-being of minoritized students or economically challenged households, shared leadership and advocacy efforts are necessary and, as noted, can press for substantial impact as collaborative relationships develop.

REFERENCES

- Auger, W., & Wideman, R. (2000). Using action research to open the door to life-long professional learning. *Education*, 121(1), 120–127.
- Barr, A. S. (1958). Characteristics of successful teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 39, 282–284.
- Boix Mansilla, V. (2005). Assessing student work at disciplinary crossroads. *Change*, 37(January/February), 14–21. doi:10.3200/CHNG.37.1.14-21
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. Q. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2016). About the CDC-Kaiser ACE study: Major findings. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/acestudy/about.html>

- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1999). The teacher research movement: A decade later. *Educational Researcher*, 28(7), 15–25. doi:10.3102/0013189X028007015
- Delpit, L. D. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: New Press.
- DiAngelo, R. (2011). White Fragility. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 3(3), 54–70.
- Dryfoos, J. (2005). Community Schools: A Strategy for Integrating Youth Development and School Reform. In J. Quinn (Ed.), *New Directions for Youth Development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dwivedi. (2005) Influence of School Environment and Approved Academic Achievement of Students. *Journal of Educational Research and Extension*, 36(3), 207–210.
- Frankenberg, R. (1997). Introduction: Local Whitenesses, localizing Whiteness. In R. Frankenberg (Ed.), *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in social and cultural criticism* (pp. 1–33). Durham, NC: Duke University Press. doi:10.1215/9780822382270-001
- Freiberg, H. J. (1998). Measuring School Climate: Let Me Count the Ways. *Educational Leadership*, 56(1), 22–26.
- Freiberg, H. J., & Stein, T. A. (1999). *Introduction to School climate: Measuring, improving, and sustaining healthy learning environments*. Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.
- Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1986, September). Teacher Education and the Politics of Engagement: The Case for Democratic Schooling. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(3), 213–239. doi:10.17763/haer.56.3.trr1473235232320
- Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (1995). *Contemporary educational psychology* (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Grim, J., Medina, M. A., & Officer, S. D. H. (2011). *A Decade of Lessons: Community Engagement Perspectives from a University-Assisted School Community*. Midwest Center for University-Assisted Community Schools, Center for Service and Learning, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis.
- Gruenert, S. (2008). They are not the same thing. National Association of Elementary School Principals. Retrieved from <http://www.naesp.org/resources/2/Principal/2008/M-Ap56.pdf>
- Hammick, M., Freeth, D., Koppel, I., Reeves, S., & Barr, H. (2007). A best evidence systematic review of interprofessional education (Best evidence medical Education Guide No 9). [nte]. *Medical Teacher*, 29(8), 735–751. doi:10.1080/01421590701682576 PMID:18236271
- Harkavy, I., & Hartley, M. (2009). University-school-community partnerships for youth development and democratic renewal. In I. Harkavy, & M. Hartley (Eds.), *New directions in youth development* (pp. 7–17). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. doi:10.1002/yd.303
- Harkins, D. A. (2013). *Beyond the campus. Building a sustainable university-community partnership*. Charlotte, N.C. IAP Information Age Publishing.

- Henry, S. E., & Breyfogle, M. L. (2006). Toward a New Framework of "Server" and "Served": De (and Re) constructing Reciprocity in Service-Learning Pedagogy. *International Journal on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 18(1), 27–35.
- Hoy, W. K., & Sabo, D. J. (1998). *Quality Middle Schools: Open and Healthy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hunter Quartz, K. (2019, Jan. 29). Community schools score key victory in LA teachers strike. *The Conversation*, The Los Angeles Times.
- Kingston Roche, M. (2019, Jan. 23). Policy and Advocacy: Advocating for your Community. Community Schools Leadership Network (CSLN) Monthly Webinar. Coalition for Community Schools. Retrieved from http://www.communityschools.org/multimedia/past_webinars.aspx
- Kretzmann, J., & McKnight, J. (1993). *Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets*. Evanston, IL: Center for Urban Affairs and Policy Research, Northwestern University.
- Kretzmann, J. P. (2010). Asset-based strategies for building resilient communities. In J. W. Reich, A. Zautra, & J. S. Hall (Eds.), *Handbook of adult resilience*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Ladson –Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy Theory into Practice, 34(3), Culturally Relevant Teaching. pp. 159-165.
- Leonardo, Z. (2002). The Souls of White Folk: Critical pedagogy, whiteness studies, and globalization discourse. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 5(1), 29–50. doi:10.1080/13613320120117180
- Lunenburg, F., & Ornstein, A. (2004). *Educational Administration: Concepts and Practices* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.
- Mathie, A., & Cunningham, G. (2003). From Clients to Citizens: Asset-Based Community Development as a Strategy For Community-Driven Development. *Development in Practice*, 13(5), 474–486. doi:10.1080/0961452032000125857
- McIntosh, P. (1990) White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. Available at <http://amptoons.com/blog/files/mcintosh.html>
- Morrison, T. (1992). *Jazz*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Murtadha, K. (2016). Urban University Community Engagement: Questions of Commitment to Democratic Ethics and Social Change. *Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education at Indiana State University*, 8(1), 4–18.
- Murtadha-Watts, K., Belcher, A., Iverson, E., & Medina, M. (1999). City schools/city university: A partnership to enhance professional preparation. National Association of Secondary School Principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 83(611), 611. doi:10.1177/019263659908361108
- Nieto, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center: Some thoughts on transforming teacher education for a new century. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 180–187. doi:10.1177/0022487100051003004
- Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2012). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Community Schools as a Vehicle for Social Justice and Equity

Oakes, J., Maier, A., & Daniel, J. (2017). *Community schools: An evidence-based strategy for equitable school improvement: A review of the evidence*. Palo Alto, CA: National Education Center and Learning Policy Institute.

Plan, I. (2020). *Bicentennial Agenda (2016). Neighborhood-based, Community Schools* (pp. 108–113). Indianapolis, IN: Metropolitan Development Commission for Indianapolis and Marion County.

Sensoy, Ö., & DiAngelo, R. J. (2012). *Is everyone really equal?: An introduction to key concepts in social justice education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Shor, I., & Freire, P. (1987). *A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey Publishers.

Strand, K. (2003). *Community-Based Research and Higher Education : Principles and Practices*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Szabo, S. M., Scott, M. M., & Yellin, P. G. (2002). Integration: A strategy to help preservice teachers make the connection between theory and practice. *Action in Teacher Education*, 24(3), 1–9. doi:10.1080/01626620.2002.10734425

Tatum, B. (1997). *“Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?”: And other conversations about race*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Welch, S. (2000). *A Feminist ethic of risk*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Wubbels, T., & Levy, J. (1993). *Do you know what you look like? Interpersonal relationships in education*. London, UK: Falmer Press.