Title
Reflections on "Bad Teachers"

Permalink

Journal

ISSN

Author
Kumashiro, Kevin

Publication Date
2012-01-01

Peer reviewed

Reflections on "Bad Teachers"

Kevin Kumashiro[1]

University of Illinois at Chicago

Note

This article is a version of a lecture delivered at the University of California, Berkeley on March 7, 2012.

I would like to talk with you today about my newest book, *Bad Teacher!: How Blaming Teachers Distorts the Bigger Picture* (Kumashiro, 2012), and will begin by telling a story. The story comes from Lani Guinier, Professor of Law at Harvard University, who wrote a book with Gerald Torres a few years ago called *The Miner's Canary* (Guinier & Torres, 2003). In this book, she tells the story of being at a family party where young children were outside in the yard engaging in a relay race. It's the race where you have to carry a golf ball in a spoon, run to the next person, and pass the ball on, and you see which team can get the ball to the finish line first. It was girls against boys. The girls won. So the boys demanded a rematch. And the girls won again.

As Guinier and the other adults were watching from the sidelines, they tried to analyze the race, asking questions like, Why are the girls winning? What is it about the girls? Are they more coordinated? Are they more patient? And why aren't the boys winning? What's up with the boys? Until at one point, the grandmother of one of the children paused the conversation by asking, Who chose this game? Guinier argues that that question reminds her that, when we are trying to make sense of a conflict or a competition, we tend to ask only certain kinds of questions, and yet there are other kinds of questions that are perhaps the more important questions that we need to be asking but that rarely get asked.

She tells us that there are three kinds of questions that we need to be asking. The first is the question that we tend to ask most often: Who is winning and who is losing? This is the question that many of the adults were asking with the relay race. The implication is that if we figure out why the winners are winning, maybe we can help the losers to compete better, or we can help them to win. In other words, maybe we can fix the losers. The second kind of question is reflected by what the grandmother asked: Who made the rules to this game? It is often the people in positions of power who make the rules to the game, and they make those rules in ways that advantage them in the competition. This is not to say that girls are naturally more coordinated or patient or skillful. But it is not surprising that they would choose a game that they were more likely to win and that, in fact, they did win twice. There is a third type of question that we almost never ask that is perhaps the most significant of them all: What is the story that we tell the losers to get them to want to continue playing? In the relay race, the boys knew that the girls chose the

---

[1] Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Kevin Kumashiro, University Hall, Room 819, 601 S. Morgan (MC 231), Chicago, IL 60607. Email: kevink@uic.edu.

games, and they knew that they were losing, but they insisted on continuing to play because they were buying into the story that there was something fair about the game, and that they had a chance to win.

Asking the Right Questions about Problems in Education

These three questions can apply to other contexts as well, including education, and can help us to complicate our understanding of the "problem." One example is how we understand the problem of standardized and high-stakes testing. The first question, *Who is winning and who is losing?*, is often answered by what many have called the "achievement gap." We think we can measure learning with standardized tests, and when we look at standardized tests, we see a gap. We see that certain students are performing at one level, while a whole bunch of other students are performing at another level, with a huge gap between them. Therefore, the goal of a lot of initiatives is to "close the gap," to help certain students perform better on the tests.

But this is not the only way to think about the problems with testing, which leads to the second question, *Who made the rules to this game?* The rules of test construction and usage are illustrative. For decades, researchers have revealed cultural bias in test content. For decades, researchers have also revealed that tests do not always align with what it is that schools are trying to teach. In other words, cultural bias and curriculum nonalignment have long been argued to be significant problems with standardized and high-stakes testing. But a third problem with testing is perhaps most significant for this analysis, and that is how we produce norm-referenced tests.

Certain questions appear on college-entrance exams like the ACT and the SAT that do not actually count towards the test-taker's score. The test-makers administer these questions to see how the group of test-takers, as a whole, performs. If the distributions of the scores of those questions look like the distributions of the scores overall, that is an indication that these are good test questions. If a whole bunch of students who are performing well overall are failing those questions, then clearly those questions are not giving us the kind of results that we want, or so the test-makers say. This is the nature of norm-referenced testing, where the score references a student's performance to the norm or the majority. What does that mean in practice? It means that the tests are constructed in ways that guarantee the distribution of scores that currently exist. Tests are made, in other words, to reinforce the status quo.

The third question that Guinier asks is, *What is the story that we tell the losers to get them to want to continue playing?* This question reminds me of myself, and many people with whom I work, who are all very critical of standardized testing, but ironically, often end up relying on tests as evidence that certain strategies are working. Those of us pushing, for example, for multicultural education, culturally relevant teaching, student-centered instruction, teacher-generated and locally developed curriculum—often frame our argument by saying that "These are great things, and just look at the high scores as evidence that they are working." In other words, we are still buying into the story that the tests are fair, that the tests are accurate, and that the tests are useful for making high-stakes decisions.

Guinier's three questions can also help to complicate how we understand public school reform more broadly. Let's look at the first question, *Who is winning and who is*

losing? Six years ago, Gloria Ladson-Billings (2006) wrote a groundbreaking article in which she argued that the achievement gap was really the tip of a much larger iceberg, of a larger problem of racial and other disparities in education. She points to several major elements of the bigger problem, including segregation, inequitable funding, and school governance. In the past few years, all three problems have worsened significantly.

First, segregation. A few years ago, the Civil Rights Project at the University of California, Los Angeles (Orfield & Lee, 2007) revealed that our nation has lost almost all the ground that we gained from the desegregation movement. *Brown vs. Board of Education* was decided in 1954, and for about 10 years, there was no progress. It was not until 1964, with the Civil Rights Act, that we began to see change, and for about a quarter of a century, our schools were actually making progress with desegregation, particularly for African American students in the South. But beginning in the late 1980s, as the court-ordered desegregation programs across the nation were expiring, school districts returned to what they always used to assign students to schools: students' residences. Given that our neighborhoods across the nation are highly racially segregated, it should not be a surprise that our schools are also going to be incredibly segregated unless we have some kind of desegregation program. Today, segregation continues to be on the rise, driven in part by programs that ironically claim to help desegregate, such as choice programs.

Funding inequity has also widened. When Jonathan Kozol (1992) wrote his book, *Savage Inequalities*, 20 years ago, he pointed out that a school district can spend about three times as much per student as the district right next door because so much of school funding is based on local property taxes. In recent years, the wealth gap in our nation has reached historic levels, and because wealth inequity has continued to rise, we now see school districts spending more than four times as much per student as neighboring districts.

Governance is looking less and less democratic. Chicago, where I live, likes to think of itself as the model for school reform all over the country. And in some ways it is. In the 1980s, Chicago was seen as the model for decentralizing school governance, as every school was to create a Local School Council that consisted of people who were inside and outside of the school, including community members. A few years later, in the mid-1990s, that reversed, and Chicago became seen as the model for school centralization, a form of governance that is now seen in school districts all over the country. Today, decision-making falls on the shoulders of an increasingly smaller and elite group. It is no longer primarily school leaders and elected officials who are governing schools and making policy decisions. It is increasingly the mega-philanthropies and corporations.

This leads to Guinier's second question, *Who made the rules?* The mega-philanthropies, like the Gates and Broad foundations, are exerting unprecedented influence over school reform. Although philanthropic funding continues to constitute only a small percentage of school funding, its influence is disproportionately large as it engages a corporate-based strategy to leverage wealth, not unlike the venture capitalists (Saltman, 2010; Scott, 2009). This is where the term "venture philanthropies" comes from. Venture capitalists are those who leverage their wealth to make more money, and similarly, venture philanthropies are leveraging their wealth to influence policy. Primarily, these philanthropies target urban areas with the intention of piloting certain types of reforms eventually to scale up nationwide, which is why we see so much Gates

and Broad funding coming into cities like Chicago (Lipman, 2011). Corporations also exert increasing influence over school reform. One example is Pearson, which dominates not only the testing market but also the test-preparation market, and is profiting enormously from funding initiatives like Race to the Top that require substantial outsourcing. Consequently, it is among the most influential educational lobbyists right now.

Why is it that we are not talking about these things? Why is it that we are not talking about the larger problems, such as segregation and funding inequities? Why is it that we are not talking about who is making and driving all these reforms? This gets to Guinier's third question, *What is the story that we tell the losers to get them to want to continue playing?* I think the most pervasive story that is framing education discourse today is the neoliberal story of how marketization will solve all of our problems.

What is neoliberalism? Consider, in contrast, classic liberalism, which argues that justice is the result of lifting constraints on individuals. If we get rid of government and societal constraints, individuals will be free to act and live as they choose. Neoliberalism takes that ideal and situates it in a market-like economy, which means that justice is no longer just about lifting constraints; it is also about enabling people to prosper by allowing them to compete with one another (Duggan, 2003). Like with grocery stores in a neighborhood, it is competition that will drive innovation and hard work, which leads to overall improvement and growth. This primacy of the marketplace has become the "common sense" of today. Rarely questioned or contested is the notion that schools will improve if we simply marketize the system. Sometimes this story is so compelling that it does not allow us to see how the reforms that we are advocating for are actually working against our best interests. Even when the reforms are hurting us, we still buy into the underlying stories.

Longer Day, Merit Pay, and Data Display: Asking Questions about Teacher Reforms

Let me draw on this analysis as I now turn specifically to make sense of how the attacks on teachers are masking the bigger problems in education. I want to highlight four elements of this bigger picture. The first element is that, today, we are seeing policies that are based on the assumption that teachers are to blame for all that is wrong with education. Three policies are illustrative: longer day, merit pay, and data display.

Lengthening the school day has been a priority of Chicago's new mayor, Rahm Emanuel, since his election last year. He and other reformers argue that Chicago has one of the shortest school days in this nation, and so how should we try to improve schools in Chicago? We should lengthen the day. It is looking very likely that we are going to lengthen the school day. Research, of course, does not tell us that lengthened school days correlate with better education. Just look, in contrast, at some of the most elite schools in this country, such as the University of Chicago Lab Schools where the current mayor sends his kids and where President Obama sent his kids. The Lab Schools do not have the longest day nor the highest amount of contact hours. There is recess in the University of Chicago Lab Schools. There is study hall. In other words, it is not the case that the University of Chicago Lab Schools are an example of how extended teacher contact alone is going to lead to more learning. Research does not suggest that the quantity of

time is what matters most. Research suggests much more that it is the quality of time that matters (Glass, 2002). So, why does the longer-day policy enjoy so much politician and public support? Because it buys into a very persuasive and compelling image of what is wrong with schools. The notion that lengthening the school day is a solution to our problem is based on the assumption that teachers are simply not working enough, and therefore, we need to lengthen the day.

A similar assumption underlies initiatives to reward teachers with merit pay. Merit pay is basically a financial reward to teachers whose students are doing well in school, which typically is measured by high student test scores. This is a form of positive reinforcement, of incentivizing something that teachers would be able to do better if they so chose. The underlying assumption here is that teachers are choosing not to work hard, and if we can incentivize teaching, that might make them want to work harder, and, as a result, raise student test scores.

In contrast to rewards are punishments, which are symbolized by the third initiative, data display, which we saw most clearly last year in Los Angeles (http://projects.latimes.com/value-added/) and then again last week in New York City (Santos & Otterman, 2012), where the press decided to join reformers to publicize student test-score data. Now you can look up individual teachers to see how their students are performing on tests. What is the assumption here? It's a parallel assumption that embarrassment can drive improvement. Why? Because the problem is that teachers are simply not trying hard enough, and if we can make them want to try harder, either by incentivizing or by threatening to embarrass them, that might actually drive improvement.

The Bifurcation of Teachers and Teaching: Two Routes for Teachers and Two Routes of Teaching

Longer day, merit pay, and data display are reforms that are very much based on parallel logics. These policies actually lead to the deprofessionalizing and weakening of the teaching force, and perhaps not surprisingly, this year's annual Metlife Survey of the American Teacher (2012) shows a 20% drop in job satisfaction among teachers. This leads to the second element of what I'm calling the "bigger picture," namely, that the consequence of deprofessionalizing teaching is a more inequitable public school system. There are at least two ways of thinking about how current policies are driving the bifurcation of teachers and teaching: one is what I call "two routes for teachers" and the other is "two routes of teaching."

What are the two routes for teachers? As I noted earlier, it has become commonsensical that the market is going to drive improvement, that competition is what will make us more innovative, smarter, and hardworking. This is the rhetoric behind school choice, vouchers, and charter programs, namely, that by proliferating the alternative options out there, schools and teachers will want to, and need to, work harder. So too, with teacher preparation. A quarter-century ago, in the 1980s, critics argued that universities were a "monopoly," were the only ones preparing teachers, and operated like an "education school cartel" (Imig & Imig, 2008). By dominating the market, they lowered the standard of teacher preparation. So we needed to infuse it with options, and thus began the rapidly increasing funding for alternative options, especially the fast-track

alternative teacher-certification programs, such as the Passport to Teaching and Teach for America.

Significantly, the rhetoric highlights the role that alternatives will play in increasing overall quality, but the reality shows a different picture. Graduates of alternative certification programs are not being hired by the most elite schools. Overwhelmingly, they are being hired by the most struggling schools. Lois Weiner (2007) tells us that this is actually a global phenomenon. Around the world, teachers who are getting less preparation, less coursework, and less supervised field experiences are being placed in the most struggling schools, while the teachers who have the most coursework, the most supervised experiences, and the most advanced degrees are teaching in the most elite schools. The market has created two tracks for teachers.

The market has also created two tiers for what and how we teach. When schools are struggling, the "turn around" policies require more testing, more test preparation, narrowed and scripted curriculum, less teacher autonomy, and so on, none of which reflects the characteristics of the most elite schools domestically or internationally. The top-performing school systems abroad are not serving as models for American reforms, such as the highly touted school system in Finland, which, according to Linda Darling-Hammond's (2010) research, uses locally developed curriculum and does not rely on high-stakes testing. This is also true back home, as with the University of Chicago Lab Schools, for example, which have broad, rich interdisciplinary curricula and assessments, less time spent on testing and test prep, high levels of autonomy, and collective bargaining among teachers—characteristics that research tells us are what make schools work and are what strengthen teaching and learning. This is why we should be skeptical whenever someone says that they have a great reform for people's children, but it's never a reform that they would want for their own. And that is exactly what is happening today.

The Sorting of Students

This leads to the third element of the bigger picture: The sorting of teachers parallels the sorting of students. We often hear people talk about how schools should provide equal educational opportunity, level the playing field, and prepare all children to succeed and to compete. This is often the rhetoric that we hear from our politicians, from reformers, and from the media. But the reality is that schools were never about equal educational opportunity. From their very beginnings, public education in this country was for only certain groups of students, and as we were forced to integrate our schools, we created more and more indirect and subtle ways to sort them, such as through tracking. Schools have always played primarily a sorting function in our society.

These are arguments that people have made on various dimensions of diversity throughout the past century. Scholars like Carter G. Woodson (1933/2003) have talked about "the mis-education of the negro," and about how schools sort by race. Joel Spring (2009) made similar arguments about American Indian boarding schools in this country. Jean Anyon (1979) talked about sorting by social class, preparing working-class students for working-class jobs, while schools in wealthy communities prepared students for leadership and managerial jobs. Jonathan Kozol (1992) made a similar argument about how school funding absolutely impacts the quality of education that the students are receiving. Myra and David Sadker (1994) made similar arguments about how schools

sort us by gender, particularly by developing our gender consciousness, or where we are supposed to fit within gender hierarchies in the society. There is much research that can point to many other dimensions of diversity and social groupings.

The Power of Frames

So, why don't we often see this bigger picture of sorting? One concept I think we should keep in mind is the concept of hegemony (Apple, 2006). Hegemony tells us that there is always some symbol of fairness and the potential for any individual to succeed that masks the structural, institutional, and cultural barriers to success. It is this distraction, this contradiction, that allows oppression to continue to play out. Without a structural analysis, we are more likely to buy into neoliberal ideologies that tell us that market-based solutions are going to solve all problems. Without structural analyses, we are more likely to individualize the problem. This is exactly what is going on in education today. And this leads to the fourth element of what I am calling the bigger picture: We do not often see the full picture because of the power of frames.

FrameWorks Institute (Bales, 2010) shows us why this might be happening. Based on polls, focus groups, and other sources of data, the FrameWorks Institute issued a series of reports, which culminated in 2010, about what everyday Americans think when they hear words like "education" and "school reform." One of their findings was that discussions about "education" lead people to imagine the classroom where a teacher is standing at the front, talking to, and teaching the students. So when we talk about "problems" with education, the "problems" get mapped onto, and reduced, to the figure of the teacher. This is why we have such a hard time talking about systemic or structural issues with education. Common sense makes it all about the individual. We can talk all we want about funding inequities, but people are going to come back to their memory of that one bad teacher or that one great teacher who really made all the difference in the world. They are going to come back to the individual.

What Can We Do? Four Areas of Work

There are four things that we can do to push back on problematic reforms. First, we need to reframe the debate. The common sense of education has been framed very narrowly to define education as an individualistic enterprise in a market-based economy. So, part of our job needs to be to expose the bigger picture and to get people to talk about education in more complex ways. George Lakoff (2004), in his book, *Don't Think of an Elephant*, talked about the power of framing and reframing a debate. Any frame both enables and limits how we define the problem and the possible solutions, so engaging in debate can be counterproductive if we fail to change how that debate is framed. Think about the debate on tax cuts: The people who are pushing for and supporting tax cuts were brilliant in framing the debate when they got a lot of people to use the term "tax relief." The term "tax relief" sets up taxes as a bad thing, as something that we need relief from, so the only thing that I can debate is whether to give a little or a lot of relief. That is not productive, and instead, we need to reframe the debate. We need to get people to think about taxes using a different metaphor, a different conceptual framework, such as by talking about taxes as a form of investment. On any issue, we need to step back and

ask ourselves, How has this debate been framed already, and how might I reframe the debate to get people to see the bigger picture?

One example of how a group of us are trying to do this kind of public reframing is with an organization in Chicago called CReATE, which stands for Chicagoland Researchers and Advocates for Transformative Education (http://www.createchicago.blogspot.com). It formed a year ago when the mayoral campaign was in full swing. We had had decades of Daley administrations in Chicago. When Daley announced that he was not going to run for mayor again, we saw a huge number of people putting their names into the hat, including celebrities, politicians, and grassroots organizers. A bunch of us noticed that even the grassroots organizers were saying the same things about what was wrong with schools and what we needed to do to fix them. They were saying, we need to hold teachers accountable, we need to hold principals accountable, we need to get parents to be more involved at schools, we need to measure learning more and tie everything to those test scores. In response, about five-dozen professors from almost every university in Chicago came together to form this network. Our goal was to see whether we could impact the public conversation and reframe the debate by speaking from research.

In March of 2011, we issued a statement about what we called "Myths and Realities of Chicago School Reform." What we tried to do was take some of the most common things that we were hearing from the politicians and respond with what the research says is wrong (or right) about those statements, and provide better alternatives. This led to a conversation with the local teachers' union and a yearlong campaign with them about areas that needed to be researched. We agreed that an independent group of faculty members might be able to intervene by saying, as experts on educational research, here is what we think the research is telling us about the problems with reforms and better alternatives. Last month, we released our first research brief, which focused on testing. The brief summarized the history, the science, and the impact of, as well as the alternatives to, standardized high-stakes testing. Next month we are going to issue our second brief, focusing on school safety. As with many districts in the country, Chicago's strategy to make schools safer is through further policing and criminalization. So, in the brief, we argue that we need to think about safety much more along the lines of restorative and transformational justice.

CReATE is a small initiative and is not solving all the problems, but it is one way that academics can try to step outside of what we normally think of as the role of university people. One of my mentors is the late Eric Rofes, who once gave a keynote lecture at a conference where he said that the identity of the academic, of the university researcher, is very much an assimiliationist one. We have created this profession that not only discourages us from, say, writing for the newspaper, but also places the most value on things that reach the least amount of people (since what matters the most in our profession is writing for academic journals). He argued that we need to redefine our identity. We need to embody it very differently. What would it mean for the academic to also be the public intellectual, the grassroots organizer, the media commentator, or the political strategist? That is what we are trying to move towards with this initiative of CReATE, and I am hoping that many more people will engage in these kinds of actions.

The second thing that we can do is to collectivize. There are two groups that show great examples of collectivizing in recent history: teachers' unions and parents' organizations. On Monday, March 5th, 2012, the British Columbia Teacher Federation in Canada began their strike. Usually when we think about labor actions, we think about people going on strike to improve their compensation. However, when I read the reasons that they went on strike, the things that stood out to me are their arguments that they are striking to push back on policies that they think are hurting their ability to teach. Their argument that they are striking to improve learning conditions reframes the scope of contract negotiations, reframes what it means to engage in labor actions, and reframes the very work of unions.

Whereas the union in British Columbia reframed "what we do," the union in Chicago reframed "who we are." Two years ago, critics of the Chicago Teachers Union (CTU) argued that the CTU was not a strong voice to challenge the school district and school reformers, and to advocate for more progressive policies for teachers and students. So, a caucus within the CTU, the Caucus of Rank-and-File Educators (CORE), put together a slate and successfully won the top elected leadership positions in the CTU. Today, the CTU is considered by many members and observers as a very different union, doing different kinds of work and interacting differently with the school district.

Another example of collectivizing can be seen on the website of the National Opt-Out Movement (NOO) (http://www.unitedoptout.org), which includes parents saying that we need to get organized and push back on standardized testing by opting out of nonessential tests. NOO aims to inform parents about tests that are nonessential and steps for opting out. There are a number of nationwide and global movements to push back on high-stakes testing. You can see other examples at the website of Fair Test (http://www.fairtest.org).

A third way that we can push back is to think about our work as a form of movement building. My book ends with some thoughts about how we build movements. You can also look at a book by Eric Mann (2011) called *Playbook for Progressives,* in which he helps to map out the role that individuals can play in building movements. Many progressive voices have been saying that the problem with liberal organizing for the past few decades is that we do not seem to think about our work in terms of movement building. We tend to think about our work as discrete actions that lead to legislative gains on behalf of identity groups. That is, we tend to think of activism as my community, however I define the "my," engaging in certain kind of actions that are going to lead to certain kinds of legislative or litigated gains. This is exactly the framework used by some people who have been critical of the Occupy Movement. When Occupy Wall Street was happening, liberals were asking, What are we actually accomplishing, and isn't it a problem that even the activists who are sitting at Wall Street are unable to articulate their goals?

It is true that the Occupy Movement did not accomplish immediate legislative change. But maybe that was not their goal and maybe that is not how we should think about activism. One thing that they did accomplish is they made terms like "the 1%" much more of a household phrase. They helped people to see themselves as part of "the masses." Where they succeeded, in other words, is in reframing those concepts. If you think about the Civil Rights Movement, there were many legislative failures, and there

were many successes, like Brown, or the Civil Rights Act, that were highly contradictory, compromised gains (Anderson, 2003). So, the Civil Rights Movement is defined not merely by legislative and litigated gains, but also by its success in reframing what it means to be a democratic nation and what we see as civil rights and diversity in the nation. It changed public consciousness. And, in fact, if you think about conservative organizing over the past quarter century, this is exactly what some of the most prominent conservative leaders would argue (Lakoff, 2004). Leaders like Grover Norquist have said that they were not so concerned that initiatives did not lead to legislative gains because that was not their only goal in the first place.

Think about debates over school funding that have been powerfully reframed in recent years. Several initiatives from conservative organizations have helped to reframe the problem not as one of inadequate funding, but rather as one of inefficient spending. This is exactly the frame that the federal government used successfully in its defense in court against states and school districts that argued that No Child Left Behind was an underfunded mandate. Their response was that, yes, this legislation may be underfunded by tens of millions of dollars, as some would argue, but the whole purpose of No Child Left Behind was to hold schools and states accountable. It was to get them to be more efficient with the resources that were already there. So, why would we put a whole bunch of new resources in there until we can see whether the gains we want are possible simply by being more efficient?

Another powerful reframing happened after Hurricane Katrina in debates on school vouchers. Up until then, choice, vouchers, and charters were framed along the lines of democratic values. Proponents were saying that choice was central to democracy and everyone should have the freedom of choice. After Katrina, the Democratic Party loosened its opposition to vouchers and even showcased some of the strongest supporters of the so-called Katrina vouchers. This was when the federal government finally opened the door to vouchers. But the Democratic Party did not use the language of democracy to argue for the vouchers. The argument that leaders like Senator Kennedy were saying when they went back to their constituencies was that they did not want to look like they did not care, or that they had no compassion, for people who were in most need. The framing of vouchers moved from one of democratic ideals (freedom of choice) to one of compassion.

Building movements that change social consciousness is not easy or quick. I recently completed a radio interview where the interviewer said that it sounds like the conditions with public education are very dire, are both demoralizing for our teachers and harmful for our young people, and that sadly, it sounds like public education has, throughout history, served a very problematic function in society. Why, then, was I arguing that we should further invest in it or that public education is something we should fight for? This leads to my final point: We must reclaim, not disinvest in, public education.

Some people have indeed argued for the dismantling of public education. The Republican Party has long called for the dissolution of the federal Department of Education. Conservative leaders have long advocated for initiatives that would privatize and dismantle public education, including choice programs, outsourcing, and deregulation (Apple, 2006). But that is not the solution. Yes, both historically and globally, public education has always served a sorting function. But public education has

also always been a site of struggle. It is in the realm of schooling that we define who we want our next generation to become and what we imagine our future to be. This is why it is worth struggling for and reclaiming public schools.

References

Anderson, C. (2003). *Eyes off the prize: The United Nations and the African American struggle for human rights, 1944-1955.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Anyon, J. (1979). Ideology and United States history textbooks. *Harvard Educational Review, 43*(3), 361-386.

Apple, M. W. (2006). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Bales, S. N. (2010). *Framing education reform: A FrameWorks message memo.* Washington, D.C.: Frameworks Institute. Retrieved from http://www.frameworksinstitute.org

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Duggan, L. (2003). *The twilight of equality: Neoliberalism, cultural politics, and the attack on democracy*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Glass, G. V. (2002). Time for school: Its duration and allocation. In A. Molnar (Ed.), *School reform proposals: The research evidence.* Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University Education Policy Research Unit. Retrieved from http://epsl.asu.edu/epru/documents/EPRU%202002-101/epru-2002-101.htm

Guinier, L., & Torres, G. (2003). *The miner's canary: Enlisting race, resisting power, transforming democracy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Imig, D. G., & Imig, S. R. (2008). From traditional certification to competitive certification: A twenty-five year retrospective. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, D. J. McIntyre, & K. E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (pp. 886-907). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kozol, J. (1992). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools.* New York, NY: Harper Perennial.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher, 35*(7), 3-12. doi:10.3102/0013189X035007003

Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant: Know your values and frame the debate.* New York, NY: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Lipman, P. (2011). *The new political economy of urban education: Neoliberalism, race, and the right to the city*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Mann, E. (2011). *Playbook for progressives: 16 qualities of the successful organizer.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

MetLife, Inc. (2012). *The MetLife survey of the American teacher: Teachers, parents, and the economy.* New York, NY: MetLife, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.metlife.com/teachersurvey

Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2007). *Historic reversals, accelerating resegregation, and the need for new integration strategies.* Los Angeles, CA: Civil Rights Project at UCLA. Retrieved from http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration and-diversity/historic-reversals-accelerating-resegregation-and-the-need-for-new integration-strategies-1

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: How our schools cheat girls.* New York, NY: Touchstone.

Saltman, K. (2010). *The gift of education: Public education and venture philanthropy.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Santos, F., & Otterman, S. (2012, February 24). City teacher data reports are released. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Scott, J. (2009). The politics of venture philanthropy in charter school policy and advocacy. *Educational Policy, 23*(1), 106-136. doi:10.1177/0895904808328531

Spring, J. (2009). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Weiner, L. (2007). A lethal threat to U.S. teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(4), 274-286. Retrieved from http://www.jte.sagepub.com/content/58/4/274.full.pdf

Woodson, C. G. (2003). *The mis-education of the Negro.* San Francisco, CA: Book Tree. (Original work published 1933).