THINKING WITH SCHOOL LEADERS: WHAT CAN PHILOSOPHERS OFFER?

Michael G. Gunzenhauser
University of Pittsburgh

Philosophers of education may imagine their work has great relevance to people trying to lead K-12 schools. In our current context, it would seem philosophers of education are sorely needed. Standardized assessments maintain their hold on curriculum and instruction, differentially affecting schools whether they are the targets of accountability programs (who can never quite achieve the test score results to avoid being targeted for takeover or replacement) or the competitive winners (who have to repeat their test score dominance in perpetuity, lest they lose public support). We can now add to those struggles the political backlash against long-deferred efforts to address issues of equity, inclusion, and racial justice. Pennsylvania is not Florida, but parts might as well be. In my area, some districts have forbidden instruction in diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) or removed library books in response to parent complaints. Nearly all school leaders in my area are facing some degree of backlash from parents and/or their school boards as they attempt to address educational inequities in their schools.

Considering the pressures that school leaders face for test score accountability and constraints on their equity practice, I argue that philosophers have an important role to play in thinking with school leaders about how best to respond to largely individualistic pressures for standardized practice. In this paper, I name some underlying philosophical concerns that are at issue and address ways leaders can identify their core commitments, stand strong in the face of pressures, and work toward greater collective responsibility for more equitable and liberatory educational opportunities for students.

THE PROBLEMS OF SCHOOL LEADERS

As research has documented well, the job of a school leader has become very difficult, whether the leader is a principal, an assistant principal, a district administrator, or a district superintendent. Compliance work has long taken on outsized proportion to their other responsibilities, and poorly resourced schools feel the pinch acutely. Accountability pressures have rewritten the guidance on teacher supervision and led to greater use and misuse of data. These pressures reinforce standardization and fairness understood as equal treatment. Measurement and the ability to compare proliferates competition among schools and school districts (including competition for resources with charter schools, cyber schools, and homeschooling). While political pressure on leadership practice has always been part of the job, school leaders more recently have to contend with state-level actors intent on curtailing even the most tepid liberatory practices and the disorganized organizing throughout the country by groups such

as Moms for Liberty (in the summer of 2023 named an extremist group by the Southern Poverty Law Center).[1]

Political pressure varies in intensity depending on location. I live in an urban county in Pennsylvania in a vaguely center-left political pocket with right and far-right sentiment on the edges of the county and in the surrounding counties. With so many school districts in close proximity, people often relocate to situate themselves in school politics they can stand, whether that means escaping intolerance, chasing higher average test scores, accessing more privileged opportunities, seeking cheaper school taxes, or freely embracing white supremacy.

Since the murder of George Floyd in 2020, districts have responded to the call for more racially and socially responsive educational practices. In some cases, leaders have sought systemic change and moved closer to what we might call "liberatory education," educational approaches that provide educational opportunities that defy the racially and culturally limited dominant approaches to education encouraged by competition-based accountability systems and associated practices of standardization. Especially for school leaders contributing to systemic change, there's quite a bit of work to do, as school leaders are in the position to act on a daily basis to implement governmental policies that radically limit the possibilities of teachers and students to do the work of liberatory education.

In recent conversations, school leaders tell of mostly disorganized resistance to their equity and justice work.[2] Some white parents are resisting equity work in a local urban charter school near me, for instance, pushing back against disciplinary practices they find insufficient for ensuring the safety of their children. Suburban parents have sometimes organized their resistance to curricular choices; in many schools, individual parental complaints have led to their children being excused from certain lessons. In others, new slates of school board candidates have been elected to police library shelves for perceived decency of materials, targeting mostly race- and LGBTQ-related materials. Leaders are relying upon support from their school boards to keep individual complaints from becoming organized protests in a mostly successful attempt to keep parents from changing their curricula. While some leaders have left positions because their equity efforts were not supported, most leaders who have been able to maintain their equity work face periodic doubts by teachers that they can and should continue to do the work. In many cases, leaders are eager for partners to help them grow their work and think through the challenges they face.

---

[1] See Southern Poverty Law Center, "Moms for Liberty," (2023), https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/group/moms-liberty.
[2] Sierra Stern, Osly J. Flores, & Michael G. Gunzenhauser, "Taking Up the Call for Racial Justice: The Conditions of Relationality for Equity Leadership" (Paper presentation, Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Philadelphia, PA, April 14, 2024).

PHILOSOPHICAL ISSUES IN SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

As a potential partner in school leader practice, philosophy of education is indeed largely absent. While it is largely absent from school leader preparation and professional development, one place to find philosophy is in the social theory that sometimes informs equity and justice practice. A more prevalent place is in the moral leadership discourse, mostly from ethical theorists arguing for the centrality of moral leadership.[3] Care and caring have found their way into national educational leadership standards, and there is now a greater emphasis on justice, fairness, and equity. More recently there has been recognition that race is important, although acknowledging the existence of racism and leaders' contribution to its perpetuation is still outside the scope of those standards, despite the extensive research on culturally responsive and race-conscious leadership practice.[4] Most promising, researchers such as Lisa Bass and Noelle Witherspoon Arnold have integrated race-consciousness and caring ethics.[5]

To help school leaders with their efforts to make their schools more liberatory, especially within current contexts, philosophers have at least four areas in which they can engage with school leaders. Those issues include the caring trap, the standardization of students, the destabilization of professionalism, and the narrowing of educational aims. I take each in turn toward a general view of how philosophers of education can more effectively think with school leaders for a more collective, liberatory education. As I explain more below, these issues expose some strong cultural themes of competition,

---

[3] Joan P. Shapiro & Steven J. Gross, *Ethical Educational Leadership in Turbulent Times: (Re)solving Moral Dilemmas,* 2nd ed. (New York, NY: Routledge, 2013); Joan P. Shapiro & Jacqueline A. Stefkovich, J.A, *Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in Education: Applying Theoretical Perspectives to Complex Dilemmas,* 3rd ed. (New York, NY: Routledge, 2011); Robert J. Starratt, *Ethical leadership* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2004); Robert J. Starratt, "Ethics and Social Justice: Strangers Passing in the Night?" in Ira Bogotch & Carolyn M. Shields (eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Social (In)justice* (Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer, 2014): 67-80.

[4] Bradley W. Davis, Mark A. Gooden, & Donna J. Micheaux, "Colorblind Leadership: A Critical Race Theory Analysis of the ISLLC and ELCC Standards," *Educational Administration Quarterly* 51, no. 3 (2015): 1-31.

[5] See Lisa Bass, "Fostering an Ethic of Care in Leadership: A Conversation with Five African American Women," *Advances in Developing Human Resources* 11, no. 5 (2009): 619-632; Lisa Bass, "When Care Trumps Justice: The Operationalization of Black Feminist Caring in Educational Leadership*," International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 25, no. 1 (2012): 73-87; Lisa Bass, "Black Male Leaders Care Too: An Introduction to Black Masculine Caring in Educational Leadership," *Educational Administration Quarterly* 56, no. 3 (2020): 353-395; Lisa Bass, ed., *Black Mask-ulinity: A Framework for Black Masculine Caring* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2016); Arnold's work includes Noelle Witherspoon & Bruce M. Arnold, "Pastoral Care: Notions of Caring and the Black Female Principal," *The Journal of Negro Education* 79, no. 3 (2010): 220-232.

standardization, and individualization that have made school leadership increasingly difficult and have greatly constrained the possibilities of public education.

FIRST ISSUE: DON'T GET CAUGHT IN THE CARING TRAP

The emphasis on caring in relation to school leadership practice is not surprising, and most school leadership discourse follows the same arguments that philosopher of education Kenneth Strike made about the importance of balancing concern for care with concerns for justice. Among the exceptions are Bass and Arnold, who dig more deeply into care theory from Carol Gilligan and Nel Noddings[6] and attend to the numerous critiques and expansion of that earlier care theory advanced by key feminist and womanist authors.[7] Bass has delved into both Black feminist and Black masculinist caring in school leadership, and that important work has been influential in my collaborative work, in which we have looked at the impersonal caring that results from benign neglect, misplaced empathy, or race-evasive educational practices.[8]

As Black feminist critiques of caring have shown us, the white savior mentality or the Messiah complex can mask what is essentially impersonal caring—extending to students what one believes to be what they need without knowing what they actually want and need.[9] Impersonal caring is a double problem: it fails to serve students, and it wears out teachers whose efforts at caring are not received by students. Teachers may then perceive students as

---

[6] Carol Gilligan, "Woman's Place in Man's Life Cycle," *Harvard Educational Review* 49, no. 4 (1979): 431–446; Nel Noddings, *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984).

[7] Angela Valenzuela, *Subtractive Schooling: U.S.-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1999); Audrey Thompson, A., "Caring and Colortalk: Childhood Innocence in White and Black," in Vanessa Siddle-Walker & John R. Snarey, eds., *Race-ing Moral Formation: African American Perspectives on Care and Justice* (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2004): 23-37; Vanessa Siddle Walker & Renata H. Tompkins, "Caring in the Past: The Case of a Southern Segregated African American School," in Vanessa Siddle-Walker & John R. Snarey, eds., *Race-ing Moral Formation: African American Perspectives on Care and Justice* (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2004): 77-92; Sheron A. Fraser-Burgess, "Accountability and Troubling the Caring Ideal in the Classroom: A Call to Teacher Citizenry," *Educational Studies* 56, no. 5 (2020): 456-481; Andrea D. Green, A.D., "In a Different Room: Toward an African American Woman's Ethic of Care and Justice," in Vanessa Siddle-Walker & John R. Snarey, eds., *Race-ing Moral Formation: African American Perspectives on Care and Justice* (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2004): 55-71.

[8] Michael G. Gunzenhauser, Osly J. Flores, & Michael W. Quigley, "Race-Conscious Ethics in School Leadership: From Impersonal Caring to Critical Responsibility," *Teachers College Record* 123, no. 2 (2021): 1-40.

[9] Lorraine Code, *Rhetorical spaces: Essays on gendered locations* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1995).

ungrateful for their efforts at caring. Instead, teachers need to work toward more genuine caring, starting with a historically situated and context-specific understanding of students' needs and interests.

However, there are systemic barriers to genuine caring. Philosopher of education Chris Higgins, echoing Maxine Greene, argues that the freedom-seeking teacher is the one best able to teach.[10] Higgins argues that the teacher needs to maintain their personhood; otherwise, the students' needs completely dominate. The trend of declining teacher freedom coincides with the emergence of feminist and feminine ethics of caring, so it may not be a surprise that the downside of caring has emerged in its adoption as a philosophical basis for practice. If teachers have declining freedom, the danger is that self-sacrifice and martyrdom become the mark of caring. As Higgins argues, the problem with an overemphasis on the individual in ethics is that it tends to have a goal of maintaining the innocence of the individual. This situation makes teachers out as martyrs, making them difficult to criticize. In other words, it's difficult to understand how teachers can actually be in a position to genuinely care for students if much of what they do is decided for them. Without careful attention to the cultivation of caring, we have in other words set up teachers to be martyred.

Philosophers can think with school leaders about how best to foster the widespread impulse of caring for students without it overtaxing and exhausting teachers. They can help teachers see that the expectation of caring can be a dangerous trap. Teachers should certainly be expected to continue to learn about the needs and interests of their students in order to care for them in ways that actually serve them. If genuine caring is to be a foundation of moral leadership, leaders need to help teachers enact that caring, which may require removing barriers and changing practices that get in the way.

SECOND ISSUE: KNOW STUDENTS, DON'T STANDARDIZE THEM

A main way to remove barriers to genuine caring is for leaders to appreciate the related issue of the standardization of students through adoption of norms that all students are supposed to adhere to, along with the establishment of categories of deviation to place students that don't fit the norm. Channeling Michel Foucault, philosopher Thomas Popkewitz blew the whistle on educational reforms decades ahead of most people's appreciation of his reading of the changing social organization of education.[11]

In 1991, among Popkewitz's arguments was recognition for how teachers' participation in the development of curriculum standards was orchestrated to give the impression that their professional knowledge is respected if not essential. Responsibility for the authorship of curriculum standards is

---

[10] Chris Higgins, C., *The Good Life of Teaching: An Ethics of Professional Practice* (Chichester, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011).

[11] Thomas S. Popkewitz, *A Political Sociology of Educational Reform: Power/Knowledge in Teaching, Teacher Education and Research* (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 1991).

disembodied and diffused when it is subsequently returned to teachers to implement. The interest in setting high standards (and making them available to all) shifts to an interest in standardization.[12] Teachers' standardized practice is transferred, then, to standardized performance expectations of their students.

In his more recent work, Popkewitz addresses the pursuit of practical knowledge in educational research and its desire to make education more inclusive.[13] Consistent with the kind of governmentality we experience now, the sciences powerfully define the desired persons that our reform efforts attempt to instantiate ("the potentialities of society and people that research is to actualize"[14]). That process, Popkewitz argues, works against its very purpose:

> [P]aradoxically, the universalizing distinctions of the child's "well-being" are produced through the objectifications of populations that inscribe desires of redemption and rescue: the abjected qualities of the fragile families and lacking in the capabilities or psychological characteristics to succeed.[15]

And so, the sources of knowledge that are most prized for informing teacher practice are themselves logically flawed in their base assumptions. This rather sophisticated take-down of standardization invites critique of what he refers to as the erasures of differences to only reinscribe them. Popkewitz invites consideration of alternative approaches (which he doesn't explicitly name, but that's for those of us who work with school leaders to figure out), and in the meantime, "criticism that cuts into what seems self-evident."[16]

Other larger issues are things like mandatory state assessments and the constructions of educated persons embedded in Popkewitz's critiques. To the extent that schools reify these constructions, the collective autonomy of the school is compromised. Higgins' teacher is seeking freedom within a confined space, having to be concerned about how well their students are going to do on standardized measures.

Thinking with school leaders, philosophers of education can help explore the distinctions between high standards and standardization. They can help question forms of assessment that insist upon rigid consequences for students falling short, such as removing them from arts instruction and enrichment activities for extra test preparation. Philosophers can help leaders understand the value of discretion in policy implementation and the avoidance of additional surveillance that's neither required nor necessary for students' educational aspirations. Leaders further can question definitions of proficiency,

---

[12] Scott Thompson, "The Authentic Standards Movement and Its Evil Twin," *Phi Delta Kappan* 82, no. 5 (2001): 358-362.

[13] Thomas S. Popkewitz, "The Paradoxes of Practical Research: The Good Intentions of Inclusion that Exclude and Abject," *European Educational Research Journal* 19, no. 4 (2020): 271-288.

[14] Popkewitz, "The Paradoxes of Practical Research," 271.

[15] Popkewitz, "The Paradoxes of Practical Research," 281.

[16] Popkewitz, "The Paradoxes of Practical Research," 283.

standard pacing of instruction, and the constraints built into having to adopt wholesale curriculum products rather than building the capacity of teachers to create curriculum.

THIRD ISSUE: INSIST ON THE LIBERATORY AIMS OF EDUCATION AND TEACHING

Along with standardizing students is the concern with how high-stakes accountability policies now in effect nationally for two decades have effectively narrowed the curriculum in public schools, emphasizing tested areas. The narrowing of curriculum both narrows the aims of education and constrains the practice of teaching. Interest in teaching as a profession has narrowed precipitously in the last generation, exacerbated now by the stresses of Covid-era teaching and expanding student mental health needs.

Around the time that national-level educational reform first started to take hold in the 1980s, philosophers of education were wise to the dangers of the various reforms that had begun to attract widespread support among policymakers. Among the many philosophers of education commenting about this phenomenon at the time, Maxine Greene predicted the narrowed attention to educational aims coming from 1980s concerns.[17] At the time, Greene argued that reforms were making the work of the teacher increasingly prescriptive; the teacher was becoming a deliverer of instruction rather than a learner and inquirer. The basis for Higgins' view already mentioned, the pursuit of freedom of the teacher, Greene argued, is a precondition of their ability to provide educational experiences for students to do the same. Greene was one of many educational theorists arguing for the importance of education for freedom and liberation. Philosophy of education, once a staple in teacher education but derided by reforms as being too theoretical, subsequently lost its place in the curriculum in favor of concern for greater content area expertise (especially but not limited to secondary education) and more instrumental concerns for skill development for classroom management and delivery of standards-based curriculum. School leaders who went through such teacher education programs are routinely surprised in my classes when presented with ideas that bring their instrumental goals into question. For them, liberatory education is radically different from how they have been taught.

To help with the issues of narrowed aims of education and teaching, philosophers of education can help school leaders attend to the stated and unstated aims of education in their schools, to develop a vision for the role of the teacher in guiding students in pursuit of those aims, to engage communities in the practice of identifying preferred aims, and to create curriculum to achieve it. To get at the core issues for why we are experiencing a shortage of teachers, school leaders need partners to think about how deeply engrained social expectations of education and teaching have changed.

---

[17] Maxine Greene, *The Dialectic of Freedom* (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 1988).

FOURTH ISSUE: MAKE PROFESSIONALISM COLLECTIVE

An underlying concern throughout this paper has been the encroachment by standardization on the decision making of the individual teacher. Accountability systems attempt to identify effective teachers and reward them for their seeming success in eliciting higher than average achievement. These systems incentivize individual teachers to improve as many of their students' individual performances as possible. Such individualistic approaches to school reform have dominated for so long, it may be difficult for leaders to imagine alternatives.

The development of these reforms found support in the move to raise professional expectations of teachers. Historian David Labaree expressed concern for the predictable consequences of the move to professionalize teaching in the 1980s and 1990s through initiatives such as the Holmes Group, which aimed to lead the field by moving teacher certification into graduate programs.[18] In his conceptually rich genealogical essay, Labaree predicted in 1992 the paradoxical devolution of teacher professionalism that would arise from calls for greater professionalization of teaching. Labaree remarked that professionalization required solidification of specialized knowledge, which would need to occur as a first step. That happened: teacher educators built power and credibility, took greater control of standards and curriculum, and effectively decreased the autonomy of individual teachers. In practice, this work eliminated the expectation that teachers would need to make very many curricular and instructional decisions at all. Whatever autonomy teachers derived from implementations of progressivist education became less normal, less prominent, and less desirable.

As an alternative to all the individualization and coming standardization, philosophers at this time typically advocated for progressivist principles and more substantively rational practices that resisted the acceptance of new levels of control.[19] One of the more fully articulated views on the matter was provided by philosopher of education Kenneth Strike, who in a series of pieces addressed the specific challenges of school governance and bureaucratic control of schools by legislatures.[20] Within the discourse about professionalism

---

[18] David F. Labaree, "Power, Knowledge, and the Rationalization of Teaching: A Genealogy of the Movement to Professionalize Teaching," *Harvard Educational Review* 62, no. 2 (1992): 123–155.

[19] John I. Goodlad, Roger Soder, & Kenneth A. Sirotnik, K.A., eds., *The Moral Dimensions of Teaching* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1990).

[20] Kenneth A. Strike, "Is Teaching a Profession: How Would We Know?" *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 4, no. 1 (1990): 91-117; Kenneth A. Strike, "The Legal and Moral Responsibility of Teachers," in John I. Goodlad, Rogert Soder, & Kenneth A. Sirotnik, eds., *The Moral Dimension of Teaching* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1990): 188-223; Kenneth A. Strike, "Professionalism, Democracy, and Discursive Communities: Normative Reflections on Restructuring," *American Educational Research Journal,* 30, no. 2 (1993): 255-275; Kenneth A. Strike, Emil J.

in circulation at the time, Strike was interested in the relations between democratic control, autonomy, and professional judgment. Strike articulated a special role for teachers as "first among equals" who should initiate school policy and participate in deliberative spaces along with students (in a junior role), parents, and the school board (as representatives of the larger community).

Particularly relevant for Strike's argument is that teachers should not have ultimate authority about curriculum and educational aims (as they would if schools were to be ruled by philosopher kings).[21] Strike argues for a combination of John Locke's "consent of the governed" and Jurgen Habermas' "speech communities" to position the teacher within a local deliberative community. With some respect for the autonomy of the teacher but a more collective notion of decision-making ability, the teacher's special knowledge is honored, along with attention to varied and all opinions. Elsewhere Strike refers to this as "collective autonomy," arguing that school communities should maintain autonomy, free from undue influences of larger legislative authorities.

Wise to the limitations of the ideal speech situation, Strike is attentive to what we would now call minoritized views. While consensus is the arbiter in the ideal speech situation, deliberation need not always lead to consensus, but rather some notion of the sovereignty of the people through the decisions of the school board, who might have an arbitration role. The opportunity for marginalized (and marginalizing) viewpoints to be expressed in school board meetings, in the principal's office, by parents mostly, and by students, seems to be the model. The school board remains the ultimate arbiter. What seems missing from what Strike puts forward is accounting for influence from the outside to come leaking into the situation.

Outside influences leak into the deliberative process in educational communities in at least two ways. One is the introduction of reactionary discourses that reinforce dominant perspectives, especially now with the anti-critical race theory movement. These influences are coming not only directly from complaining individuals, but nationally organized efforts to ban certain texts. More insidiously, these seem to be geared toward self-disciplining teachers not wanting to risk controversy. These national discourses seem intended to overwhelm more local, deliberative public spaces and to intimidate rather than inform collective decision making. Leaders may need help to identify when communities can be led to be more inclusive, and sometimes the most an equity-focused leader can do is name the damage being done by excluding others and constraining opportunities.

Philosophers can think with school leaders about the kind of collective responsibility for education that Strike and others offered as alternatives to the more individualistic approaches to education that reform efforts have led us to believe are necessary for systemic improvement. Leaders need tools for leaning

---

Haller, & Jonas F. Soltis, *The Ethics of School Administration* (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 1988).

[21] Strike, "Professionalism, Democracy, and Discursive Communities."

into parent and community interests in asserting responsibility for education. Rather than being nostalgic for some lost moment when teachers were autonomous decision makers, leaders need to clarify the roles that all members of communities have for asserting responsibility and working for collective decision making about professional decisions. Philosophers can work with leaders to see the conceptual import of such collective efforts to work against the fundamental constraints of the profession. Indeed, some current advocates for school-based educational reform have returned to these collective notions, including the work on collaborative professionalism by Andy Hargreaves and Michael Fullan[22] and some of the applications of improvement science for systemic reform by Jill Perry, Anthony Bryk, and Brandi Hinnant-Crawford.[23]

CONCLUSION

With an approach that encourages school leaders to become more firmly grounded in the philosophical concepts that guide their most important commitments, philosophers of education can think with school leaders on these four core issues and other applied concerns that may arise as important in particular settings. I offer here an approach that encourages philosophers to take seriously the current issues that school leaders face as philosophical conflicts. Leaders are working against powerful cultural themes that dominate education policy with standardization and individualization, furthering inequities and imposing colonial, patriarchal, and white supremacist concerns. Philosophical approaches can help by fostering collective, liberatory practices.

The arguments for liberatory education are promising, yet they invite philosophical elaboration. Beyond the critique that leadership practice often lacks philosophical grounding, one way that philosophers of education can engage with school leaders (and those preparing to be school leaders, if we are to take on the opportunities presented to us) is to help leaders argue persuasively for their beliefs about the right aims of education, their professional ethics, and their beliefs in the importance of understanding the life experiences of others.

I imagine a philosopher of education's project as a way *to think with* leaders who are capable and committed leaders. I should make explicit the recurrent assumption that a philosopher's school leader partner has interest in making education more equitable for their students. Importantly, a school leader should know what they believe is valuable, just, and meaningful and should be

---

[22] Andy Hargreaves and Michael Fullan, *Professional Capital: Transforming Teachers in Every School* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2012).

[23] Jill A. Perry, Debby Zambo, & Robert Crow, *The Improvement Science Dissertation in Practice: A Guide for Faculty, Committee Members, and Their Students* (Gorham, ME: Myers Education Press, 2020); Anthony Bryk, Louis M. Gomez, Alicia Grunow, & Paul G. LeMahieu, *Learning to Improve: How America's Schools Can Get Better at Getting Better* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2015); Brandi N. Hinnant-Crawford, *Improvement Science in Education: A Primer* (Gorham, ME: Myers Education Press, 2020).

interested in collaborating with others in their communities about these beliefs and values, even if they might have difficulty expressing them or not fully know how to act upon them. If they are not interested in that work, they have challenges a philosopher of education is not likely to be able to help them with.