What do students have to do with educational leadership?: Making a case for centering student voice

By: Van T. Lac and Katherine Cumings Mansfield

Abstract:

The purpose of this article is to illustrate the value of educational leaders intentionally including students in shaping the policies and practices that affect young people's schooling experiences. First, we share the literature on student voice and introduce Principal Orientations for Critical Youth Educational Leadership as a conceptual model, advocating ways leaders can engage young people in school governance. Second, we share an empirical example from our research that holds promise to build caring, equitable, and responsive classrooms and schools by centering students' voices. Finally, we consider what our findings mean for educational leadership preparation programs.

Keywords: student voice | social justice | shared governance | critical youth leadership | leadership preparation programs

Article:

In educational settings, structures rarely invite students and families to work alongside teachers and administrators at the proverbial decision-making table. For the most part, educational polices and pivotal decisions are made on behalf of students and families rather than with them. Some of this decision-making emanates from the federal government in the form of congressional laws such as the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA). ESSA, passed in December 2015, governs U.S. K-12 public education policy and practice. ESSA replaced the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB), which in turn was the reauthorization of the 1965 *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA), significantly expanding the federal role in public education. In addition, individual states govern decisions ranging from how teachers and principals should be trained and certified to how schools are funded, while local education agencies such as school boards make judgments regarding what textbooks should be used and how students should be disciplined. Rarely are community members, such as parents and students, consulted as to their perceived needs or desired outcomes.

For most of its 100-year history, the educational leadership field has been engaged with traditional definitions of leadership and roles of school leaders. These emphases are reflected in

how leadership preparation programs are designed, curriculum selected, and andragogical strategies used in the university classroom (Cobb, Weiner, & Gonzales, 2017; Kottkamp & Rusch, 2009; McCarthy & Forsyth, 2009). However, contemporary trends in coursework and professional standards have moved toward school leaders' roles as justice advocates and democratic change makers (Carpenter & Brewer, 2012; Cobb et al., 2017; Newcomb & Mansfield, 2014). While we celebrate the turn in emphasis, we remain concerned that the act of leading schools for social justice still remains an adult-centric venture. That is, regardless of educational leadership emphases (both as a discipline and as individual leadership practices), seldom do students have a say in the day-to-day decisions that affect their lives. For example, an increasing number of education scholars have challenged what they perceive as undemocratic practices in schools, highlighting the silence of student voice in the daily functions of schools (Cook-Sather, 2007; Mitra & Gross, 2009; Rudduck & Fielding, 2006; Smyth, 2006). Furthermore, an emerging group of scholars, specifically in the field of education administration, have sought to push the limits of who may be considered an educational leader, advocating for centering the voices and experiences of students in schools (Bertrand, 2014; Mansfield, 2014, 2015; Mansfield, Welton, & Halx, 2012; Mitra, 2006, 2008).

The purpose of this article is to illustrate the value of educational leaders intentionally including students in shaping the policies and practices that affect children and youths' schooling experiences. First, we share the literature on student voice and offer what we have named Principal Orientations for Critical Youth Educational Leadership (POCYEL) as an emergent conceptual model for leaders to engage young people in school governance. Second, using qualitative secondary analysis (QSA) of an empirical study, we reengage with the findings using POCYEL and discuss the ways the original study does and does not meet the principles of the framework. Finally, we consider what our findings mean for educational leadership preparation programs.

What Is Student Voice? And Why Should We Care?

In our review of literature on student voice, we decided to focus on research conducted in the United States in the past 10 to 15 years, narrowing our search primarily to the field of educational leadership to explore how and to what degree students have been conceptualized as school leaders in the literature. This review is not meant to be exhaustive, yet we aim to offer a broad overview of the literature related to student voice as it pertains to school leadership and education reform.

Student voice in school settings, when actualized, can manifest in myriad ways. The practice of youth voice, according to Mitra (2006), can involve students simply sharing their perspectives with adults at school to working alongside them to seek solutions to problems. Fielding (2001) further articulates a continuum of student voice, ranging from *students as data source*, such as teachers using student work to inform instruction, to *students as researchers*, where youth drive in-school inquiries and initiate change in their schools. Mansfield, Welton & Halx (2012) have created a conceptual model for student voice based on the extant literature, but acknowledge limitations of their current knowledge by leaving space in their articulation for *Undiscovered Territory of Student Voice Possibilities*. Indeed, an examination of the

educational leadership literature reveals a relatively uncharted terrain with limitless possibilities on how to weave student voice into the fabric of leading schools.

The Potential of Student Voice

Anchoring student voice in educational settings matters in several ways. First, including students in school governance teaches them the democratic ideals of the United States that strengthen citizenship behaviors into adulthood (Dewey, 2007, 2013). Even in an era of standardization and accountability measures in schools, Smyth (2006) argues for an approach to schooling that steers away from a compliance model; he advocates a form of schooling that requires students' active involvement and participation in their own learning. Students who develop voice and leadership skills strengthen feelings of self-efficacy, and, in turn, are empowered to make a difference in their schools and communities (Jones & Yonezawa, 2002; Mitra, 2006, 2008, 2009; Oldfather, 1995; Parker & Neuharth-Pritchett, 2009). However, Silva (2001) raises the concern of whose voice counts among students: the high achieving, college-bound pupil with the propensity already to participate in leadership activities or those students who are often left at the margins because of their academic standing or track record with discipline. Finally, some youth-led initiatives strengthen young people's critical consciousness, equipping students with the sociopolitical skill set and tools to better understand and analyze how social, historical, political, and economic structures perpetuate inequitable outcomes in schools and society (Cammarota & Fine, 2010; Freire, 1970; Kirshner & Ginwright, 2012; Oakes, Rogers, & Lipton, 2006).

In addition to buttressing students' development, shared voice and governance also benefits educators. For example, research shows that adult facilitators and supporters of student-led initiatives articulate the specific ways *they* learn and grow as they work alongside youth to create change inside and outside of schools (Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008; Guishard, 2009; Lac & Fine, in press). Cook-Sather (2007) documents the benefits for all stakeholders—students, student teachers, and school leaders—when adults pay heed to the concerns and perspectives of young people regarding teaching, learning, and schools in general. Even students and teachers who may not directly participate in youth voice initiatives benefit when structures are in place to elevate the voices and perspectives of young people (N. G. Fielding & Fielding, 1986; Mitra, 2008, 2009; Poon & Cohen, 2012; Wernick, Woodford, & Kulick, 2014). For example, Poon and Cohen (2012) highlight the work of youth in a New Orleans organization called the Vietnamese American Young Leaders Association (VAYLA). Touted as the New Orleans "miracle" after Hurricane Katrina, schools in New Orleans transitioned into the first major United States city to adopt all charter schools across the district. The dominant narrative threading through this "miracle" included the storyline that the poor students floundering in underperforming schools before Hurricane Katrina would finally be rescued by an innovative approach to education through the charter school movement (Poon & Cohen, 2012). In response, the authors, along with youth researchers from VAYLA, sought to examine the degree and extent of this turnaround in New Orleans. Their research results directly contradicted this dominant narrative, eventually leading school district officials to implement policies in response to key findings.

For generations, young people have played a pivotal role in social justice movements despite an enduring view of youth cast in a pessimistic light. In fact, from the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s to Black Lives Matter Movement since 2013 (Craven, 2015), youth continually play a

central role as change agents in their schools and communities—ideals that illustrate the promise of democracy. Despite the fact that youth have historically been at the forefront of social activism, the dominant discourse still positions them as the source of societal ills (Hosang, 2006). Youth are constructed as passive receivers of mandates rather than agents of change, restricting young people's potential contributions, essentially silencing their voices (Vadeboncoeur & Stevens, 2005). Public policies, consequently, tend to focus on controlling and containing youth, rather than creating spaces to include students in self-governance and decision-making processes. Ginwright and Cammarota (2006) assert the integral linkages between youth activism and the imperatives of a democracy:

> The only chance for democracy to expand in the next generation is for young people to be perceived of and treated as vital agents of social transformation. Limiting their agency by undermining their efforts to improve community conditions will render them objects of knowledge—vessels to be filled. The advancement of an active and engaged citizenry requires the edifying practice of acknowledging and supporting youth agency, and young people's capacity to become subjects of knowledge and social transformation. (p. xix)

Thus, we maintain that building an active and engaged citizenry that buoys our democracy requires youth to play a crucial role in the vision and the transformation, especially in schools—places where people purport to serve them and where they spend most of their time.

While the extant literature echoes the idea that youth-led initiatives thrive in learning contexts where adults work to support students in their work (M. Fielding, 2001; Jones & Yonezawa, 2002; Mitra, 2009; Wernick et al., 2014), there is a growing body of research that highlights the very real challenges that surface when youth engage in student-led initiatives.

The Obstacles to Student Voice

Researchers and scholars who adopt sociocultural perspectives account for the ways the intersections of race, class, gender, sexuality, and many more social categories directly shape an individual and a group's collective identity, experiences, and opportunities (Mansfield, 2013, 2015; Mansfield et al., 2012). Mansfield and colleagues (2012) contend that addressing the complex nature of student voice requires careful attention to context and power. Even as some critical theorists acknowledge schools as potential sites for resistance, these same scholars also recognize the ways schools continue to serve as sites of social reproduction (Anyon, 1981; Bowles & Gintis, 2002; Giroux & Penna, 1979; McLaren, 2015; Shapiro, 2017). Having students disrupt the status quo and create change in traditional institutions, such as schools, sometimes entails encountering challenges unique to school settings, such as resistant school or district staff.

Across several studies, youth express how participation in student-led initiatives allows them to exercise autonomy, matching their developmental needs in ways that traditional schooling experiences do not (Eccles et al., 1993; Mansfield, 2014; Mitra, 2008; Ozer & Wright, 2012). However, creating infrastructures for youth voice in schools can surface intractable hurdles. Sometimes challenges can be related to technical aspects of schools, such as scheduling issues or time constraints. For example, Ozer, Newlan, Douglas & Hubbard (2013) document how an

elective course at a local high school, which focused on youth research, encountered obstacles when student enrollment changed each semester, compromising continuity in vision and execution of the research agenda. Several studies also highlight the tensions of engaging in student voice initiatives among students and adults (Mitra, 2008, 2009). Even though the adults in Mitra's (2009) study sought ways to collaborate with students, admittedly, once the project turned into a course, and grading became tied to the experience, both students and teachers acknowledged a shift in power dynamics among the group.

Few adults in schools would disagree with the idea that students should have a voice in their educational experiences. However, based on what we know from research and our personal experiences, the extent and the degree to which students' voices result in change surfaces a clear divergence between the will of youth and what most consider traditional educational leadership. At times, admittedly, there may be valid reasons for administrative pushback. For example, Mitra (2009) illustrated a youth-led initiative designed to support Spanish-speaking families at an underresourced school. In this example, student leaders determined that providing translation services for Spanish-speaking parents could help relationships between families and staff. However, the school principal, citing concerns related to student confidentiality issues, made the unilateral decision to terminate student-translator services. But in other empirical studies, the adults in the building simply either dismissed or disregarded the work of student-led initiatives and/or spent more time marveling at youth's presentation skills rather than on what they were actually asking traditional leaders to consider changing (Bertrand, 2014; Oakes et al., 2006). Sometimes, as Lac and Fine (in press) report, educational leaders seek to direct the course of an initiative rather than supporting youth in their leadership endeavors. In another example, Oakes and colleagues (2006) detail the resistance from school staff when students protested the practice of racialized tracking at their high school. Conflictual viewpoints create challenges for school leaders to address while attempting to appease multiple stakeholders with divergent interests.

The Key Levers to Student Voice in Educational Leadership

While the roadblocks to student voice appear insurmountable at times, empirical research offers key levers adult advocates and educational leaders can employ to amplify and prioritize the voices of young people in schools. The key levers include school leaders committing to youth voice, positioning students as leaders in their schools, and affording opportunities to support young people to exercise their voice.

First of all, to put it simply, school leaders who genuinely support centering the voice of students incorporate it as a natural part of school culture. Mitra, Serriere, and Stoicovy (2012) highlight the vision of an elementary school principal prioritizing the engagement of students, and her staff echoing that this is a "part of the way we do things here" (p. 106). In his study of four elementary school principals, Damini (2014) notes that school leaders who value student perspectives normalize a daily routine involving constant interaction and dialogue with students. Rather than assuming they know what students think and believe (especially about school), such principals actively seek out student perspectives (Damini, 2014; Gentilucci & Muto, 2007). At a fundamental level, if school leaders strive to center the voices of students in their schools, then they must internalize this core belief and create a school culture that nurtures this ethos.

Another important facilitator for youth voice in schools requires the intentional positioning of students as change agents and leaders. York and Kirshner (2015) compare the experiences of students participating in civics in action (Levinson, 2014) courses at two different high schools. The staff and administration at Smith High perceived students in this course using a deficit-oriented lens and offered minimal support to help young people in their healthy lunches campaign. In contrast, students at Central High were positioned as youth researchers and change agents; staff and administrators supported students through their presence at events. Adults at the school offered critical feedback to strengthen students' antibullying campaign. Not surprisingly, students most effective in having their voices heard in this study were the ones who were perceived as capable of enacting change in their schools.

A final lever requires school leaders to actively and intentionally create opportunities for student voice. In their study of three different school administrators leading reform efforts, Osberg, Pope, and Galloway (2006) note genuine incorporation of student voice varied depending on whether the principal made this a priority. One administrator set up meetings with her leadership team with intentionality to ensure their student representative could attend as well. In Sussman's (2015) work with youth leaders and school administrators, he mentions that effective school reform efforts require a "circulatory channel" where constant communication occurs between all parties involved (p. 124). School leaders were encouraged to invite and include student leaders in school leadership team meetings to guarantee that students' voices were heard (Sussman, 2015). For student voice initiatives to thrive within school settings, there needs to be a concerted effort made on the part of school administrators to value and support this work.

Some school leaders may need a way to conceptualize how including student voice in their leadership practices fits within what they learned in their preparation programs. Taken together, we agree with Mansfield and colleagues' (2012) assertion that "democratic practices, critical pedagogy, transformative leadership, and leadership for social justice are critical components of educational leadership that foster students' voices and leadership capacity" (p. 31). Next, we push further, by building on the Mansfield et al. (2012) tripartite approach by sharing additional specificities around the orientations that traditional school leaders need to engage young people in school governance.

Conceptual Framework

Grounded in our review of the extant literature on youth voice, we seek to contribute to the field of educational leadership by offering guiding principles for school leaders to consider when working collaboratively and equitably with students for social justice. The following section details principal orientations nested in a Freirian (Freire, 1970) lens that fosters a liberatory approach to leadership for administrators in their work with youth. These elements come together to generate what we are calling the *Principal Orientations for Critical Youth Educational Leadership* (POCYEL) framework. POCYEL consists of three orientations that encompass fostering critical perspectives with youth, recognizing and respecting students' lived experiences, and adopting a constructivist approach to leadership in schools. We begin with an overview of Freire's philosophical stance and then proceed to summarize the three principles of POCYEL.

The roots of the POCYEL framework draw from the teachings of Paulo Freire. Notable as a world-renowned scholar and activist, Freire formulated his philosophical approaches to education through his work as a literacy teacher in the rural areas of Brazil. Freire's seminal book *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) delineates key principles in his vision of what transformative and liberatory education looks like in practice. Freire (1970) argued that oppressed populations have the right to *critical consciousness*—a recognition of the utility of systemic inequities and how public policies have directly shaped the oppression of marginalized groups. He also delineated between a *banking model* and a *problem-posing* approach to education. A banking model assumes students enter schools as empty vessels with nothing to offer classroom learning; in this model, the teacher represents the sole proprietor of knowledge, depositing content and skills into students. However, a problem-posing approach levels the hierarchy in the classroom where both teachers and students alike have experiential knowledge and skills to contribute to the learning in the classroom. In a problem-posing classroom, dialogue represents a vital element in pedagogy where students and teachers together co-construct knowledge and an understanding of how to read the word and the world around them (Freire, 1970). Threaded throughout this POCYEL framework, we braid together the principles of Freire's teachings and also tie in key takeaways from the literature review on student voice.

Developing a Critical Eye

The first orientation of POCYEL requires school leaders to develop critical subjectivities in their efforts to work alongside students for social justice. For example, if school leaders do not learn to recognize the function of educational policy and practice in shaping oppression, how would they come to understand the importance of leading with a social justice stance or the essential role student voice plays in effective school reform? Freire (1970) insisted that authentic change requires an active recognition of how policies and structures, historically and presently, shape oppression. Building from that, scholars of youth participatory action research (YPAR) assert that discovering and implementing solutions requires critical analyses to define and understand problems (Cammarota & Fine, 2010; Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008; Kirshner, Strobel, & Fernández, 2003).

One approach to consider would be to create learning opportunities for students, families, teachers, and administrators to foster critical perspectives. For example, during professional development meetings, principals might engage staff in critical conversations centered on systems of oppression such as racism, classism or xenophobia (Lewis & Diamond, 2015; Mansfield, 2013; Pollack, 2008; Singleton, 2014; Smith et al., 2011). To nurture a critical mindset in students, school leaders and teachers could enact critical pedagogy, thus helping young people move beyond viewing opportunity gaps in terms of individual merit and toward a more nuanced perception of ways current institutional structures carry the vestiges of both de jure and de facto segregation (Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008; Parker & Stovall, 2004). Both school personnel and students need a firm understanding of *power over* to more adequately practice *power with*, which could potentially lead to expanding our notions of who counts as a leader or what constitutes leadership.

Honoring Students' Lived Experiences

Another leadership orientation that is essential to building POCYEL is affording respect and appreciation for the perspectives of students. Students know what is working and what needs serious attention in schools. However, far too often, educational leaders do not take advantage of harnessing the knowledge and wisdom youth could be offering if only given the chance. Rather than viewing youth as a resource and as potential co-leaders, principals and teachers more often than not adopt a banking model to school leadership, making assumptions about what students are capable of actually thinking and doing (Damiani, 2014; Gentilucci & Muto, 2007). However, research outside traditional notions of educational leadership suggests that when adults value and recognize the lived experiences of students, classrooms and schools become more inclusive and welcoming (Jones & Yonezawa, 2009; Mansfield, 2011, 2015; Poon & Cohen, 2012; Wernick et al., 2014). For example, Wernick et al. (2014) document the work of young people involved in Riot Youth, a community-based organization located in Ann Arbor, Michigan, with the goal of supporting lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, or questioning youth (LGBTQQ). Based on Riot Youth members' personal experiences of being bullied and harassed in schools, Riot Youth decided to develop a school climate survey to be distributed across multiple high schools in the city. Students used theater performance as a mechanism to share findings from the survey with the community (Wernick et al., 2014). The theater group called Gayrilla performed their survey findings regarding harassment, bullying, and feelings of isolation to audiences packed with parents, community members, and school administrators. As a direct result of attending the performance, educational leaders reached out to Riot Youth to help shape school and district policies to support LGBTQQ students.

The promotion of student voice in schools necessitates school and district leaders seeing students as experts in their own lives. According to Freire, respecting people as subjects of *their* lives rather than objects in *our* lives is essential to human growth and development. Freire (1970) declares, "Attempting to liberate the oppressed without their reflective participation in the act of liberation is to treat them as objects that must be saved from a burning building" (p. 65). Similarly, attempting to change schools without involving students robs them of the opportunity to develop their leadership capacities and pilfers their prospects to be agents of change in their own schools.

Adopting a Constructivist Approach to Educational Leadership

A final orientation toward developing POCYEL requires traditional school leaders to employ a constructivist approach in their practices. Similar to understanding learning as something people construct together in a problem-posing classroom (Freire, 1970), a constructivist approach to leadership entails recognizing students as potential co-constructors of knowledge when it comes to everyday practice in schools. Thus, principals who couple their knowledge of learning theory with their leadership for social justice philosophy would understand the need to create systematic opportunities to co-construct knowledge with students in terms of identifying, defining, and solving problems. In other words, a constructivist approach to educational leadership means constructing what it means to be a leader with students and inviting opportunities for co-leadership. For example, students can lead a committee that shapes policies around dress code; in addition, students can be co-leaders in determining discipline policy as well as take a leadership role in implementing peer mediation.

Echoing the sentiments of Freire (1970), who refused to see students as empty containers in the classroom, school leaders must also envision students in their schools as valuable contributors in building leadership capacity of a school. Take, for example, the research of Jones and Yonezawa (2009), which documented the ways local students can be supported to conduct research in their schools. At one high school, in particular, a principal in their study requested youth researchers investigate how the structure of their school either facilitated or deterred learning for students. Student researchers shared their findings with the staff, specifically that sophomores felt overwhelmed by the workload at school. The principal used student research findings to inform discussion during professional development and, ultimately, to support teachers in how they approached assigning student work (Jones & Yonezawa, 2002, 2009). The work of Jones and Yonezawa highlights the ways school leaders can apply a constructivist approach to leadership with students. Without the invaluable insights of students, school leaders and staff would not have the necessary information to improve the learning conditions in schools (Halx, 2014; Mansfield, 2014, 2015; Welton, Harris, LaLonde, & Moyer, 2015). Furthermore, when students are provided the tools and opportunities to engage in building their own leadership capacity, they often unearth perspectives and insights from fellow students not typically or readily accessible to adults.

POCYEL in Practice

To make sense of our understanding of POCYEL in practice, we revisited the findings of a prior study documenting the ways school leaders created a safe space for middle school girls to develop their voice and leadership skills. The purpose of this section is threefold. First, we describe our QSA methodology used to generate this article. Then, we share an overview of the original empirical study including its purpose, methods, and findings. Finally, we engage in an analytical discussion whereby we reexamine the existing data through the POCYEL lens.

Overview of QSA Methodology

As noted above, for this study, we chose to use QSA of one of our empirical studies to ground our understanding of the POCYEL framework. In doing so, we also hoped to provide readers examples of specific ways educators might implement the POCYEL approach.

We chose QSA because its purpose matched ours; that is, we used existing data collected from prior studies to pursue a new research question or utilize alternative theoretical perspectives (Gladstone, Volpe, & Boydell, 2007; Heaton, 1998; Mansfield, 2015). To do so, we adhered to four key ethical principles for using QSA effectively (Heaton, 1998; Hinds, Vogel, & Clarke-Steffen, 1997; Szabo & Strang, 1997). First, this QSA is sound because we have access to the original data, as Mansfield is the primary investigator. Second, we conducted preliminary analysis on the original interview transcripts, observational notes, documents, and field notes to check for compatibility of the data for QSA, consequently enabling supplementary in-depth analysis. Third, we provide an overview of the original study's design and methods (as prescribed by Witzel, Medjedovic, & Kretzer, 2008) in the next section. Finally, as outlined by Hinds et al. (1997), we gave careful consideration to the ethics associated with using primary data for secondary purposes. Based on our professional judgment, we do not consider secondary

analysis for the purposes of this article a violation of the original agreement we made with the participants.

Overview of Original Study

Data for this QSA were derived from an ethnography conducted over a 6-year period that used participant observation, photography, focus groups, and interviews to discover and describe the emergent school culture and the lived experiences of female secondary students in an all-girls college preparatory school (for additional details on the methodology, see Mansfield, 2011). The ethnography shares the story of a group of women educators who purposefully crafted a unique school culture designed to disrupt and transform the "dailiness of sexism, racism, and classism" (Mansfield, 2015, p. 25). The principal and teachers were committed to building a supportive school culture that included developing robust relationships, forefronting the voices of women, and creating opportunities for students to co-lead this organization. The educators featured in this research did not have training in POCYEL, nor was there direct mention of this approach in transcripts. However, the development of women as leaders was a distinct purpose of the school as stated in the memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the school district and the private philanthropy partially funding the school.

The original research, as a long-term ethnography, was approached inductively. That is, the researcher did not enter the setting with exact research questions in mind, but spent extended time in the school looking for artifacts and patterns of behavior that led to tentative hypotheses and theory building around fostering a positive school culture. Throughout the research endeavor, it became evident that the school culture centered on including critical conversations about race, gender, class, language, and other social identities, examining the social justice implications therein, along with developing the voices and leadership skills of students. (A more substantive treatment of these issues can be found in Mansfield, 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015).

Overview of Secondary Study

Conducting a secondary analysis of the original data entailed approaching the current research deductively. That is, we began with a particular theoretical framework in mind (POCYEL) and examined the original findings in light of our understanding of the POCYEL framework. While it can be argued that there are nuances within the POCYEL framework, we focus on three general principles that make this particular approach distinctive: the importance of (a) building and strengthening the critical perspectives among students and staff, (b) honoring the lived experiences and valuing the knowledge of students and staff, and finally, (c) employing a constructivist approach to including student voice in decision-making processes.

To assist with this approach, data points included revisiting interview transcripts, observation notes, and visual data such as photographs and lesson plans. Below, we discuss the original findings and compare them to our understanding of POCYEL. We then follow with a discussion of implications of this QSA for traditional school leaders hoping to build caring, equitable, and responsive classrooms and schools by centering students' voices before considering what these findings mean for educational leadership preparation programs.

Discussion of QSA Findings

The purpose of this section is to discuss how the original research findings compare with our understanding of the POCYEL framework. It is important to note that, in the interest of space, it is impossible to fully flesh out this discussion by providing abundant supportive evidence. Rather, the reader is counseled to consult prior publications that examine and discuss these research findings in greater detail (Mansfield, 2011, 2013, 2014, 2015).

The founding principal of the school, Ms. Santiago[1] showed evidence of POCYEL orientations. For example, she worked to purposefully develop critical perspectives as an essential skill; actively recognized students' lived experiences as true, just, and appropriate; and espoused a constructivist approach in a variety of ways, albeit to varying degrees. Much of Ms. Santiago's intuitiveness can be contributed to her intimate knowledge of the city and her lived experiences that were very similar to those of the students she served. (Ms. Santiago was often referred to as a "local girl" who went off to an Ivy League university so she could "come back home to serve the community.") Ms. Santiago was also promised a great deal of autonomy during the hiring process. Additional details are shared below.

Cultivate Critical Perspectives

Ms. Santiago was in the unique position to build this school "from the ground up." She literally crafted the school culture according to her understanding that historically minoritized peoples have the right to critical consciousness and that she was in a position to make that happen. In addition to adhering to high expectations and providing a robust formal curriculum, Ms. Santiago and her team displayed a conscientious effort to incorporate problem-based skill building in informal curricula. On a regular basis, the adults at the school engaged students in critical conversations about some of the barriers that they (principal, teachers, students, parents guest speakers) have faced/are facing/may face as a person of color or as a woman (or at the intersection of ethnicity, sex, and socioeconomic status). Ms. Santiago also emphasized that awareness of systemic inequities and ways policies have shaped oppression (Freire, 1970) was not enough. Principal Santiago believed that "it's a social injustice if you don't let people know what they need to be aware of in their lives [and how to combat that]." Thus, she and the faculty and staff, along with community volunteers, provided students with information and skill-building activities that they believed would help to "empower them to become strong women."

Concede Lived Experiences

Ms. Santiago was clear that her personal experiences as a Latina growing up in poverty were the impetus for her work. She purposefully shared her story to help people understand her motivations and the passions developing the culture of the school. This standpoint also translated to how she treated faculty, staff, and students. Ms. Santiago went beyond tolerating diversity. She acknowledged teachers' lived experiences as true and proper by first hiring people who understood this philosophical stance and then regularly *conceded* to their judgment on meeting the needs of students in their individual classrooms.

---

[1] All names of people and places are pseudonyms.

Perhaps most importantly, Principal Santiago and her team built a trusting environment to draw out the students' voices and share *their* lived experiences. The educators at this school modeled their belief that to avoid seeking the introspective involvement of students in their "liberation" is to treat students as "objects that must be saved" (Freire, 1970, p. 65). Honoring lived experiences was a reciprocal endeavor. Ms. Saaveda, the college counselor, expressed how "sharing her story" was essential to help students trust her; she "gets it."

> We literally have been like to the same bakeries on Sunday morning, gotten the same things, seen the same lady that is mute and sells candy apples, you know, from time to time, in the hot, hot sun, and how our dads always either bought the candy apple or gave her money. Like, we had the exact same stories. And, they are like, "Wow, you are me, Miss. You're me!" And, I said, "That is what I am trying to say. Yes, yes. You're me." And, I said, "Yeah, like I am not kidding when I tell you I get it. I lived there." I showed one of them my house . . . "that's literally my room on the other side of that window . . . you know I used to sleep on the floor, too, because eight houses down, the girl got shot [by a drive-by shooter] and paralyzed from the waist down, when I was in like the fifth grade. And, you know, I could not ride my bike on those two streets there . . ." They were like, "You are really not kidding." "No, I am not kidding you. It is not like this thing that I get up and do, like a little spiel in front of you, kind of thing." So . . . I think that really makes a difference, when the teachers can really relate to the students.

By using her personal stories, Ms. Saaveda built trust, modeled active introspection, elicited the voices of students, and affirmed the lives of both adults and students; that their experiences and perspectives are true, valid, and important.

Espouse a Constructivist Approach

Principal Santiago and her team went further than just honoring students' perspectives. She and her team *sought* students' perspectives because they viewed students as valuable contributors to identifying problems and solutions in their school. It was clear they espoused a constructivist approach not only in their pedagogy but in inviting students as co-leaders in important school decision-making processes.

One of the most salient co-constructions of leadership involved employment decisions. The power to build the cadre of teachers was not hoarded by the principal. Rather, students participated in defining what their hiring needs were and the meaning-making around what constituted excellent teaching. Students participated in training sessions that included understanding important state and district policies as well as federal U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) guidelines for evaluating job applications and conducting interviews. In addition, students helped design the rubric to use during demonstration lessons when evaluating potential teachers for hire. On top of observing these leadership training sessions, Mansfield was invited to join the students and other stakeholders as an evaluator for three finalists for a teaching position. The students were not just honorary committee members; their voices held much weight not only in the development of the hiring criteria, but in the implementation of the hiring processes and the decision-making processes that followed.

This secondary analysis of a prior study was helpful to us, not only to make sense of our nascent theory building but also to test whether our thinking was capable of bridging the theory-to-practice gap. While conjoining different theoretical frames to form a new way to view student voice is not the only way to analyze a school culture, we offer our framework as a fresh and useful tool to research how students might be positioned as co-leaders in their schools. In addition to using POCYEL as an analytical framework in our research, we also believe the three prongs of developing critical perspectives, honoring lived experiences, and practicing a constructivist approach to teaching and leading can potentially be used as a blueprint for sustained change in schools.

Implications and Conclusion

Hearkening back to the question posed in the title of our article, "What Do Students Have to Do With Educational Leadership?" we offer this answer: *everything*. The conundrum remains in how school leaders balance espousing the values of a school with actualizing these beliefs in practice. Schools and districts cannot establish equitable learning outcomes for all students when leaders continually ignore, belittle, or deny the voices of historically marginalized students, parents, and families. Educational leaders cannot purport democratic principles in the mission statement of their schools while also excising students and families from the decision-making process.

But engaging student voice in schools does not come easy. Along with others (Bertrand, 2014; Mansfield, 2012, 2014; Welton et al., 2015), we recognize that contesting the status quo and including students in school governance is difficult work. Add to that the fear that some teachers and principals have that they will lose their jobs if they become known as a justice advocate (Marshall & Anderson, 2008). For example, while the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL), adopted by the Council of Chief State School Officers, advises more learner-centered leadership and political advocacy, many school districts and educational leadership preparation programs encourage taking a neutral stance or refraining from activism altogether (Carpenter & Brewer, 2012; Mansfield et al., 2012). These conflicting messages (or lack of training in policy advocacy leadership for social justice) could potentially derail movement toward including students in school reform efforts. That leads us to wonder how leadership preparation programs can address these issues. What role can/should our university programs play in encouraging school leaders to engage students as co-leaders? How can we re-teach our students schooled in the current institutional structures new ways of engaging with these "othered" educational leaders? While we are in no way claiming to have all the answers, we do offer a few ideas for consideration in the hopes that they will spur others to build on these ideas.

At the core, school leaders who prioritize equity and aim to cultivate student voice in their schools must also become scholars in the study of social justice. Educational leadership programs should offer a range of courses that allow students to study how the intersections of race, class, gender, sexuality, and geography inform and shape educational inequities in our country. Emergent principals should develop a fluency in how structural forces perpetuate uneven outcomes for historically marginalized students through public policies and structures. We cannot expect adults to become partners and collaborators in school reform

initiatives *alongside* students if they do not have the skill sets to recognize the institutional factors that reproduce societal inequities. Educational leadership preparation programs should train new principals with the capacity to lead professional development with students and staff to address issues related to social justice.

As schools do not operate in vacuums, school leaders interested in fostering leadership skills among students must also recognize the assets and challenges present in the larger context of neighborhoods and communities. Instructors teaching courses that focus on school and community relations can consider ways to incorporate student voice. Graduate-level course readings can offer empirical studies highlighting youth in equity-oriented initiatives in schools. Furthermore, assignments such as equity audits direct practitioners to examine the academic and behavior data at their school site along categories such as race, socioeconomic status, and gender (Green, 2017; Skrla, Scheurich, Garcia, & Nolly, 2004). To build on this assignment, perhaps emergent school leaders can include students in their classes to conduct their own audit of the school by administering youth surveys or student-led focus groups. Training aspiring school leaders to prioritize student voice in principal preparation coursework might encourage practitioners to disrupt traditional notions of whose voices matter in a school setting.

While traditional leadership preparation programs might offer general qualitative or quantitative methods courses, we assert that research methods courses should be tailored to match the needs of emergent principals. Programs should specifically offer action research courses that offer practitioners the tools to research their own school settings (Herr & Anderson, 2005; Pine, 2008). Furthermore, aspiring principals should be exposed to participatory action research methods that require the experiential knowledge and perspectives of students to engage in critical social inquiry (Cammarota & Fine, 2010; Morrell, 2004; Oakes et al., 2006). Future school leaders should learn how to co-research *alongside* students and families to collectively solve problems plaguing public schools.

In conclusion, we acknowledge the advancements educational leadership and policy scholars have made in recent years to work toward equity and social justice (Bertrand, 2014; Dantley & Tillman, 2009; DeMatthews, Edwards, & Rincones, 2016; DeMatthews & Mawhinney, 2014; Furman, 2012; Green, 2017; Mansfield, 2014; O'Malley & Capper, 2015; Pazey & Cole, 2013; Santamaría, 2014; Scanlan & López, 2012; Skrla, Scheurich, Garcia, & Nolly, 2010; Theoharis, 2007). Research is taking place; results are being published. This work on a more micro level is making a difference. The more difficult part is expanding justice-minded scholars' influence to the local, regional, national, and even international levels. Educational leadership preparation programs are in a unique position to provide future principals, superintendents, and policy makers with the critical knowledge, skills, and dispositions that lead to more democratic and equitable schooling, while also including students' voices and building their capacity as leaders. In addition, it is imperative that leadership preparation programs find ways to help their students navigate potential backlash from those satisfied with the status quo. We agree with Mansfield and colleagues (2012, pp. 37-38):

> The future success of social justice pursuits depends on researchers and practitioners who are willing to step outside the conventional box and try something that might seem counterintuitive. It is indeed ironic that sharing power with others actually strengthens

one's power, and that engaging students in school leadership actually enhances the outcome of that leadership, but these ironies are nonetheless true. Professors in school leadership programs and current school leaders should all step back from the unexpected and allow the perhaps unexpected student "wisdom" to help them do their jobs.

The young people seated in our classrooms represent untapped resources with a wealth of lived experiences and knowledge, possessing the agency and the transformative power to improve their own educational experiences, given the appropriate support of adult allies. Ultimately, we contend that school administrators hold the potential to authentically engage alongside their students as educational leaders in pursuit of racial and social justice in schools and communities.

References

Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. Curriculum Inquiry, 11, 3-42.

Bertrand, M. (2014). Reciprocal dialogue between educational decision makers and students of color: Opportunities and obstacles. Educational Administration Quarterly, 50, 812-843.

Bowles, S., Gintis, H. (2002). Schooling in capitalist America revisited. Sociology of Education, 75, 1-18. doi:10.2307/3090251

Cammarota, J., Fine, M. (2010). Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research in motion. Routledge. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=9_aTAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq =revolutionizing+education&ots=RbOmh1iKQg&sig=k2GT68U7DS5q6IRRqXDpTZcE R70

Carpenter, B. W., Brewer, C. (2012). The implicated advocate: The discursive construction of the democratic practices of school principals in the USA. Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 35, 1-13. doi:10.1080/01596306.2012.745737

Cobb, C. D., Weiner, J., Gonzales, R. (2017). Historical trends and patterns in the scholarship on leadership preparation. In Young, M., Crow, G. (Eds.), The handbook on the education of school leaders (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cook-Sather, A. (2007). What would happen if we treated students as those with opinions that matter? The benefits to principals and teachers of supporting youth engagement in school. NASSP Bulletin, 91, 343-362.

Craven, J. (2015, October). Black lives matter co-founder reflects on the origins of the movement. Huffington Post. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/black-lives-matter-opal-tometi_us_560c1c59e4b0768127003227

Cumings Mansfield, K., Welton, A., Halx, M. (2012). Chapter 2 Listening to Student Voice: Toward a More Inclusive Theory for Research and Practice. In Boske, C., Diem, S. (Eds.), Global leadership for social justice: Taking it from the field to practice (pp. 21-41). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Damiani, J. (2014). Unlocking elementary students' perspectives of leadership. International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 6, 229-256.

Dantley, M. E., Tillman, L. C. (2009). Social justice and moral transformative leadership. In Marshall, C., Oliva, M. (Eds.), Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education (2nd ed., pp. 19-34). New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon.

DeMatthews, D. E., Edwards, D. B., Rincones, R. (2016). Social justice leadership and family engagement: A successful case from Ciudad Juárez, Mexico. Educational Administration Quarterly, 52, 754-792.

DeMatthews, D. E., Mawhinney, H. (2014). Social justice leadership and inclusion: Exploring challenges in an urban district struggling to address inequities. Educational Administration Quarterly, 50, 844-881.

Dewey, J. (2007). Experience and education. Simon & Schuster. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=JhjPK4FKpCcC&oi=fnd&pg=PA14&dq=experience+and+education&ots=D8BK_qGGFg&sig=U-hMey4uqhNxxyux69jpXasbpNw

Dewey, J. (2013). The school and society and the child and the curriculum. The University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=1f0tAAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=the+school+and+the+society&ots=5dr4B_KVU7&sig=GTQxXN39p0DvAK83uDxPsMcYToM

Duncan-Andrade, J. M. R., Morrell, E. (2008). The art of critical pedagogy: Possibilities for moving from theory to practice in urban schools (Vol. 285). Peter Lang. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Xd6AtJ3EhK8C&oi=fnd&pg=PP11&dq=The+art+of+critical+pedagogy&ots=YHHAvKCH_0&sig=lYJL4OPdhSR1Dpq3C96mY18NcnE

Eccles, J. S., Midgley, C., Wigfield, A., Buchanan, C. M., Reuman, D., Flanagan, C., Iver, D. M. (1993). Development during adolescence: The impact of stage-environment fit on young adolescents' experiences in schools and in families. American Psychologist, 48, 90-101.

Fielding, M. (2001). Students as radical agents of change. Journal of Educational Change, 2, 123-141.

Fielding, N. G., Fielding, J. L. (1986). Linking data: The articulation of qualitative and quantitative methods in social research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed (Ramos, Myra Bergman , Trans.). New York, NY: Continuum.

Furman, G. (2012). Social justice leadership as praxis: Developing capacities through preparation programs. Educational Administration Quarterly, 48, 191-229.

Gentilucci, J. L., Muto, C. C. (2007). Principals' influence on academic achievement: The student perspective. NASSP Bulletin, 91, 219-236. doi:10.1177/0192636507303738

Ginwright, S., Cammarota, J. (2006). Introduction. In Ginwright, S., Cammarota, J., Noguera, P. (Eds.), Beyond resistance! Youth activism and community change (pp. xiii-xxii). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group.

Giroux, H. A., Penna, A. N. (1979). Social education in the classroom: The dynamics of the hidden curriculum. Theory & Research in Social Education, 7(1), 21-42.

Gladstone, B. M., Volpe, T., Boydell, K. M. (2007). Issues encountered in a qualitative secondary analysis of help-seeking in the prodrome to psychosis. The Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research, 34, 431-442.

Green, T. L. (2017). Community-based equity audits: A practical approach for educational leaders to support equitable community-school improvements. Educational Administration Quarterly, 53, 3-39.

Guishard, M. (2009). The false paths, the endless labors, the turns now this way and now that: Participatory action research, mutual vulnerability, and the politics of inquiry. The Urban Review, 41, 85-105.

Halx, M. D. (2014). A more critical pedagogy: Could it reduce non-completer rates of male Latino high school students? The student perspective. Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 22, 251-274. doi:10.1080/14681366.2013.825876

Heaton, J. (1998). Secondary analysis of qualitative data (Social Research Update, 22). Retrieved from http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU22.html

Herr, K., Anderson, G. L. (2005). The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty. SAGE. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=wa2FruKrl1MC&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=gary+anderson+%2B+K.+herr+%2B+the+action+research+dissertation&ots=snM2BXAplg&sig=fDTiTqhEwRIdrgdcXeDR-t3KtUw

Hinds, P. S., Vogel, R. J., Clarke-Steffen, L. (1997). The possibilities and pitfalls of doing a secondary analysis of a qualitative data set. Qualitative Health Research, 7, 408-424.

Hosang, D. (2006). Beyond policy: Ideology, race and the reimagining of youth. In Noguera, P., Cammarota, J., Ginwright, S. (Eds.), Beyond resistance: Youth activism and community change (pp. 3-19). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group.

Jones, M., Yonezawa, S. (2002). Student voice, cultural change: Using inquiry in school reform. Equity &Excellence in Education, 35, 245-254.

Jones, M., Yonezawa, S. (2009). Student-driven research. Educational Leadership, 66(4), 65-69.

Kirshner, B., Ginwright, S. (2012). Youth organizing as a developmental context for African American and Latino adolescents. Child Development Perspectives, 6, 288-294.

Kirshner, B., Strobel, K., Fernández, M. (2003). Critical civic engagement among urban youth. Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education, 2(1), 1-20.

Kottkamp, R. B., Rusch, E. A. (2009). The landscape of scholarship on the education of school leaders, 1985–2006. In Young, M. D., Crow, G. M., Murphy, J., Ogawa, R. T. (Eds.), Handbook of research on the education of school leaders (pp. 23-85). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lac, V., Fine, M. (in press). The good, the bad and the ugly: An autoethnographic journey on doing PAR as a graduate student within traditional institutions. Urban Education.

Levinson, M. (2014). Action civics in the classroom. Social Education, 78, 68-72.

Lewis, A. E., Diamond, J. B. (2015). Despite the best intentions: Why racial inequality thrives in good schools. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=7aA1CgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=despite+the+best+intentions&ots=RkMSOgmAgo&sig=N8s-RzK31YTzslaaxSFXJ8TpHC8

Mansfield, K. C. (2011). Troubling social justice in a single-sex public school: An ethnography of an emerging school culture (Unpublished dissertation). The University of Texas at Austin.

Mansfield, K. C. (2013). I love these girls–I was these girls: Women leading for social justice in a single-sex public school. Journal of School Leadership, 23, 640-663.

Mansfield, K. C. (2014). How listening to student voices informs and strengthens social justice research and practice. Educational Administration Quarterly, 50, 392-430.

Mansfield, K. C. (2015). The importance of safe space and student voice in schools that serve minoritized learners. Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice, 30, 25-38.

Mansfield, K. C., Welton, A., Halx, M. (2012). Listening to student voice: Toward a more inclusive theory for research and practice. In Boske, C., Diem, S. (Eds.), Global leadership for social justice: Taking it from field to practice (Vol. 14, pp. 21-41). Emerald Group. Retrieved from http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/pdf/10.1108/S1479-3660(2012)0000014006

Marshall, C., Anderson, A. L. (Eds.). (2008). Activist educators: Breaking past limits. New York, NY: Routledge.

McCarthy, M. M., Forsyth, P. B. (2009). An historical review of research and development activities pertaining to the preparation of school leaders. In Young, M. D., Crow, G. M., Murphy, J., Ogawa, R. T. (Eds.), Handbook of research on the education of school leaders (pp. 86-128). New York, NY: Routledge.

McLaren, P. (2015). Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education. New York, NY: Routledge.

Mitra, D. L. (2006). Youth as a bridge between home and school: Comparing student voice and parent involvement as strategies for change. Education and Urban Society, 38, 455-480. doi:10.1177/0013124506287911

Mitra, D. L. (2008). Strengthening student voice initiatives in high schools: An examination of the supports needed for school-based youth-adult partnerships. Youth & Society, 40, 311-

335. Retrieved from
http://yas.sagepub.com/content/early/2008/04/01/0044118X08316211.short

Mitra, D. L. (2009). Collaborating with students: Building youth-adult partnerships in schools. American Journal of Education, 115, 407-436. doi:10.1086/597485

Mitra, D. L., Gross, S. J. (2009). Increasing student voice in high school reform: Building partnerships, improving outcomes. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 37, 522-543.

Mitra, D. L., Serriere, S., Stoicovy, D. (2012). The role of leaders in enabling student voice. Management in Education, 26, 104-112.

Morrell, E. (2004). Becoming critical researchers: Literacy and empowerment for urban youth (Vol. 227). Peter Lang. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=TGbUrNZW-voC&oi=fnd&pg=PR2&dq=e.+morrell&ots=L5NK43XNUP&sig=OjjJS7Yst1rYpCvqpEl9k-JH_-4

Newcomb, W. S., Mansfield, K. C. (2014). Purposeful presence: Situating social justice in leadership education. Scholar-practitioner Quarterly, 7, 279-290.

Oakes, J., Rogers, J., Lipton, M. (2006). Learning power: Organizing for education and justice. Teachers College Press. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=PrzNuQhgKqgC&oi=fnd&pg=PP7&dq=learning+power&ots=jW1DfGhj5s&sig=da261qTSmRJHFhMXd0e9muaqpus

Oldfather, P. (1995). Songs "come back most to them": Students' experiences as researchers. Theory into Practice, 34, 131-137.

O'Malley, M. P., Capper, C. A. (2015). A measure of the quality of educational leadership programs for social justice: Integrating LGBTIQ identities into principal preparation. Educational Administration Quarterly, 51, 290-330.

Osberg, J., Pope, D., Galloway, M. (2006). Students matter in school reform: Leaving fingerprints and becoming leaders. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 9, 329-343.

Ozer, E. J., Newlan, S., Douglas, L., Hubbard, E. (2013). "Bounded" empowerment: Analyzing tensions in the practice of youth-led participatory research in urban public schools. American Journal of Community Psychology, 52(1-2), 13-26.

Ozer, E. J., Wright, D. (2012). Beyond school spirit: The effects of youth-led participatory action research in two urban high schools. Journal of Research on Adolescence, 22, 267-283.

Parker, A. K., Neuharth-Pritchett, S. (2009). Calming rough waters: Teacher strategies for smoothing the transition to middle school. Childhood Education, 86, 20-26.

Parker, L., Stovall, D. O. (2004). Actions following words: Critical race theory connects to critical pedagogy. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36, 167-182.

Pazey, B. L., Cole, H. A. (2013). The role of special education training in the development of socially just leaders: Building an equity consciousness in educational leadership programs. Educational Administration Quarterly, 49, 243-271.

Pine, G. J. (2008). Teacher action research: Building knowledge democracies. SAGE. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=siS92yVcFnwC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1937&dq=teacher+action+research&ots=K-gmMlhAQA&sig=JqicC5tPgzLFacCVjHtaGmOJN3s

Pollack, M. (2008). Everyday anti-racism. London, England: The New Press.

Poon, O., Cohen, J. (2012). Youth participatory action research and the future of education reform. Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis, 1, 144-171.

Rudduck, J., Fielding, M. (2006). Student voice and the perils of popularity. Educational Review, 58, 219-231.

Santamaría, L. J. (2014). Critical change for the greater good: Multicultural perceptions in educational leadership toward social justice and equity. Educational Administration Quarterly, 50, 347-391.

Scanlan, M., López, F. (2012). ¡Vamos! How school leaders promote equity and excellence for bilingual students. Educational Administration Quarterly, 48, 583-625.

Shapiro, T. M. (2017). Toxic inequality: How America's wealth gap destroys mobility, deepens the racial divide, and threatens our future. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Silva, E. (2001, June). 'Squeaky Wheels and Flat Tires': A case study of students as reform participants. In Forum Symposium Journals, (43(2), 95-99).

Singleton, G. E. (2014). Courageous conversations about race: A field guide for achieving equity in schools. Corwin Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=stXHBAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=courageous+conversations&ots=MbiGoiwiCT&sig=pVjOBEMEEHS_w4QVph_351jNMLo

Skrla, L., Scheurich, J. J., Garcia, J., Nolly, G. (2004). Equity audits: A practical leadership tool for developing equitable and excellent schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 40(1), 133-161.

Skrla, L., Scheurich, J. J., Garcia, J., Nolly, G. (2010). Equity audits: A practical leadership tool for developing equitable and excellent schools. In Marshall, C., Oliva, M. (Eds.), Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education (2nd ed., pp. 259-283). New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon.

Smith, R. G., Crawley, A. L., Robinson, C., Cotman, T., Swaim, M., Strand, P. (2011). Gaining on the gap: Changing hearts, minds, and practice. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.

Smyth, J. (2006). "When students have power": Student engagement, student voice, and the possibilities for school reform around "dropping out" of school. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 9, 285-298.

Sussman, A. (2015). The student voice collaborative: An effort to systematize student participation in school and district improvement. Teachers College Record, 117, 119-134.

Szabo, V., Strang, V. R. (1997). Secondary analysis of qualitative data. Advances in Nursing Science, 20, 66-74.

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 43, 221-258.

Vadeboncoeur, J. A., Stevens, L. P. (2005). Re/constructing "the adolescent": Sign, symbol, and body. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Welton, A. D., Harris, T. O., La Londe, P. G., Moyer, R. T. (2015). Social justice education in a diverse classroom: Examining high school discussions about race, power, and privilege. Equity & Excellence in Education, 48, 549-570.

Wernick, L. J., Woodford, M. R., Kulick, A. (2014). LGBTQQ youth using participatory action research and theater to effect change: Moving adult decision-makers to create youth-centered change. Journal of Community Practice, 22, 47-66.

Witzel, A., Medjedovic, I., Kretzer, S. (Eds.). (2008). Secondary analysis of qualitative data [Sekundäranalyse qualitativer daten]. Historical Social Research, 33(3), 33-45. Retrieved from http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=H-Soz-u-Kult&month=0809&msg=QcWkbdXXfyAsa6Tm6Gh2Pw

York, A., Kirshner, B. (2015). How positioning shapes opportunities for student agency in schools. Teachers College Record, 117, 103-118.

Author Biographies

Van T. Lac, PhD, University of Wisconsin, Madison, is an assistant professor at the University of Texas–San Antonio in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. Prior to her graduate studies, she taught high school English and coached beginning teachers in Richmond, California. Her research focuses on the intersection of critical youth research and leadership for social justice.

Katherine Cumings Mansfield, PhD, University of Texas at Austin, is associate professor of educational leadership and policy at Virginia Commonwealth University where she teaches an array of courses such as Program Evaluation Theory and Methods, Critical Policy Analysis, Education Finance Policy and the Equitable Distribution of Resources, School-Community Relations, and Leadership for Social Justice and Equity. She has published in a variety of journals, including *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, and *Journal of Research on Leadership Education.*