

## Editors' Introduction

Since the founding of the Berkeley Review of Education (BRE) in 2011, we have committed to publishing a range of interdisciplinary scholarship focused on equity, diversity, and inclusion in education. The election of Donald Trump, which took place shortly after we began working on Volume 6, Number 2, has reinforced for us the importance of encouraging scholarly dialogue around the ways that education impacts the lives of American students from nondominant populations, including people of color, poor, women, LGBTQ+ people, people with disabilities, non-English speakers, immigrants, undocumented people, refugees, and other groups.

In the days since Trump's election, young people from these groups have been the target of hateful rhetoric and bullying, even within their own schools (Jamieson, 2016). Meanwhile, the new presidential administration has supported initiatives that effectively undermine educational opportunity and access for such students. For example, Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos has embraced the rapid expansion of privatization efforts, including vouchers and for-profit charter schools, and President Trump's proposed budget aims to increase funding for the expansion of charter schools (Klein, 2017). Yet research demonstrates that such initiatives disproportionately leave poor Black families with few quality schooling options in cities such as Detroit (Harris, 2016) and contribute to deepening levels of racial segregation across the country (Frankenberg, Siegel-Hawley, & Wang, 2011). President Trump's proposed budget also threatens to cut funding for a range of programs that have long benefited nondominant communities, including college access programs such as TRiO, which provides services and supports to first-generation and low-income college students (Klein, 2017).

These recent events are among many that illustrate the need for scholars to continually engage in research oriented around equity, diversity, and inclusion in order to inform policy, practice, and activism. More than ever, the field of educational research needs fresh empirical and theoretical perspectives addressing how, in our current social and political moment, schools can serve as nurturing and safe environments for our most vulnerable youth, and policies can facilitate equitable educational opportunity and access. As the BRE celebrates its fifth anniversary and 12th publication, we renew our commitment to furthering the scholarly conversation around these crucial topics.

In Volume 6, Number 2 of the BRE, the contributing authors, incorporating a range of disciplinary, theoretical, and methodological approaches, illuminate new avenues through which education policy and practice can advance equity, diversity, and inclusion. The articles in this collection reveal the ways in which policies and practices have persistently and systematically fallen short of these goals, yet also highlight opportunities for reversing course. Two articles reconceptualize how teachers' classroom practices—specifically, approaches to language instruction and classroom management—can more meaningfully attend to students' diverse backgrounds. Another article examines participatory action research (PAR) as a tool for facilitating dialogue and action around promoting diversity in independent schools. The final article addresses how decision-making in the contemporary education policymaking arena limits opportunities for authentic public input and invites readers to consider how policymaking can be more inclusive and democratic.

In our opening article, *Translanguaging: Definitions, Implications, and Further Needs in Burgeoning Inquiry*, Luis Poza traces the use of the term *translanguaging* through the educational research literature from its emergence in 1994 as a critical reaction to the power relations that typically play out in classrooms for emergent bilingual students, through its official adoption in New York City teacher-education materials. The term *translanguaging*, in its original form, rejects entrenched language hierarchies and the prescriptive classification of communication into discrete *languages* as the objects of study, instruction, and policy, focusing instead on the *linguistic practices* used in multilingual environments. This focus is not merely descriptive, but also critical and liberating. In his review of the literature, Poza does not find evidence of severe dilution of the term's critical stance. At the same time, he calls for further research into whether teachers, particularly those whose training incorporated translanguaging, enact translanguaging's inherent critical stance in their classrooms.

In our second article, *From Discipline to Dynamic Pedagogy: A Re-conceptualization of Classroom Management*, Jonathan Ryan Davis puts forth an alternative framework for classroom management that shifts attention away from discipline toward dynamic engagement with students' diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds and learning needs. His piece integrates a broad range of theoretical and empirical perspectives in a new framework called the Dynamic Classroom Management Approach (DCMA). The foundation of DCMA rests on proactive and positive relationships among teachers and students and calls for teachers to acknowledge students' assets. Further, Davis emphasizes that teachers must be self-aware of their own biases and highlights their responsibility for meeting the needs of all learners in the culturally diverse classroom. Overall, he argues that DCMA is a framework that can inform classroom practices that meaningfully empower and engage diverse students.

In our third article, *Engaging Diversity and Marginalization through Participatory Action Research: A Model for Independent School Reform*, Joseph Nelson, Tanya Maloney, and Zachary Hodges grapple with issues concerning student diversity and inclusion in independent schools. Co-authored by a university researcher, school practitioner, and a high-school student, this article illustrates the power of student voice and the potential for PAR to influence school policy and practice. This qualitative case study highlights one school's use of PAR to enrich institutional knowledge of student diversity, capture the schooling experiences of historically marginalized students, and develop a dynamic action plan that would support continued learning and promote inclusivity within the school community. The authors find that the PAR process can be an effective method for surfacing underlying tensions and bringing to light the perspectives and experiences of students, particularly those identifying as students of color.

In our fourth and final article, *The Ballot Initiative and Other Modern Threats to Public Engagement in Educational Policymaking*, Peter Piazza argues that educational ballot initiatives, although seeming to represent the interests of voters, more often represent the preferred policies of politically-powerful special interest groups. In his review of the conceptual and empirical literature, Piazza finds that, following the *Citizens United* Supreme Court case, these special interest groups have successfully spent large sums of money to place educational initiatives on state ballots. He argues that this trend undermines authentic democratic engagement in the education policymaking process,

especially because the public often is not aware of who is funding particular initiatives. Piazza calls for a more deliberative model of public participation in education policymaking, which would be more inclusive and representative of diverse public interests.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Berkeley Review of Education invites pieces that continue and extend the conversations started by the authors in this issue as well as work that starts new conversations on issues related to equity, diversity, and inclusion. We encourage senior and emerging scholars, practitioners, and policymakers to submit articles that address issues of educational diversity, equity, and inclusion from various intra/interdisciplinary perspectives. The editorial board especially welcomes submissions that provide new and diverse perspectives on pressing issues impacting schools, educational systems, and other learning environments. We also welcome a broad range of “critical” scholarship. We define as “critical” work that aims to analyze, evaluate, and examine power and dominant structures while helping us to imagine something new.

We thank the many people who have assisted in getting this issue to press: the authors, current and former board members, volunteers, reviewers, advisers, and the students and faculty members at the Graduate School of Education who have helped us in many other ways. We especially thank Dean Prudence Carter, Assistant Dean Alejandro Luna, and our faculty adviser, P. David Pearson, for their ongoing support and guidance as we broaden the scope and readership of the journal. Finally, we thank the U.C. Berkeley Graduate School of Education and Graduate Assembly for their generous financial support.

*The Editors*

### References

- Frankenberg, E., Siegel-Hawley, G., & Wang, J. (2011). Choice without equity: Charter school segregation. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 19(1), 1–96.  
doi:10.14507/epaa.v19n1.2011
- Harris, D. N. (2016, November 25). Betsy DeVos and the Wrong Way to Fix Schools. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/25/opinion/betsy-devos-and-the-wrong-way-to-fix-schools.html>
- Jamieson, A. (2016, November 20). “They are scared”: Teachers grapple with fear and bullying after Trump victory. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/nov/20/donald-trump-schools-election-students-bullying>
- Klein, A. (2017, March 16). Trump budget would make massive cuts to Ed. Dept., but boost school choice. [Web log post]. *Education Week*. Retrieved from [http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/campaign-k-12/2017/03/trump\\_budget\\_massive\\_cuts\\_education\\_boosts\\_school\\_choice.html?\\_ga=1.102151299.325488229.1468788244](http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/campaign-k-12/2017/03/trump_budget_massive_cuts_education_boosts_school_choice.html?_ga=1.102151299.325488229.1468788244)