"Making Cambios, Usando la Voz"
Addressing Ethical Dilemmas of Education in Immigrant Contexts

Adanari D. Zarate
University of California, Santa Barbara
Leslie Reese
California State University, Long Beach
David Flores
University of California, Los Angeles
Jisel Villegas
University of California, Davis

Introduction

The growing population of immigrant youth in the United States includes both documented and undocumented young people, as well as those who live in mixed status families in which some family members are authorized and at least one other family member is not (Suárez-Orozco, et al., 2011). These young people find themselves residing at the center of two worlds where education and immigration policies send mixed signals (Gonzales, 2007). School is the lodestone for many immigrant families—the attractive promise for their children's attainment of the "American dream" through free, public schooling. At the same time, school is the place where students are categorized and sorted, where they

Adanari D. Zarate is a Ph.D. student in the Department of Chicana / o Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Leslie Reese is a professor in the Department of Teacher Education of the College of Education at California State University, Long Beach. David Flores is a Ph.D. student in the Department of Chicano Chicana Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles. Jisel Villegas is a Ph.D. candidate in the School of Education at the University of California, Davis. adanari_zarate@umail.ucsb.edu, leslie.reese@csulb.edu, deejflores@yahoo.com, & jisel.vega@gmail.com

learn which kinds of experiences, languages, knowledge, and identities are valued and which are ignored.

This article describes and analyzes the process of designing a day-long university symposium to bring together students, scholars, practitioners, and community partners to engage in critical discourse around policies and practices that affect the immigrant community in the areas of language policy, immigration status, and overall access to education. Through facilitated roundtable discussions, participants were invited to make recommendations for improving the preparation of educators to better address the needs of immigrant students. The symposium was purposefully framed to move beyond a "what works" approach typical of many current reform efforts in education and to focus instead on the authentic ethical dilemmas facing educators—teachers, administrators, counselors—in their everyday practice.

In their work, Shapiro and Gross (2008) outline four key ethical paradigms in (re)solving dilemmas related to educational practices: ethics of critique, care, justice, and the profession. The ethic of critique asks educators to deal with the difficult questions regarding areas of difference, including questions of who makes the laws, rules, or policies; who benefits from these laws, rules, or policies; and whose voices who are silenced. The ethic of care focuses on moral decision-making, challenging individuals to consider the consequences and potential long-term effects of their decisions. The ethic of justice focuses on concepts of fairness and equality, calling upon educators, community members, and students to challenge policies and practices that result in marginalization and unequal opportunities for segments of our population. Finally, the ethics of the profession places the student at the center of the decision-making process, reminding educators of the need to act in the best interests of students as well as according to professional codes of ethics (Shapiro & Gross, 2008, p. 7). The symposium theme, taken up in this article, acknowledges the need for educators to rethink, redefine, and reframe the concepts of privilege, culture, language, power, and social justice, especially for the immigrant community of students.

The need for ethically framed challenge of current conditions and policies, and the posing of recommendations for the improvement of preparation of educators working with immigrant students and their families, has never been greater. California, with 1.4 million English learners (ELs) enrolled in public schools and 37% of its K-12 population from immigrant homes, is home to one in four of the nation's English learners (Migration Policy Institute, 2010). Despite legislation in 1998 seeking to ensure English-only education for ELs in the state, a persistent gap in academic performance vis-á-vis their English background

peers continues to characterize the school experience of English learners, due in part to inequitable access to appropriately trained teachers (Gándara, Rumberger, & Jolly, 2003). Concern for meeting the challenge of preparing teachers and administrators to better serve the needs of immigrant students is currently taking place in a national environment of heightened attention to immigration policy and paths to citizenship for immigrants. At CSULB, the time was auspicious for community members, educators, and university students and faculty to come together to discuss challenges and solutions.

Critical Race Theory

In order to design a symposium for a dialogue on the ethics of education within an immigrant context that focused on issues of privilege, race, and language, the planning committee utilized Critical Race Theory (CRT) as a guiding framework. Critical race theory is a useful tool in that it centers the historical and contextual experiences of people of color while interrogating policies that perpetuate and reinforce social inequities. As defined by Mari Matsuda (1991) CRT is

> The work of progressive legal scholars of color who are attempting to develop jurisprudence that accounts for the role of racism in American law and that work toward the elimination of racism as part of a larger goal of eliminating all forms of subordination. (p.1331)

Matsuda's (1991) definition of CRT is highly useful, and her call to eliminate all forms of subordination was the foundation of the research-based planning for the symposium. Research for the symposium addressed the development of policies and practices in the educational arena that specifically affect documented and undocumented immigrant students and families.

Although CRT was developed through a legal framework, recent scholars have since expanded its reach into education. In the education field, CRT challenges the ways race, racism, class, and gender impact educational structures, practices, and discourses that subordinate students of color (Delgado Bernal, 2002; Solórzano, 1998; Yosso, 2005). Critical Race Theory is a promising framework because it "exposes how mainstream schools promote racism through White-supremacist teaching practices, White-based curriculum, and school designs that privilege White culture by ignoring and/or denying how racism shapes the lives of students of color" (Knaus, 2009, p.142). As CRT's name suggests, it critically questions policies and practices that reproduce unequal social relations.

Conversely, critical race theorists believe that if education can oppress, it can also liberate. Critical theorists understand that before education

can be truly emancipatory, it must be willing to acknowledge the cultural wealth of communities of color, along with alternative epistemologies and scholarship (Delgado Bernal, 2002). The current discourses of color-blindness, standardization, and meritocracy mask the historic and inherently unequal educational system experienced by immigrant students. Therefore, as Ladson-Billings (1998) explained, "CRT can be a powerful explanatory tool for the sustained inequity that people of color experience" (p.18).

Critical race theory has its origins in critical legal studies (CLS), a predominantly legal practice that has challenged the "legitimacy of oppressive structures in American society" (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p.10). However, CLS's racial blind spots are regularly questioned by scholars of color (Delgado Bernal, 2002). People of color and women working within CLS became increasingly dissatisfied with the pace and progress of racial and gender equity in the United States. In addition, they felt that their experiences could not be authentically explained through a Black vs. White understanding of race relations, one that ignored the lived experiences of other marginalized groups (Castagno & Lee, 2007; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Yosso, 2005). Consequently, many women and people of color broke from CLS and began centering their attention on race and racism (Yosso, 2005).

A critical race analysis has since expanded to include gender, language, sexuality, and immigrant experiences that acknowledge the intersectionality of the struggles for equality. As a result, CRT has launched a wide net that includes other racialized and gendered groups under the names of Latino Critical Race Theory or Latino Crit (LatCrit), Feminist Crit (FemCrit), Asian Crit (AsianCrit), Tribal Crit (TribCrit), etc. For example, Tribal Crit includes "tenets and principles that are culturally specific to Indigenous people and communities" (Castagno & Lee, 2007). In education, TribCrit is used to examine practices and policies impacting indigenous students specifically. LatCrit theorizes issues such as immigration, language, ethnicity, identity, or surname to explore concerns particular to the Latino/a, Chicano/a community (Delgado Bernal, 2002; Yosso, 2005). Perez-Huber (2009) applied CRT and LatCrit in her study of undocumented Chicana college students because it "illuminates the intersectionality of race and immigration status that is at play in the dominant framing of Latina/o undocumented immigrant communities" (p. 708). Moving beyond a narrowly framed race analysis, Latino Critical Race Theory is not in competition with CRT, but a complement to it.

Critical race theory, with its many branches, is therefore a powerful tool to de-center Whiteness and challenge the establishment of White supremacy and its subordination of people of color (Ladson-Billings, 1998).

It centers its attention on race and privileges the voices of historically marginalized communities. For the intents and purposes of this paper, we focus our attention to applying a CRT and LatCrit framework in education. Simply stated, a Critical Race analysis in the context of education examines how current educational pedagogies, practices, theories and policies reinforce power and continue the marginalization of people of color, and in particular Latino/a students.

Solórzano and Yosso (2001) compiled five themes that form the basic pedagogical practices of CRT in education. These include

> 1. *The centrality and intersectionality of race and racism with other forms of subordination*. CRT is intentional about identifying the various dimensions of race and racism and how they intersect with all other forms of subordination such as ethnicity, language, gender, and sexuality.
>
> 2. *The challenge to dominant ideology*. CRT does not subscribe to claims of a color-blindness or meritocracy. Rather, CRT claims that these myths show the sophistication of racism and are used to continue the dominance of power.
>
> 3. *The commitment to social justice*. CRT maintains a commitment to social justice and the elimination of racism and other forms of subordination. (Solórzano, 1997)
>
> 4. *The centrality of experiential knowledge*. CRT acknowledges the diverse accounts of knowledge that come from people of color. What is often times considered a deficit in students (such as a home language other than English) is conceptualized as an asset in CRT.
>
> 5. *The interdisciplinary perspective*. CRT believes that to truly understand race, racism, and other forms of subordination, these must be contextualized within a historical and contemporary context using transdisciplinary methods. (Solórzano, 1997)

CRT has been used to document and analyze the mechanisms through which racialized inequalities are enacted and sustained, for example through unequal school funding systems at a district level (Alemán, 2007) or through racialized microaggressions in teacher-student interactions (Pérez-Huber, 2011). CRT has also been used as a framework for the development of coursework that puts the lived experiences of students of color at the center, as for example when high school students examined the intersections of race and power through the analysis of images in the media (Stovall, 2006). In this paper, we document the use of a CRT framework to dig deeper into the dilemmas facing educators with regards to immigrant students. In the opening of this paper we ask what the purposes of educational policies and practices are, and who benefits from these policies and practices. Knaus (2009) suggested

that "CRT frames the purpose of the U.S. as serving and continuing its capitalistic roots, creating a perpetual need for subservient populations to work menial labor for artificially low wages" (p. 142). In analyzing policy, we assess who the beneficiaries of policy are and who are those who are silenced.

Centering the analysis on race and on people of color, we contend that the dilemmas facing education workers may not be dilemmas at all, but rather the cycle of social reproduction working all too well. Duncan and Morrell (2008) state that educations "production of failures means they are in fact successful at producing the results they are designed to produce" (p. 5). A CRT framework has the potential to uncover the hidden agenda of the schooling of people of color in order to transform and employ a more equitable system. However, we also seek to move beyond theory to praxis, creating a space in which students, teachers, administrators, parents, and community members come together to listen, dialogue, critique, and put forth recommendations for improvement of the preparation of educators of immigrant students and students of color. Our research questions focus on the effectiveness of CRT as a framework for this kind of work, as well as the challenges and recommendations identified by participants in the process.

Research Questions

- What issues faced by immigrant students and their families are identified through the use of a critical race theory framework for symposium structuring?
- What recommendations for educators to be better prepared to address these issues and the ethical dilemmas that they raise emerge from an inclusive symposium setting?

Methods

Description of the Context

For the planning of an event that grappled with issues of education and immigration, California State University, Long Beach proved to be a receptive environment. CSULB is a large public university in Southern California that promotes the learning of a diverse urban community. The university is recognized as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), meaning it provides services for the growing Hispanic/Latino population, including those of undocumented status. As a university that commits to a safe learning environment, an event such as ours was of interest to the campus population and the surrounding community.

The conceptualization process of an education themed event at

CSULB began through the participation of students from the Social and Cultural Analysis of Education Masters of Arts program in a course on qualitative research methods. For their research studies in this course, the students used critical race theory (CRT), which became a central theoretical framework in planning the conference. The emphasis was student involvement and sharing their research with the broader university community. Authors of the present paper include the instructor and two students from this course, as well as additional faculty and staff who made up the symposium planning team.

The first planning meeting was held at CSULB's Center for Language Minority Education and Research (CLMER). The meeting consisted of additional interested faculty, other recruited MA students, and a CLMER staff member. During this meeting, discussions entailed selecting the symposium topic, the expectations for the event, and what the student involvement would consist of. When discussing research interests, it was apparent that all had an interest in school staff/student relations, teacher preparation, and undocumented students. Students approached these issues through personal lived experiences or through their work. The lack of teacher preparation in low-income schools with high immigrant populations was a concern that surfaced throughout these discussions.

From the initial meeting, the graduate students were fully empowered by the participating faculty, who were committed to a student-centered process of event design. Through further discussion and review of CRT research, the agreement was made that ethical issues within education in immigrant contexts would serve as the guiding framework. It was also important to not focus solely on immigrant students, but rather to look at the context around immigration more generally as it affects students, families, and educators. Calling the event a "symposium" allowed for the participants to provide insight and partake in roundtable conversations throughout the day. Thus, the central theme acknowledges the need to rethink, redefine, and reframe the concepts of privilege, culture, language, power, and social justice especially for the immigrant community of students in a preschool through grade 12 setting; and the need for open discussions with the attendees throughout the day was central to the event.

In order to achieve the goal of having effective dialogue among participants at the tables, a facilitator was assigned to each table to moderate the conversation. In order for this to be achieved, graduate students from the College of Education and undergraduates from Chicano/Latino Studies Department at CSULB were recruited for a 2-hour facilitator training session. During the training, the goals and expectations of the symposium were explained and "what if" scenarios

were posed. Facilitators previewed and practiced with the discussion questions that would be posed following each panel presentation. Although critical race theory was used to inform both the questions posed for discussion as well as the topics chosen for panel presentation and discussion, CRT did not constitute an explicit topic of discussion in and of itself. The practice dialogues emerging from the "what if" scenarios were important not only for facilitators to practice managing an active conversation at the table, but also to know how to handle varying perspectives and opinions from attendees, assuring their comfort to share with others.

The *Ethics of Education in Immigrant Context: Examining the Educational Experiences for Immigrant Youth* symposium hosted by CLMER, Chicano and Latino Studies Department, and the Social and Cultural Analysis of Education Student Organization took place on Friday, April 20, 2012. The event was held in the CSULB Student Union main ballroom, with 163 attendees present. Participants included 79 university students, 20 faculty, 23 PK-12 teachers and administrators, 36 community members, and 5 parents. Panels consisting of university educators, policy makers, PK-12 educators, and community members addressed such themes as "Education in Immigrant Contexts: Key Issues in Practice, Policy, and Research," "Ethical Dilemmas in Education in Immigrant Contexts," and "Overtested: How High-Stakes Accountability Fails English Language Learners." One portion of the symposium included showing the 15-minute film "Immersion." Panel members were asked to respond to the film and address ethical issues from a variety of perspectives, particularly in light of the current public discourse about immigrants and immigration. The lunch break included a poster presentation of individual research studies that the eight participating students prepared to share at the symposium.

The last panel of the day, titled "Voices from the Schools," consisted of the College of Education dean and students in the multiple subject and counseling credential programs. Each were asked to discuss challenges of education in immigrant contexts, including issues faced by students from undocumented and mixed status backgrounds, and the preparation of teachers, counselors, and administrators needed to meet these challenges.

As each panel/discussion progressed, time was allotted to the table attendees to ask questions and discuss each topic amongst them. It was at the closing of the symposium that attendees were asked to work in table groups in order to develop recommendations for preparation of educators for immigrant educational contexts and provide feedback evaluating the symposium. As each table shared their recommendations,

the take-away question "What do we do Monday morning?" was posed to each attendee. Our goal was to make sure that participants left the symposium with something they could reflect on in the near future as they continue to work with immigrant students.

Data Sources

Primary data for this article include facilitator notes taken during the conference and surveys completed by participants at the end of the one-day conference.

Discussion Notes. As previously explained, table facilitators received a two-hour training where goals and expectations of the symposium were described and scenarios were presented and enacted. Facilitators had an opportunity to preview and role-play discussion questions that would be discussed following each panel presentation. Table facilitators were asked to take handwritten notes during their table discussions following panel presentations. The morning of the conference facilitators were given their pre-assigned table assignment along with a notepad and writing instruments.

The first data sources for the present paper comprise the transcriptions taken by the 20 table facilitators with the following types of information gathered: (a) participants' comments about the panel presentations, (b) questions generated by table participants for the panels, and (c) recommendations made by table members for improving the preparation of educators to better meet the scholastic needs of students in immigrant contexts. Notes were collected from facilitators, then transcribed by a graduate student, and finally entered into a database under one of three subdivisions: (a) comments, (b) questions, and (c) recommendations. The notes produced varied from facilitator to facilitator as did the style in which notes were taken. For example, some facilitators preferred to write notes in bullet point format while others wrote complete sentences. Individual entries were typically 1-2 sentences, but ranged from phrases to short paragraphs. Remarks consisting of single words or phrases were eliminated from the dataset, resulting in 187 comments, 22 questions, and 21 recommendations.

Participant Evaluation Surveys. The second source of data derives from participant evaluation surveys. At the end of the symposium, participants were given evaluation forms and asked to provide demographic information, assess the symposium, and provide feedback and recommendations for both educator preparation and for future events. The evaluation survey comprised of eight questions, three were open-ended questions and the remaining five questions asked to rate the item using a five-point scale. Of the five rating questions, four questions used

a scale where five was excellent, four was very good, three was good, two was fair, and one was poor. The fifth and final rating question used a different five-point scale where a score of 5 was strongly agree, four was agree, three was neutral, two was disagree, and one was strongly disagree. We collected 77 surveys of the 163 guests (or 47%) who attended the symposium. The survey data was entered into a spreadsheet and averages for the five rating questions were tabulated.

Data Analysis

In order to address the research question regarding the utility of CRT as a way of framing discussion and recommendations, we began with the

Table 1
Codes for Qualitative Data Analysis

Code	*Examples*
Race	Includes mention of racism, discrimination of all types including discrimination based on language and immigration status, testing as part of discriminatory practice, dehumanizing results of oppression.
Challenge to Dominant Ideology	Includes challenge to current testing and accountability structures, using scholarly work for change, implementation of primary language programs instead of current English only programs, better/alternative training for teachers to work with English learners.
Social Justice	Includes empowerment, advocacy, resistance, the teacher as advocate, and exercising *voz y voto* (voice and vote).
Experiential Knowledge	Includes building teachers' knowledge about the students and their communities, using funds of knowledge, community cultural wealth, validation of student background.
Transdisciplinary Perspective	Includes law, decision making, policy, multiple issues associated with family reunification and deportation in mixed status families.
Collaboration	Includes relationships; collaboration among teachers, counselors, & families; parent involvement.
Other	Includes statements and questions about the cost of education, goals of education, implementation of common core, blaming of teachers.

All comments, questions, and recommendations were coded using the code that best exemplified the response. Comments were grouped by theme (code) and the content summarized.

creation of codes derived from this theoretical framework using a process of analytic induction, in which a priori, theory-derived codes were applied to narrative data (Patton, 2002). Codes were applied to each previously chunked individual comment, question, or recommendation entry. Codes based on the elements of critical race theory were used for "reexamining yet again those propositions that have become the dominant belief or explanatory paradigm within a discipline or group of practitioners" (Patton, 2002, p. 494). These codes are operationalized in Table 1 below.

We engaged in an iterative coding process in which material that did not fit the CRT codes was initially coded as "other." As material within the category of "other" was reexamined, a cluster of responses emerged dealing with the importance of collaboration and building relationships between parents and teachers and among teachers. This code was added to the code list, and a second round of coding took place. Thus, the "collaboration" code was not part of the CRT framework, but emerged as an important theme in the process of coding.

The coding process consisted of four members of the research team taking each set of comments, questions, and recommendations and doing a preliminary coding of each. Following the individual coding, all four members reconvened in order to compare coding and decide on a final code for each. The code was considered final when at least three of the four coders agreed.

Table 2
Coded Responses

	Questions fr. Audience		Recom-dations		Table Discussion		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Dominant Ideology	6	27%	5	24%	42	22%	53	23%
Collaboration	4	18%	3	14%	35	19%	42	18%
Experiential Knowledge	0	0%	11	52%	24	13%	35	15%
Transdisciplinary Perspectives	6	27%	0	0%	24	13%	30	13%
Social Justice	3	14%	1	5%	21	11%	25	11%
Race	0	0%	0	0%	14	8%	14	7%
Other	3	14%	1	5%	27	14%	31	13%

Total= 230

Findings

Use of CRT as a Framework for Inclusive Dialogue

Understanding the context of participant responses was critical in comprehending the way in which they encounter and think about ethical dilemmas in PK-12 settings. The 230 responses were compiled and analyzed using the coding system described above. Table 2 below presents the frequency with which each code appeared in the three types of symposium activities, arranged in order of the most prominent to least prominent theme. Overall, responses falling into the CRT categories made up close to 70% of the total; however, the distribution across the various types of activities varied. Certain topics were more likely to emerge as recommendations for educators; others were more evident in the questions posed to the panels. The content of responses in each category is examined below.

Dominant Ideology. As seen on Table 2, responses that were coded under dominant ideology came up in all three categories, giving this code the highest percentage in the overall column of the table. Many of the responses that encompassed critical issues within the tenet of dominant ideology challenged the notion of success as measured by standardized tests, particularly when these tests may not be relevant for children from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. There was an overwhelming challenge to current systems and, in one participant's words, to "combat deficit views" that permeate these systems. Inadequate preparation of teachers to deal with different racial groups and to effectively instruct English learners was also posed as a challenge to the current system of teacher preparation. Some comments contained clear calls for system change: "School culture must be changed i.e., the ways in which faculty treat youth (criminalized, problematized, and minimalized) and the ways in which it is reflective on to the teachers that work with them." Others posed questions about how this change might be achieved by participants: "As students/grad students and individuals of institutions of higher education, what emphasis can we place on our scholarly projects to create change? In other words, what can we focus on in our studies and in our work, in order to influence policy? As people who are having these conversations, as people with the power to influence policy, how can we do that?"

Collaboration. Collaboration responses mentioned the importance of building relationships and bridging connections between school agents and the home. In some cases, the need for collaboration was posed in the form of a question, as when a parent asked: "*¿Cómo podemos trabajar con*

los maestros y directores sin que se sientan que estamos entorpeciendo su trabajo? ('How can we work with teachers and principals without their feeling that we are getting in the way of their work?'). Others cited the institutional supports needed in order to facilitate collaboration: "There need to be resources that are outside of the classroom but within the school. For instance, like a position of someone who is a community liaison and can help facilitate the relationship between the teachers and the community members/parents." Collaboration involved relationships among teachers as well as between parents and teachers. For example, one table group recommended "retreats in order for faculty to become more comfortable in working with diverse populations, as many times faculty tend to have diverse mixes." Like the challenge to dominant ideology code discussed above, collaboration codes spanned all areas of symposium activities.

Experiential Knowledge. Experiential knowledge comments encompassed building teacher knowledge about their students and the community that they come from. Critical issues of how unprepared teachers were to be able to work with certain student populations were prevalent throughout the entire event. Thus, the need to understand and draw upon students' experiential knowledge emerged primarily within the recommendations presented by the symposium participants. Participants found it important for the development of funds of knowledge, community cultural wealth, and validation of student backgrounds. One table group recommended: "Before one begins to student teach, they should have to take a class that serves as a link to a community; the student teacher can spend more time in a school environment, creating a curriculum where the student can develop relationships in the community before they graduate." Participants articulated the need to connect student teachers with the community and parents, not just with content that they must teach, and to "improve teacher cultural awareness in teacher preparation programs."

Transdisciplinary Perspectives. Data categorized as transdisciplinary perspectives related to law, policy, decision-making, and social/psychological issues associated with things such as family reunification. Most significantly, this code exemplified the lack of information that participants had about issues dealing with law and policy. Most of the responses in this code came from the questions activity. For example, as participants discussed the ethical dilemmas associated with deportation of undocumented family members, they asked: "Is there any law that prohibits the separation of mixed-status families?" "Are there any more policies or laws being put on the floor to keep families united?"

Social Justice. Statements categorized under social justice all questioned what we all can do in our spheres of influence by "usando la voz" ('using our voice'). Being an advocate was the central overarching theme that encompassed comments about voting, empowerment, and making change. Although not many responses came from a social justice background, those that did were in the form of a "how to" question, showing the lack of information that people have when trying to advocate and wanting to make a change. For example, one table group asked: "How do we begin as communities of color to form more resistance movements toward empowerment of cultural wealth? For example, we in U.S. insist that immigrants give up home language as a deficit (ESL) when in fact other nation's children know 2+ languages on average." Others encouraged parents as advocates for their children's education by "*making cambio—usando la voz* (making change—using our voice) to make sure learning strategies are actually teaching our children."

Race. In our data, there were clear examples of the intersectionality of race and racism from participants' responses; however, interestingly enough, discussion about race and racism only came up during the more intimate format of table discussions (see Table 2). In the recommendations and questions that were shared with the group at large, issues of racism and discrimination were not explicitly stated. In table discussions, the overarching critical issues expressed in the responses consisted of overt statements about discrimination. Clear statements about dehumanization and silencing through language and testing were shared that expressed the way in which participants viewed oppression and racism in PK-12 settings. For example, one community member described the tracking that takes place in some schools: "For the home language survey, if we tell the school that we speak Spanish, they place our children directly in ESL classes." Marginalization of immigrant children was expressed through comments such as "children can't learn in an environment where they're not wanted!" Others made the connection between high-stakes testing and discrimination. One table discussed the differential impact on teachers of color of the current economic crisis, stating that "pink slips are largely given to Latino or ethnic teachers."

Other. Comments that did not seem to fit into the existing CRT tenets or the added collaboration code were coded as "other." This code included a variety of comments about the educational system such as the current climate of teacher bashing, the cost of higher education, and the implementation of common core standards. Some comments were also coded as "other" due to a lack of context needed in order to define the actual meaning of a statement. For example, one table noted the "public

attack on education, on teacher, student, administrator, everything/body to blame."

Upon analysis, we found that over two-thirds (69%) of the table discussion comments, questions, and recommendations reflected the key tenets of a CRT framework. An additional 18% of the comments referred to collaboration and relationship building. At this time, we are not proposing "collaboration" as an extension of the existing tenets of CRT; however, we do see it as a significant theme that encompasses the action component within the existing theory. Therefore, we see the collaboration code as evidence of praxis, the piece that brings the existing CRT tenets together. Viewed in this way, 87% of the participant responses can be seen as consistent with and reflective of CRT tenets.

Recommendations For Educator Preparation Based on Symposium Feedback

Drawing from the recommendations posed through table discussion, as well as those submitted as part of the symposium feedback surveys, we categorized recommendations in three broad categories: drawing on experiential knowledge, teaching for social justice, and combating a deficit approach to immigrant communities and students of color.

"Getting out into the community." The need for pre-service coursework that fosters student engagement in communities with people of color was the most prominent recommendation to emerge from the symposium. Participants recommended requiring teachers to learn certain demographics and information about the populations they teach, to go out into the community, and to go into the homes of children in order to connect with their home and community realities. Student teachers need to connect with the community and parents, not just with the content they are teaching, and they need to learn strategies for how to do this effectively in their university pre-service coursework. Using a funds of knowledge approach (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005), applicable to a variety of cultural and ethnic backgrounds, was recommended. This recommendation recognizes the importance of understanding, validating, and building upon the experiential knowledge of students of color and their communities.

Teaching for social justice. In order to implement the kind of coursework described above, it was recommended that university faculty incorporate the culture(s) of the region of where the students might work (e.g. Chicana/o Studies), as well as modeling use of the concept of funds of knowledge. Faculty need training on how to deal with the mi-

cro aggressions that will occur as they try to implement socially aware or socially just practices. Retreats in order for faculty to become more comfortable in working with diverse populations may also be needed.

Challenging deficit assumptions. School culture, whether it is at the PreK-12 level or at the university level, must be changed. The treatment of immigrant youth and students of color more generally as criminalized, problematized, and minimalized, and the ways that this projects on to the teachers that work with them, must be addressed. Current accountability measures that categorize students as "below basic" or "far below basic," "disadvantaged," and/or "limited" in their linguistic proficiency serve to confirm and underscore existing deficit assumptions about certain groups of students, i.e. students of color, immigrant students, English learners, undocumented students. Efforts by faculty at the university pre-service level and teachers and administrators in K-12 settings to implement viable alternatives to the current over-testing of students are recommended.

Discussion

Often the evaluation of teacher preparation programs takes place within the university itself, as student data from exams, signature assignments, Teaching Performance Assessments, and satisfaction surveys are analyzed. Surveys rating the performance of candidates in the classroom after exiting the preparation programs may be utilized as well. However, in a setting in which parents and community members join students, faculty, and practicing K-12 educators in intimate and open-ended table discussions, concerns regarding the education of immigrant children and the preparation of the teachers who serve these students take on a different focus and urgency. Key areas of concern at the CSULB symposium centered around the need for stronger relationships between school and community, better understanding on the part of teachers of the communities that they serve, and more effective ways of assessing and instructing diverse students. In their work on restructuring schools to enhance outcomes for linguistically diverse students, Miramontes, Nadeau, and Commins (1997) use the term "outreach" to describe the relationship of school and community. This term reflects a broadening of the definition of community participation to foster the inclusion of family members in decision-making at the school site, as well as teachers building on community funds of knowledge in the academic curriculum.

The concerns emerging from symposium discussions are evidenced in the literature as well. In her ethnographic study at a high school with Latino students, Valenzuela (1999) found that instead of the school

building on students' dual language heritage and culture, the school ignored and/or devalued these potential resources in what she labeled a "subtractive schooling" process. Valenzuela contended that subtractive schooling divorces students from their roots and heritage, thus serving to "undermine the worth of their unique culture and history" (p. 172). Subtractive schooling is associated with restrictive language policies, such as Proposition 227 or the "English for the Children" initiative in California, that attempt "to either seriously curtail or outright ban the use of an English learner's primary language for purposes of instruction" (Morales & Aldana, 2011, p. 159). De Jong, Arias, and Sánchez (2011) examined ways in which these restrictive policies have impacted teacher preparation. Their case studies documented a significant reduction in teacher preparation for working with English learners following the passage of restrictive policies in Arizona and Massachusetts. In addition to the issues of academic performance and accountability that dominate current discourse around education, the education of immigrant students poses ethical challenges for educators. Ethical dilemmas posed and discussed during the symposium included the exclusionary and labeling outcomes of high-stakes testing, the effects of immigration policies that divide families and cause children and parents to live in fear of deportation, and challenges posed by teachers without adequate preparation who struggle to engage children and parents in communities in which they have little experience.

Key to an ethics focus on education and leadership is placing the best interests of the student at the heart of "the ethic of the educational profession" (Stefkovich & Begley, 2007). This ethic places the student at the center of the decision-making process while also taking into account the other ethical paradigms of care, critique and justice (Shapiro & Gross, 2008). Conceptualization of best interests refers to the student as an individual (as opposed to students in a group). An assumption is made that if a student is treated with fairness, justice, and caring, then a strong message is sent to all students that they will also be treated with similar justice and caring (Stefkovich and Begley, 2007). The ethic of care considers the consequences of our decisions and actions. Are our policies around language equitable for immigrant students especially in an era of high stakes testing? What are the results of policies that exclude or further marginalize (knowingly or unknowingly) English Language Learners? The second ethical paradigm calls upon the educational leader to critique—to reframe power, culture and language. At the heart of this paradigm are the stories—the student narratives that reshape and challenge dominant ideologies and existing narratives. As the title of this paper suggests, it is the voice that brings about change.

The third paradigm is that of justice. This ethic calls on us to challenge a policy or law by posing the question of whether it (law/policy) is right and, if so, according to whom or what? Finally, the ethic of the profession is one that, when faced with an ethical dilemma, the educational leader must ask him/herself what is the appropriate way for a professional to act (under this situation)? His/her response to this question must center on the best interest of the student. Issues raised and recommendations proposed in this paper point the way toward preparing educators to engage with parents and community members in constructing educational programs that address the best interests of immigrant students.

References

Alemán, E. (2007). Situating Texas school finance policy in a CRT framework: How "substantially equal" yields racial inequity. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(5), 525-558.

Castagno, A., & Lee, S. (2007). Native mascots and ethnic fraud in higher education: Using tribal critical race theory and the interest convergence principle as an analytic tool. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 40*, 3-13.

De Jong, E., Arias, M.B., & Sánchez, M.T. (2011). Undermining teacher competencies: Another look at the impact of restrictive language policies. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 118-136). New York: Teachers College Press.

Delgado Bernal, D. (2002). Critical race theory, Latino critical theory, and critical raced-gendered epistemologies: recognizing students of color as holders and creators of knowledge. *Qualitative Inquiry, 8*, 105-126.

Duncan, M. J., & Anyon, J. (2006). Toward a critical approach to education policy implementation. In M. I. Honig (Ed.), *New directions in education policy implementation: Confronting complexity* (pp. 149-186).

Gándara, P., Rumberger, R., & Maxwell-Jolly, J. (2003). English learners in California schools: Unequal resources, unequal outcomes. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 11*, 36, 1-54.

González, N., Moll, L. & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gonzales, R. (2007). Wasted talent and broken dreams: The lost potential of undocumented students. *Immigration Policy in Focus, 5*(13), 1-11.

Knaus, C. B., (2009). Shut up and listen: applied critical race theory in the classroom. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 12*(2), 133-154.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). What is critical race theory and what is it doing in a nice field like education? *Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 7-24.

Matsuda, M. (1991) Voices of America: accent, antidiscrimination law and a jurisprudence for the last reconstruction. *Yale Law Journal, 100*, 1329-1407.

Miramontes, O., Nadeau, A., & Commins, N. (1997). *Restructuring schools for*

linguistic diversity: Linking decision making to effective programs. New York: Teachers College Press.

Morales, P. Z. & Aldana, U.S. (2011). Learning in two languages: Programs with political promise. In P. Gándara & M. Hopkins (eds.), *Forbidden language: English learners and restrictive language policies* (pp. 159-174). New York: Teachers College Press.

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Pérez Huber, L. (2011). Discourses of racist nativism in California public education: English dominance as racist nativist microaggressions. *Educational Studies, 47*, 379–401.

Pérez Huber, L. (2009). Challenging Nativist Framing: Acknowledging the community cultural wealth of undocumented Chicana college students to reframe the immigration debate. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*, 704-730.

Solórzano, D. (1997) Images and words that wound: critical race theory, racial stereotyping and teacher education. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 24*, 5-19.

Solórzano, D. G. (1998). Critical race theory, race and gender microaggressions, and the experience of Chicana and Chicano scholars. I*nternational Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*, 121-136.

Solórzano, D., &Yosso, T. (2001) Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: counterstorytelling Chicana and Chicano graduate school experiences. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 14*, 471-495.

Shapiro, J. P., & Gross, S. J. (2008). *Ethical educational leadership in turbulent times: (Re)solving moral dilemmas*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.

Stefkovich, J., & Begley, P. T. (2007). Ethical school leadership: Defining the best interests of students. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 35*, 205-224.

Stovall, D. (2005). Where the rubber hits the road: CRT goes to high school. In A. Dixson & C. K. Rousseau (eds.), *Critical race theory in education* (pp. 231-240). New York: Routledge.

Suárez-Orozco, C. Yoshikawa, H., Teranishi, R., & Suárez-Orozco, M. (2011). Growing up in the shadows: The developmental implications of unauthorized status. *Harvard Educational Review, 81*, 438-472.

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

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 8*(1), 69–91.