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A SURVEY RESEARCH STUDY OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE AND CHANGE: WHAT DO EDUCATORS GAIN FROM ANTI-BIAS/ANTI-RACIST PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT?
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Research studies suggest that professional development would better prepare the 84% White teaching force to serve diverse classrooms. Schools have begun providing professional development with desired outcomes of better serving their diverse student body. This research study focused on educators who received summer camp-style immersive anti-bias/anti-racist professional development and examined the relationships between aspects of educator change as measured by a survey instrument (n=57). The research found that teachers were likely to make anti-bias/anti-racist classroom practice changes after attending the social justice summer camp. By better understanding educator change proceeding summer camp style conferences, this study offers implications for implementing anti-bias/anti-racist professional development at the school district level.
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CHAPTER 1: GO FOR BROKE

In March 2020, most American public-school students went to full-remote attendance during the Covid-19 pandemic. On May 25, 2020, George Perry Floyd Jr. was murdered while three policemen watched Officer Derek Chauvin kneel on his neck for 9 minutes and 29 seconds. During the Spring and Fall of 2020, teachers were tasked with serving diverse students who might be concerned about race relations while trying to keep kids from falling behind (Iheme, 2020). Historically, teachers have not served their diverse students well, as illustrated by several gaps in achievement (Reardon, Kalogride, & Shores, 2019), school behavior discipline (Gopalan & Nelson, 2019), and attendance (Libassi, 2020). White students continue to outperform their non-White peers on standardized tests (Fish, 2019). Non-White students face more severe behavior discipline outcomes than White peers for similar infractions. Systemic racial oppression continues to be embedded in the fabric of American school systems. However, these systems may be able to support teacher change in pedagogical and classroom management practice by offering or requiring participation in high-quality immersive anti-bias/anti-racist professional development.

When President Donald Trump signed Executive Order 13950 in September 2020, much federally funded, anti-bias/anti-racist training took a pause. This executive order banned federally funded organizations from requiring discussions and training on discrimination and anti-racism, labeling them “offensive and anti-American race and sex stereotyping and scapegoating” (Exec. Order No. 13950, 2020). In my work as a school district leader, I found
some schools moved to an optional model for this training and implemented programs such as “Seed Project” and “Facing History and Ourselves.” Others, such as the district in which I am employed, complied with the stand-down order. These schools hosted no anti-bias/anti-racist training (Morgan, 2020). In 2021, President Joseph Biden rescinded the order. The 2022 president's order charges government agencies with eliminating systemic racism and other forms of discrimination (Wagner, 2021). This executive order allowed all schools to offer anti-bias/anti-racist professional development again.

The present study examines the relationship between conference attendance and educator change. The researcher was interested in investigating if educators who attend a conference designed to create anti-bias/anti-racist classroom practices would be more likely to enact these changes in their classrooms. This work is urgent, as teachers need to be equipped to create anti-bias/anti-racist classrooms that can better serve an increasingly diverse student body (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Howard & Aleman, 2008; Howard, 2003; Samuels, 2018). The study looks at relationships between respondents’ characteristics, professional development characteristics, respondents’ perceptions, and classroom changes respondents made after participating in immersive professional development. This information will help professional development providers make informed decisions regarding their programming content.

**Urgency**

The next several sections explain how urgent it has become that the classroom be more anti-bias/anti-racist and how difficult a task this change is. Multiple policies require or restrict teachers’ culturally competent actions in the classrooms but do not support educators to improve at this work. Historically, professional development for this purpose has been ineffective, as
demonstrated by the state of systemic racism still found in American Public Schools. Educators struggle when working with diverse students and find there is not enough available high-quality support for them. Researchers must look at more professional development models to determine which strategies are most effective at implementing educator change for anti-bias/anti-racist classrooms.

The situation requiring American public schools to become more anti-bias/anti-racist can be described through the statistics representing how very different the school experience of White children is from that of non-White children. In a 2018 study by the Patterson Research group, Anderson found that 49% of African American survey respondents had served school detention, 37% had been suspended, 16% had been arrested prior to age 18, and only 25% reported having not been disciplined in schools, as compared with far less discipline for the same infractions applied to their White peers (Cody, 2013; Crenshaw, 2015; Lewin, 2012; OCR, 2014, 2022).

Teachers are tasked with developing their students' content knowledge in whatever area they may teach, from math to English Language Arts, and from music to P.E. For this to occur, educators must bring to the table a toolbox of skills, including appropriate pedagogy, classroom management, and communication skills (Hollie, 2017; Kanter & Konstantopopulos, 2010). In today's diverse and varied classrooms, cultural competency and an anti-bias/anti-racist mindset are essential characteristics for teachers to develop content knowledge, choose appropriate pedagogy, effectively manage their classrooms, and communicate productively (Allen, Scott, & Lewis, 2013; Larabee, 2010; Lin, Lake, & Rice, 2008; White et al., 2020). Ensuring the predominantly White teaching force can teach a diverse classroom is essential.
Diversity in Faculty vs. Student Body

Several factors affect the teacher-population ratio to the diverse student population. Although the K-12 student populations reflect the diversity of the US nation, classroom educators do not (Anderson, 2018; Gottfried et al., 2022). In 2015, 83% of American school teachers were White, 7% were Black, 9% were Hispanic, 2% were Asian, and 1% were of two or more races (NTPS, 2017). In predominantly White schools, the percentage of White teachers rises dramatically. For example, in schools with less than 10% minority students, 98% of the teachers, on average, are White. In schools with 49% or fewer minority students, 90% of the teachers, on average, are White (Spiegelman, 2020). The percentage of White teachers is related to school type. In non-traditional, private, or charter settings, White teachers are 71% of the teaching force. Geography adds to the demographic makeup of the faculty as well. In rural settings, 89% of teachers are White, whereas 69% are White in urban regions. In suburban schools, 82% of teachers are White, mirroring the national average (NCES, 2017). (See Figure 1.)

Although public school teachers in America are a less diverse group of educators, research finds that school administrators are a slightly more diverse, representative population. These administrators are also faced with the “daunting task of maintaining an environment, considered by students, parents, and teachers, to be conducive for learning and safe from physical or mental harm” (Williams et al., 2013, p. 141). Roughly 60% of public-school leaders identify as women, and the average age of those administrators is 46%. These populations’ representations are very similar to those in the present study. While regional differences exist, such as a higher proportion of Black principals in the southern US, principals are still likely to be White. According to 2016 data, 79% of school administrators are White, 12% are Black, 8% are
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Figure 1:
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Hispanic or LatinX, and the remaining 1% identify as another race or ethnicity. In the highest office in the school, only 8% of superintendents identify as persons of color (Schaffer, 2021).

The US student body reflects the current diversity. Research shows this diversity is increasing (Bischoff & Tach, 2018; Carter et al., 2019; Nishina et al., 2019). In 2017, 48% of American students were White, 15% were Black, 27% were Hispanic, and 5% were Asian. Census experts predict that by 2029, the percentage of White students in American schools will fall below 45% (NCES, 2019). Further illustrating the diversity, 31% of American students are enrolled in a school with 75% or greater minority enrollment. In other words, 31% of students attend a school where White students are not the majority. (See Figure 2.)
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**Figure 2:**
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The learning needs of diverse learners are complex (Bonner, Warren, & Jiang, 2018). In 2020, Li and Sah described the diverse learner as having unique language acquisition, along with cultural and content learning contexts not experienced by typical White American students. Therefore, this is a challenge for educators who need to prepare to teach these contexts. Park (2018) described this ever-increasing group as super-diverse, noting that some schools have over 100 languages. These super-diverse children constitute over a third of our nation's public-school students, so training the teachers is urgent (Park, 2018).

Bias is ordinary and universal. Humans all perceive the world differently and interpret what we observe differently; human experiences shape perceptions and views. Although educators cannot be free of bias, if they can acknowledge and understand their biases, they will be better able to overcome the effects of the bias and better serve their diverse students (Xu, 2018).

**Stages of Professional Learning**

When evaluating professional development of any kind, it is essential to have a model in mind and lean on the work of professional development evaluation experts. The complex and unique empirical indicators of quality professional development assist experts in designing, developing, implementing, and researching to focus on the most critical factors. Using an appropriate survey research model for this study provides a lens through which to view outcome data and add to the researcher's understanding of meaningful teacher professional development learning.

Guskey (2003) stated five critical stages to evaluate professional development (see Appendix E). Level one is the participants' reactions, such as if they liked the professional development and thought the presenter was knowledgeable (Guskey, 2000). Level two is
participant learning, which measures acquired knowledge and skills (Guskey, 2002). Level three is organization support and change, which measures the organization's advocacy and support of professional development, along with what is needed to improve future change efforts. Level four is the participants’ use of new knowledge and skills; this level evaluates if participants applied new skills and used what they learned. Level five evaluates student learning outcomes and looks for improvement in test scores, student skills, attitudes, and beliefs (Guskey & Yoon, 2009).

Although two survey questions revealed interesting data regarding level one, the present study focused on levels two and four of the Guskey framework for professional development evaluation. These levels were chosen to frame the research and outcome data to be studied regarding the characteristics of the Social Justice Summer Camp. Gathering and analyzing data on levels three and five require a more longitudinal research approach unsuitable for this study. The framework using levels two and four guided the researcher's survey production and provided a more robust grounding in best practices of professional development evaluation (Guskey, 2002).

**Schools and Oppression**

Historically, schools have not served their diverse students well (Galloway et al., 2019; Orner, 2014; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paulo Friere (1972) described schools as institutions of oppression. Friere claimed that oppression is humankind's central problem. He stated, "Hence, the radical requirement—both for the individual who discovers himself or herself to be an oppressor and for the oppressed—that the concrete situation which begets oppression must be transformed" (pg. 10). His work stated that a critical idea of
oppression is that oppressors have someone weaker than them oppress: the marginalized. In their quest to become liberated, oppressed persons may become the oppressors, and this model seeks to perpetuate these systems of oppression. Friere called for the oppressed to seek objective liberation (changes in plans and structures) and personal liberation (changes in how we think about power).

Research indicated that schools are indeed sites of oppression (Beckett, 2015; Boske, 2012; Freire, 1972; Howard, 2016; Kumashiro, 2000). Experts attribute this oppression to an opportunity gap (Harry & Klinger, 2014), a discipline gap, and the surprising re-segregation that has occurred in 21st-century American public schools (Wells et al., 2019). Diverse students have access to fewer opportunities, are disciplined at higher rates, and attend schools with fewer White students than their wealthier White peers in primarily White schools (Flores, 2007; Muller, 2018).

**Statement of the Problem**

The specific problem that this research addressed is that White teachers are not prepared to serve increasingly diverse students, and, as a result, they are not serving their diverse students well (Edwards & White, 2018; Epstein, 2011; Sleeter, 2008). In their work, Edwards and White (2018) stated that research has long documented that “pre-service teachers are not leaving professional teacher education programs prepared to teach in diverse contexts, and consequently, they do not possess the abilities to teach diverse children and work alongside diverse families” (p.2). Romo’s research (2016) found that teacher training programs have struggled to prepare White teachers to serve multicultural environments. Because the demands and challenges of teaching a dramatically more diverse population has grown over the years, it is important to
determine an effective model for anti-bias/anti-racist professional development for the current teaching force.

Some researchers assert that teachers fail to serve their diverse students well because of systemic barriers to training (Blake, 2020; Hoover et al., 2018; Housal, 2020; Lui & Ball, 2019). Research shows that in most states, pre-service teachers are not required to take a multi-cultural course to become certified (Cardichon et al., 2020; Li et al., 2017; Moore, Giles, & Vitlii, 2021). One group of researchers found that only 12% of teachers had training in teaching linguistically diverse students, and only 30% had training regarding racially diverse students (Li et al., 2017). Moore, Giles, and Vitlii (2021) found that new teachers lack an opportunity to understand and appreciate the cultural differences in the classroom or to learn how to validate those differences through educational practice. Research has also found that Black and Latinx students are more likely to be taught by uncertified teachers than their White peers (Cardichon et al., 2020).

Additional research indicates that teachers’ resistance to training is another systemic barrier. Byrd, Rastogi, and Elliot (2020) found that resistance manifested in defense mechanisms against educators’ perceived threats to value systems and goals. Schick (2000) found that the resistance may reveal itself as teachers denying their bias. In “A talk to Teachers”, delivered October 16, 1963 and published in the Sunday review, James Baldwin said, “To any citizen of this country who figures himself as responsible—and especially those of you who deal with the mind and hearts of young people—you must be prepared to go for broke” (p. 1). Teachers doing the work of becoming more anti-bias/anti-racist in their classroom are in a precarious position of being the few desiring to do the work because of their fellow educators’ resistance to the change.

In addition to defense mechanisms, resistance to change may result from competing goals, or a lack of buy-in, motivation, resources, supplies, time. Alderman et al. (2021)
discussed the difficulty of using professional development to move toward anti-racist pedagogy in the field of geography, where content is a competing goal. Historically, professional development for anti-bias/anti-racist pedagogy does not substantially impact teachers' actual classroom practice (Korthagen, 2017; Loughran, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 2011).

Still, other researchers (Acosta, 2020; Lensmire et al., 2013; Smalling, 2020) have found a systemic barrier in teachers' personal beliefs and biases. Sleeter (2015) found that even when new teachers are trained, barriers such as a failure to recognize inequities, deficit views, denial that race matters, and a lack of racial identity development keep new teachers from enacting culturally competent strategies with their students. Magen-Nagar and Firstater (2019) found that teachers do not personally overcome these belief barriers and therefore do not implement them fully after participating in professional development.

Systemic barriers to teacher mindset and changes exist in the research as well. Beliefs are precursors to behaviors, so teachers' beliefs are reflected in their practices (Pajares, 1992). A failure to make changes in their classroom may suggest a failure to change their beliefs (Guskey, 2002). Other research shows that beliefs may be changed through practice, so beliefs in the classroom may follow practice (Buehl & Beck, 2015; Richardson, 1996). The relationship between change in belief and change in practice is complicated and, therefore, significant to consider when studying educator professional development for anti-bias/anti-racist classroom change.

While experts have studied several models of professional development which are effective for helping teachers advance their pedagogy and practice, we do not know if those models are adequate for assisting teachers in making anti-bias/anti-racist changes in their classrooms (DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009). Woo, et al. found in 2021 that 40% of respondents
indicated that their professional learning opportunities during the 2020–2021 school year did not prepare them to address anti-bias topics. Several large-scale analyses of research on implicit-bias training suggest teachers learn more about the content and vocabulary of the topic than how to make classroom changes (Forscher et al., 2019). Several training strategies, such as making decisions deliberately to avoid stereotypes or being aware of implicit biases, have so far failed to show benefits that last (Greenwald & Lai, 2020). Therefore, there is a lack of understanding regarding what should be included in professional development programs for anti-bias/anti-racist cultural competence and which characteristics are most important.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to employ survey research methods to determine teacher perceptions of a current model of educator professional development and to determine whether those relate to educator classroom change. In order to successfully do this, the study intended to determine through a respondent survey which anti-bias/anti-racist changes educators most often make after attending high-quality anti-bias/anti-racist professional development. Then, the study examined which conference characteristics might be more likely to lead to those actions. Lastly, the study compared whether various respondent demographic characteristics influenced their likelihood of making anti-bias/anti-racist changes.

The specific research questions for this study included the following:

1. Was attendee’s perceptions of how the Social Justice summer camp aligned to their district’s improvement priorities related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?
2. Was the support you received to attend the camp related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

3. Was the participant’s willingness to apply what they learned related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

4. Was the participant’s perception of the usefulness of the camp related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

5. Was the support you received from your school leadership to apply what you learned at the camp related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

6. Was the gender of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

7. Was the race of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

8. Was the school employment status of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

9. Was the education level of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?
Theoretical Framework

Three main theories informed this study to focus on educator change. Racial identity formation theory is an integrated framework because it informs how White teachers may come to mindset changes and see themselves as enactors of change in an oppressive environment (McAllister & Irvine, 2000; Yip, Seaton, and Sellers, 2006). System justification theory is vital because it helps explain why educators see that schools need to change but continue to be reticent to change (Liviatan & Jost, 2014). The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) from Hall (1974) is essential because it informs the researcher’s lens through which to view various data related to classroom anti-bias/anti-racist change.

Racial identity development theory explains how identity develops over time (McAllister & Irvine, 2000; Yip, Seaton, and Sellers, 2006). Racial identity develops because of one's perception that they share a joint racial group similar to their own (Tatum, 1992). The racial socialization of youth contributes to identity development and requires the young self to position oneself within a racial group (Stevenson & Arrington, 2009). Increasing age, maturation, and life experiences lead to achieving one’s racial identity (Eccles, 2007). There is an increase in identity exploration during adolescence, including racial exploration (Quintana, 2007; Umana-Taylor et al., 2014). Essentially, as one grows, matures, and has contextual experiences (such as witnessing racism or experiencing privilege), one becomes their race, including White. Racial identity development theory posits that people develop positive in-group identities and esteems within their racial group (French et al., 2006; Quintana, 2007; Seidman, 1996).

System justification theory states that adults exhibit a non-conscious tendency to defend, bolster, and justify aspects of the social status quo (Jost, 2002; Liviatan & Jost, 2014). According
to system justification theory, teachers may explain an oppressive system because it has a palliative effect; justifying it makes them feel better psychologically. It has evolutionary roots and is a defense mechanism that has helped our species survive (Toor et al., 2010). System justification reduces guilt, frustration, and moral outrage (Wakslak et al., 2005). Members of oppressed groups in school systems are conflicted between the need to justify the system and the need to advocate for their self-interest (Jost & Thompson, 2000). Teachers are more likely to explain the system of oppression in their school when under attack and less likely to justify it when no attack on the system is present (Jost, Banaji, and Nosek, 2016).

Hall’s Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) is a specific change theory that focuses on the individual level of change in how teachers make sense of the anti-bias/anti-racist changes in their classrooms and practices (Hall, 1974). CBAM approaches change as a mandate from the administration, in this case, possible requirements at the state department level, of which the teacher is a consumer of the change (Straub, 2009). This particular lens is critical for this research because it puts the responsibility to make the change on professional development and not on the people implementing it. A more comprehensive theoretical discussion is included in Chapter Two.

Significance of the Study

There is a need for updated research on effective models of anti-bias/anti-racist professional development, especially focusing on offerings for educators. A large body of research on effective professional development exists, but most of these studies do not meet empirical standards for determining effectiveness (Hill, Beisiegel, & Jacob, 2013). Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, and Shapley (2007) engaged in one of the most extensive professional
development evaluations published, including 1,300 professional development studies. Only nine of these 1,300 studies met empirical rigor, suggesting that professional development recommendations may be based on flawed research. Ten years later, this research is now outdated. More recent research studies demonstrated the bulk of the empirical analysis focuses on respondents’ feelings regarding attendance, self-reports of their motivation for attending, and self-reports of outcomes some length of time after conference attendance (Borg, 2014; Büyükyavuz, 2016; Maloney, 2017; Vega & Connell, 2008; Rowe, 2017; Rowe, 2019; Long, 2011). However, these studies do not focus on the act of educator change.

Researching the relationship between anti-bias/anti-racist professional development and educator classroom change is significant for several reasons. First, the scope of the problem is quite large as a national problem: most White teachers in the United States are not successfully teaching their increasingly diverse students (Dilworth, 2007; Wright, 2015). It is evident nationally that many White teachers do not create a culturally competent anti-bias/anti-racist mindset in their classrooms. Therefore, uncovering potential relationships between professional development and educator change by researching a potentially effective anti-bias/anti-racist training model is urgently needed if schools wish to close achievement gaps and dismantle systemic oppression in their schools.

Second, the response to the problem (mandated training) is currently inadequate. Although districts and professional organizations are trying to provide appropriate professional development, the quality varies greatly. As required by statute in the Illinois school code and other states, professional development occurs whether or not it is high quality or effective. Little (1989) originally described compliance-related (required by law) professional development as intellectually shallow and gimmicky. Researchers lack empirical and anecdotal data regarding
anti-bias/anti-racist professional development, effectiveness, participants, or high-quality statistical relationships.

Illinois has identified Strategy 2.1.4 of the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) Strategic Plan, which calls for the agency to "support implicit bias training through professional development in schools and classrooms" (ISBE, 2020). Therefore, gathering data helps describe the characteristics that correlate with a positive teacher mindset and change after participating in anti-bias/anti-racist professional development.

Finally, this research is significant because it can address the gap in practice around anti-bias/anti-racist training. By helping to build on the currently inadequate data set regarding the relationships between professional development and teachers’ change in an anti-bias/anti-racist mindset and classroom, this study can help other researchers continue the work and contribute to the field. This study uncovered relationships in the data between the Social Justice Summer Camp characteristics and teacher mindset and change.

Despite the style and type of professional learning offered, an investigation is warranted into the program's effectiveness. While researchers have studied and reported on the benefits of teachers’ attending high-quality professional development, less is known about the efficacy of professional development for cultural competence and anti-bias/anti-racism on mindsets, change, or instructional practices of White teachers in schools (Carignan, Sanders & Pouravood, 2005; DeJaeghere & Cao, 2009; McAllister & Irvine, 2000).
Glossary

**Anti-bias:** This mindset refers to understanding fundamental human differences and their value in a respectful and civil society and actively challenges bias, stereotypes, and all forms of oppression (Lin, Lake, & Rice, 2008).

**Anti-racism:** The idea is that all racial groups are equal. Anti-racist individuals are supportive of policies that undo racial inequities. This framework examines the systems and structures leading to racial disparities (Kendi, 2019).

**Bias:** This is the unconscious tendency to like or dislike the members of a group (Greenwald & Krieger, 2006).

**Cultural competence:** As represented in professional development, this is an effort towards cultural pluralism, assisting White educators to become familiar with non-White or non-English groups and giving students of color more representation. This is done through the examination of one’s own cultural identity and positionality, first and foremost. Through this examination of oneself, one can more easily recognize one’s privilege and marginalization and, by extension, the privilege and marginalization of others (Flynn, 2018).

**Implicit bias:** Attitudes or stereotypes activated involuntarily affect our understanding and can tremendously impact our decision-making. These include both favorable and unfavorable assessments, and while people tend to favor their own in-group, they can also have implicit biases against their own in-group (Kivel, 2017).
**Educator:** In this research, the term refers to Pre-K-12 teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, and certified school support staff.

**Social Justice Summer Camp:** This is an intensive, immersive, four-day camp during which from breakfast to evening participants attend interactive sessions and discussions to learn more about becoming a social justice educator.

**Stereotypes:** This term refers to the association of a group with a particular trait with “a widely held, simplified, and essentialist belief” (Stanford University, 2022).

**Summary**

As classrooms and schools continue to become increasingly diverse and education reform remains a focus both nationally and locally, professional development efforts continue to be introduced. Anti-bias/anti-racism efforts (while not entirely new, as they received their foundation with Freire's call to change) have received renewed attention due to recent state and federal mandates. Chapter One presented the background for this study, specified the problem, described the significance, and summarized the research design used.

The following chapters consist of the literature on educators' needs for anti-bias/anti-racist change in schools' professional development, the theoretical lens used by the researcher, gaps in the literature, and conference attendance. Chapter Three includes the survey research design, study context, sampling method, survey design, and data collection. Chapter Four includes findings from the descriptive and statistical analysis conducted to answer the research questions and several null hypotheses. Chapter Five completes this work and provides
recommendations for professional development providers, teachers, administrators, and policymakers.

This study intended to offer insight into the potential of the Social Justice Summer Camp. The perceptions of the teacher attendees and the findings of the research can guide future research and models of successful anti-bias/anti-racism professional development.
CHAPTER 2: UNDERSTANDING WHITENESS AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Public education faces many challenges, including increasing accountability for teachers and administrators (Erichsen & Reynolds, 2020), legislative mandates, limited access to precarious funding sources (Lafortune, Rothstein, and Schanzenbach, 2018), and educating an ever-increasingly diverse body of students (Ingersoll et al., 2019). This literature review demonstrates that it is urgent and imperative for White American teachers to become comfortable teaching a diverse body of students. Teacher professional development has long been implementing change in American schools, though great strides have yet to be made to close the achievement gap caused by structural inequities (Trujillo et al., 2017). The following review includes three main sections to build the case that teachers' professional development for anti-bias/anti-racism and cultural competency is urgently needed.

The background section explains information on critical, foundational ideas associated with this study, including Whiteness, the importance of teachers of color, and the concept of cultural competence. The review of effective professional development models will tie current research to the model in this study. Finally, educator conference attendance and the gaps in empirical research are also discussed, as some study findings indicate a need for additional professional development content in these models.
Background

In this background section, the researcher presents the areas of Whiteness, the importance of diverse teachers, and cultural competence in teacher professional development in schools to provide a foundation of critical ideas and understandings. The nature of Whiteness in K-12 schools, the importance of teachers of color, and culturally competent classroom practices are imperative to creating an anti-bias/anti-racist classroom environment and must be understood when researching teacher change after participating in anti-bias/anti-racist professional development.

Whiteness in Schools

Educators in American schools urgently need to serve their increasingly diverse student bodies more effectively (Williams, 2018). Research has brought to light Whiteness's permanence and significance in the lives of educators and students, as Whiteness permeates every part of schools (Sondel, Kretchmar, & Hadley Dunn, 2022), from the curriculum (Arday, 2018) and the discipline of students (Castagno, 2008), to requirements for graduation (Chapman et al., 2020). It is critical to understand what Whiteness is in order to understand what educator bias looks like and if it is enacted, how Whiteness creates oppression in schools (Leonardo, 2007), and how the rigid boundaries of Whiteness make it difficult for educators to better serve their diverse students (Garcia et al., 2021; Keating, 2013; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Research indicates that teachers of color have become increasingly important (Carver-Thomas, 2018; Dee, 2004; Gershenson et al., 2017; Villegas & Irvine, 2010) and that the enactment of culturally competent classroom
practices by all educators is critical if classrooms are to be made spaces that better serve diverse students (Borrero, Ziauddin, & Ahn, 2018).

A significant challenge to this goal is the construct of Whiteness, which persists in our culture because White has become the default. Experts assert that Whiteness is a construct created by humans roughly 500 years ago (Roediger, 2021). Whiteness is systematically ingrained in systems and institutions in the same way that, over time, a child is assumed when talking about a student; an adult is assumed when talking about a teacher (Pawley, 2017). The assumptions are loaded with characteristics and expectations. Whiteness symbolizes cleanliness, kindness, serenity, and youth (Babb, 1998). In describing Whiteness, researchers state that Whiteness means being well-behaved, scholarly, and friendly (Lund & Carr, 2015). The construct of Whiteness symbolizes dominance, normalcy, preference, and privilege (Bell, 2021).

(See Figure 3.)

Figure 3:

*Origins of Whiteness*
For example, in the researcher’s experience, students with other backgrounds and languages are often discussed with issues that teachers must solve at teacher meetings. Teachers discuss overcoming a language barrier, engaging families from another culture, or addressing problematic behavior from a specific group. However, teachers rarely discuss the problems of White students with the core issue being that they are White. Rarely in the researchers’ 22-year history in education did they hear teachers wondering “What are they going to do about these White kids and their behavior, attendance, parent participation, grades, or academic readiness?”

Over the last two decades, studies have indicated that the epistemology of Whiteness exists in schools. Princeton and Tufts’ 2020 study (Stark et al., 2020) found that 77% of teachers showed implicit racial bias against Black people. Although there is a persistent belief that Whites create a particular category of humanity, a race (Battalora, 2013), this is inaccurate. Whiteness, much like any other race, is a construct that can historically be traced back to its creation, prior to which race did not exist (Ray, 2019). It is well-accepted in the humanities that notions of race and human difference exist not solely by their biological foundations but by their social constructions (Guess, 2006). Schools are one of the institutions Smedley and Smedley were referring to when they stated, “Racialized science will likely attempt to find explanations for racial hegemony in the biology and genetics of the ‘racial’ group rather than in the social attitudes and institutions that perpetuate the idea of race” (2005, p. 24).

Current and past studies assert that educators frequently do not understand nor consider Whiteness. When White pre-service teachers are offered the opportunity to explore Whiteness through social justice courses or diversity workshops, they have anecdotally defined it as wealth, opportunity, and respect (Wilner et al., 2002). Sayles-Hannon (2009) defined Whiteness differently because the wealth-opportunity-respect definition fails to recognize poor Whites,
Whites that perceive themselves as having been disrespected, and Whites who live in lower classes who have little access to opportunity.

Instead, Sayles-Hannon (2009) stated that Whiteness is usual, typical, commonsense, and of the ordinary. This definition of Whiteness allows groups to move into Whiteness, as has happened for the last 500 years in the United States (Liu & Ball, 2019). For example, during their initial waves of immigration, European ethnic groups like the Irish, Italians, Jews, and eastern Europeans were not initially recognized as being in the same class as their White peers. Eventually, these lighter-skinned groups were constructed as White. This sociocultural process took a lengthy evolution of time, perhaps centuries (Allen, 2012; Ignatiez, 2008; Smedley & Smedley, 2012; Zinn, 2005).

Experts explained how Whiteness has a role in making U.S. schools oppressive for their diverse students. In K-12 education, the ideas of meritocracy and independence support a belief system of dominance and the positionality of Whiteness (Rubel & McCloskey, 2019), creating conflict surrounding how teachers consider race and anti-bias/anti-racism as essential ideas in the instruction of children (Carr, 2015). Meritocracy requires that educators view the processes that lead to achievement as earned and influenced by no systemic advances or barriers. This view allows for a confirmation of the tenets of White supremacy. Experts pointed to the continued oppression of diverse students in America as an illustration of this positionality in several ways (Tolbert et al., 2019), such as the growing re-segregation of schools (Frankenberg, Lee, & Orfield, 2003; Orfield, Kucsera, & Siegel-Hawley, 2012).

For example, most White students attend schools that are 9% Black, while the majority of Black students attend schools that are 48% Black (NCES, 2015). White and wealthy schools spend twice as many minutes on grade-level content (versus below-grade-level content) than
poorer and more diverse schools, and students in more diverse and low-income schools spend 133 hours per content area per year on below-grade-level material (Hanushek et al., 2019), rather than learning at or above grade level.

Other researchers demonstrated this oppression through achievement and opportunity gaps. Although 40% of all college students take remedial courses, Black students take remedial courses at twice that rate (Jimenez et al., 2016). Black and Latinx families pay 1.5 billion dollars annually to take remedial college courses (Hern, Snell, & Henson, 2020). Research has shown that Black and White students who attend majority-Black schools have lower achievement than Black and White students in predominantly White schools (Dirmeyer, 2021). This achievement gap is despite the research findings that both White and marginalized students hope to have high achievements (OCR, 2014). For example, 94% of 30,000 students in a diverse, multi-district survey reported wanting to attend college, and 70% of high school students reported career goals that require at least a college degree (TNTP, 2018).

Still, other researchers pointed to a school discipline gap. Research consistently shows that marginalized students are disciplined more often, with more severe consequences than their White and wealthy peers (Cody, 2013; Crenshaw, 2015; Lewin, 2012; OCR, 2014). For example, Black students in the study received slightly longer suspensions after interracial fights. The U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR, 2016) reported that diverse children are over three times more likely to receive an out-of-school suspension (Goff, 2016) and over two times more likely to be referred to law enforcement (Turner & Beneke, 2020) for the same infractions (Martin, Sharp-Grier, & Smith, 2016). Researchers found higher suspension rates for students from low-income families (Anderson & Ritter, 2017). They found that Black students who attend high-poverty schools receive out-of-school suspensions at higher rates than Black
students who attend low-poverty schools (Loveless, 2017; Skibka et al., 2014; Losen et al., 2015).

Sayles-Hannon (2009) described one Whiteness characteristic in schools as the rigidity of boundaries. This rigidity encapsulates students' expected behavior, learning, opinions, and participation styles. Flexibility for other diverse styles of behavior is outside these boundaries. The research demonstrated that Whiteness continues to be normalized by repeating these normalized boundaries (Meer, 2019). Qualities assigned to White students reflect the normal rigid boundaries, and these qualities are valued in all students, even when not expressed by the majority of the White students. Behaviors might include eye contact, dress, language, grammar, and personal preferences (Sayles-Hannon, 2009). These rigid boundaries may explain why research asserted that White teachers are more likely than Black teachers to punish students of color for perceived behavior problems (Blake et al., 2016; Lindsay & Hart, 2017) and have lower academic expectations of their Black students (Gershenson et al., 2017).

It should be noted that the critical lens placed on Whiteness is not an attack on White people, as Whiteness and White people are separate constructs. James Baldwin reminded readers that no one was White before we came to America (Baldwin, 1965). Flynn (2017) explained that the difference between Whiteness and White people is fundamental. Whiteness, the construct, is “a system of thoughts, values, and beliefs that shape how an individual interacts with and interprets her/his environment.” One can see in this definition that Whiteness is not inherently oppressive; neither are White people. Separating Whiteness and White people is in line with Giroux’s (1997) advice to be sensible in investigating Whiteness, as many anti-racist allies who study Whiteness are White people.
The Importance of Teachers of Color

The desire of schools to have more diverse teaching staff and teachers of color is historically well recognized in the research. Septima Clark called for opportunities for marginalized youth in the communities and teachers of color who could serve them. W.E.B. Du Bois (1902) firmly believed that the most significant contribution teacher’s colleges could make to Black youth was to train Black teachers. Numerous studies have concluded that teachers of color add value to the profession (Murrell, 2001; Villegas & Irvine, 2010). Teachers of color have demonstrated success with students in the areas of content achievement, social-emotional learning, mentoring, guidance, and creating an anti-bias/anti-racist classroom environment (Bettini et al., 2022; Carver-Thomas, 2018; Easton-Brooks, 2019; Jackson & Knight, 2019).

Research demonstrated that diverse students are more likely to succeed when supported by diverse teachers than are their peers who are supported by non-diverse teachers. Black students described the unique ways their Black teachers care for them (Jackson, Sealey-Ruiz, & Watson, 2014; Madkins, 2011) and serve as role models (Goings & Bianco, 2016). One study found that increasing the percentage of Black math teachers correlated to a greater likelihood of Black students' later enrollment in rigorous math courses, highlighting the race-based role-model effect (Klopfenstein, 2005). Compared with Black students taught by White teachers, Black students taught by Black teachers were likelier to report a desire to attend college and stated that their teachers cared for them and motivated them to achieve (Egalite & Kisida, 2017).

In schools with a broader representation of non-White staff and educators, non-White students tended to do better. In well-represented schools, non-White students experienced a 29% boost in matriculation to college. They were 39% less likely to drop out of high school before
graduation and 18% less likely to receive the punishment of detention and beyond. Non-White students in schools with more diverse staffs were three times more likely to be referred to advanced placement or gifted programming than their non-White peers attending schools with a mostly White staff (Cody, 2013; Crenshaw, 2015; Lewin, 2012; OCR, 2014, 2022).

The cultural competence of teachers of color can impact students of color. Some experts posit that Black teachers have a more advanced multicultural awareness, which may foster a more adaptive, responsive classroom environment for diverse students (Cheng & Halpin, 2016). A recent study found that Latino and Black educator respondents had greater multicultural awareness than White educator respondents (Cheng & Davis, 2019). Furthermore, many Black educators brought with them an essential cultural perspective that allowed them to engage in the pedagogy of insistence (Ross et al., 2008) or an "unwavering commitment to student educational success" and the belief that Black children can and must learn (Acosta, 2018, p. 3).

Cultural Competence

Barnes (2006) defined cultural competence as the ability to "know and facilitate the various ranges of student's cultural and linguistic groups in the learning process." Early on, cultural competence was thought of as multicultural or trans-cultural competence. At their core outcomes, these competencies had the ability to view ideas and events through the lens or perspective of another culture (Jurasek, 1995). Forde and Torrance (2017) stated, "If the intentions underpinning the policy articulations of equality and social justice are to be addressed, leaders need the understandings, skills, and motivation to focus on shaping the conditions in schools and classrooms that foster inclusive pedagogies, which engage constructively with issues of diversity," indicating they see cultural competence as a complex active skill.
In 1989, *cultural competence* was defined as "a set of congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency or among professionals and enable that system, agency or those professions to work effectively in cross-cultural situations" (Cross et al., 1989, p. 7). The 1989 research asserted a six-point continuum that began with cultural destructiveness and included cultural incapacity, cultural blindness, cultural pre-competence, cultural competence, and cultural proficiency. Respecting that set of behaviors and characteristics *may* have allowed White teachers to instruct their diverse classrooms more effectively. Nevertheless, as only the last two points on the continuum indicated behaviors that would benefit a super-diverse classroom, cultural competence remains complex and challenging to achieve. (See Figure 4.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culturally Incompetent</th>
<th>Culturally Competent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Destructiveness</td>
<td>Cultural Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Incapacity</td>
<td>Cultural Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Blindness</td>
<td>Cultural Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Pre-competence</td>
<td>Cultural Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Competence</td>
<td>Cultural Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Proficiency</td>
<td>Cultural Competence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4:**

*Cross’s Cultural Competence Continuum*

Cultural competency is generally characterized as a combination of knowledge about specific cultural groups and attitudes towards, and skills for dealing with, cultural diversity (Bettencourt, 2003). Cultural competence is a blend of mindset, understanding, and skills. The world is increasingly multicultural, and teachers regularly contact families, students, and
colleagues from different classes, religions, races, and language backgrounds (Kuma-Tan, 2007). Subsequently, "Cultural competence" has been proposed to support teachers in managing diversity issues with students, colleagues, or families.

Seeleman, Suurmound, and Stronks (2009) suggested that some of the critical mindsets of a culturally competent person are an understanding of how culture shapes behavior and decision-making. Experts asserted that one should be aware of the social settings in which specific cultural groups exist and differently understand the teacher's biases and tendency towards judgment (Copur-Gencturk et al., 2020; Milner & Ford, 2007). Researchers extended this understanding that one must have a culturally competent mindset to understand the worldviews that culturally different people may have (Pieterse et al., 2008). Cultural competence is as much about thoughts as it is about actions.

One approach to anti-bias/anti-racism is culturally responsive teaching. Culturally responsive teaching expects teachers to create a classroom where all children are welcome and given the best chances to learn without biases against their social and language foundations (Gay, 2000). This form of pedagogy proposes that through teachers, students become more culturally competent, have access to high levels of achievement, and develop a critical lens that allows them to challenge the status quo (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Cochran-Smith and colleagues (2009) explained, "We argue that teaching for social justice, or what we title here ‘good and just teaching,’ reflects a central and essential purpose of teaching in a democratic society, wherein the teacher is an advocate for students whose work supports greater efforts for social change" (p. 1). This work must be done by teachers and administrators alike. Muhammad Khalifa (2019) said, “Culturally responsive leaders must lead institutions in ways that affirm the learning,
cultural assets, relationships, and other educational needs of indigenous, Black, Brown, ELL, and any other marginalized students.”

**Review of Research on Professional Development**

The review of the research on teacher professional development constituted the main gaps in the literature for this study. The following section will outline how researching anti-bias/anti-racist professional development can be challenging and requires more empirical research. This section will also explain what characteristics effective professional development for educators should contain to be successful. These findings are significant because they guide the evaluation of the study’s Social Justice Summer Camp. The researcher poses that although there is a wealth of literature on conference attendance, there are contradictions and gaps in the literature regarding teacher conference attendance, and few conferences are as immersive as the one studied by this researcher.

**Policy**

Many states have legislation requiring anti-bias/anti-racist professional development. The Every Student Succeeds Act legislation, which also required professional development, explicitly stated that events such as one-day conferences and workshops do not qualify as professional development. The NCLB act codified a definition of professional development (Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, & Shapley, 2007). As of 2015, this reorganized definition became part of the reauthorization of the Secondary Schools act, defining professional development for local educational agency strategies. This definition required providing educators (including teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals,
and, as applicable, early childhood educators) with the knowledge and skills necessary to enable students to succeed in a well-rounded education and to meet the challenging State academic standards”. Section B of the law follows: "... are sustained (not stand-alone, 1-day, or short-term workshops), intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom-focused" (Every Student Succeeds Act, 2015, p. § 8002(42)).

Research has found that teachers in most states participate in professional development to ensure ongoing licensure or meet compliance with a state or federal mandate (Muniz, 2019), costing American schools over $25 billion annually (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). Kohli (2015) found that compliance-related state mandates for professional development can hinder teacher effectiveness in the classroom. Quoting LaGuardia et al. (2002), Kohli noted that professional development makes teachers passive objects of change: "The essence of this change is from that of active and creative participants in the change process to one of the passive recipients of externally designed and mandated training in how to improve test scores: from agents of change to objects of change” (p.7). Kohli further explained, "With teachers positioned as objects, rather than agents, their professional duties become about compliance rather than change” (p.7).

Kohli’s findings are in line with the current state of teachers’ perceptions of their own positionality in the professional development space: Over 80% of teachers have participated in at least one professional learning workshop in the past year. On average, teachers spend more than twenty hours in professional development workshops annually. Less than 30% of teachers reported being able to choose their professional development opportunities and 18% reported that they have never had a say. Lastly, only three out of every ten teachers demonstrated
significant improvement in their practice after attending a professional development workshop (Hargreaves, 2021).

Professional development comes in many forms. Joyce and Calhoun (2010) stated that no single professional development (PD) model best reaches all participants. Professional development may be a graduate course or a class offered by the district or school with a defined curriculum. Professional development with a defined curriculum may occur in a workshop setting with expected outcomes and activities or a more typical lecture course setting (Garet et al., 2001; Jones & Dexter, 2014). Professional development may include a school book club, article study, or a Professional Learning Community (PLC) (Kwakman, 2003; Livingstone, 2001). Jones and Dexter (2014) also described independent professional development as an independent initiative that possesses no requirement from the organization, such as a Twitter chat on a professional learning network (Alderton et al., 2011). Professional development includes teacher learning, content, or classroom skills designed to improve and strengthen practice (Birman et al., 2000; Buysse, Winton, & Rous, 2009).

Experts posed that professional development initiatives can lack the necessary support and resources to affect teachers and teaching practices (Parker & Post, 2015). Researchers recommended dozens of hours of external implementation support from administrators, consultants, or coaches (Fullan, 2001). This administrative and expert support is critical. Guskey (2014) found that a high-quality support system allows teachers to make meaning of the content, take ownership, and implement it within their classrooms.

If teachers are expected to improve their cultural competence and use these skills in their classrooms, they must access the necessary skills and knowledge. A comprehensive synthesis of research on professional development for teachers has shown that successful professional
development has several fundamental characteristics, such as content-specific material and collaborative grouping (Garet, Porter, Andrew, & Desimone, 2001; Guskey, 2000; Hawley & Valli, 1999; Kennedy, 1999; Stiles, Loucks-Horsely, & Hewson, 1996). Desimone (2009) found that teacher professional development should be interactive, social, and based on discourse and community practice. Darling-Hammond (2010) stated that professional development activities should engage teachers in concrete teaching tasks, assessment, observation, and reflection for effective professional development. Professional development should occur over time, have follow-up and support opportunities, continuously evaluate, and include models and demonstrations. Parker and Post (2015) have remarked that teacher professional development is most relevant when it focuses on teachers’ real work in real schools with real students.

Research has found that teachers often believe professional development to be more effective than researchers believe it to be. For example, The OECD (2014) reported that 90% of participants in their study indicated that the professional development they attended in the last twelve months had a positive impact. Barr asserted (2015), "Although many of the core features of effective professional development have been identified for civic education, math, science, and language arts, relatively few studies have provided rigorous evidence of the ultimate impact on students of professional development for teachers" (p.4). The American Institute for research (2016) completed a meta-analysis of professional development studies. It looked at more intensive professional development than typically found in compliance mandates, and each study looked at student achievement as an outcome. The findings were that teacher knowledge and practice improvements did not translate into student achievement gains.

Experts have found researching professional development to be complicated. Hill, Beiseigel, and Jacob (2013) reviewed the literature and found that professional development
theories may be misinformed because they are based on studies with poor empirical designs. Those researchers also found that most studies showed that although the professional developments had the needed characteristics, those professional learning opportunities did not realize students' achievement gains. Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, and Shapley (2007) engaged in one of the most extensive professional development evaluations published, including 1,300 professional development studies. Only nine of these 1,300 studies met empirical rigor, suggesting that professional development recommendations may be based on flawed research. Guskey and Yoon (2009) found contradictory recommendations for professional development in empirical articles.

In their look at many studies, Hill, Beisiegel, and Jacob (2013) found that in cases where student achievement was an outcome of effective professional development, poor empirical methods made it difficult to draw relationships between professional development and the improvement in student achievement. Yoon and colleagues (2007) found it challenging to prove that the length of professional development was related to effectiveness. He looked at nine studies and could not find causal or relationship links between student outcomes and immersion length in professional development. In contrast, Darling, Hyler, and Garner (2017) found “PD of at least 90 hours over two years with supports that included demonstration lessons, coaching, co-designing learning tasks, co-planning, curricular resources including lesson units for argument writing, and formative assessment tools to help teachers focus on student learning” was statistically significant compared to “business-as-usual” professional development and achieved student gains in three of the four tested areas.
Anti-Bias Professional Development

For the most part, attempts to bring cultural competency to classrooms with the goal of anti-racial bias have yielded slow and mixed results (Lensmire et al., 2013). Professional development modules focusing on unpacking teachers’ privilege can work against anti-racist and culturally competent pedagogical changes. Lensmire and his colleagues’ work (2013) called for a focus away from accepting and understanding White privilege and a move to dismantle White supremacy in K-12 education. This move toward anti-bias/anti-racism was motivated by a lack of a critical lens on professional development of teachers over the last several decades.

An anti-bias/anti-racist perspective challenges the dominant thinking that differences are deficits and that different groups should assimilate into dominant groups (Matthews, 2005). Berument (2019) contended that the deficit model sustains inequalities that keep minoritized groups at the margins. He stated, "In order to attain different results and truly contribute to the construction of a democratic society, all members of the society should get access to the same resources and have the same perception as human beings as they deserve" (p. 87). The deficit perspective denies the resources of the strengths-based perspective to some students in schools and, therefore, denial of resources. Strengths-based anti-bias educator views acknowledge that non-dominant groups do indeed have funds of knowledge and challenge deficit notions that the families do not value education or do not respect authority (Matthews, 2005)

Anti-bias/anti-racist professional development for White teachers may include educating teachers regarding Whiteness, examining White privilege, and understanding students who are non-White. Kemple, Harris, and Lee (2015) found that three activities helped develop an anti-bias/anti-racist mindset: exploring an individual's identity through reflection, participating in
small-group discussions, and discussing carefully selected readings. Gallavan (2005) stated she helped teachers work through their Whiteness, and the "exercise propels students into a lively dissection of social consciousness as they dismantle their perceptions of privilege, power, and dominance." Regarding the outcomes of the work, she stated, "Their notes of explanation reveal their thoughts and beliefs about themselves, others, and society. These findings agree with the research on successful professional development with the key characteristics of social interaction and discussions.

Professional development for anti-bias/anti-racism has the opportunity to close the achievement gap for non-White students. Castagno (2008, 2013) explained that the achievement gap is not caused by non-White students who are underperforming White peers. The achievement gap is described as an education debt caused by system-wide racism and Whiteness as the dominant forces in the curriculum. For many years, districts and service providers have delivered more professional development to combat school achievement gaps. Darling-Hammond called professional development "a coherent part of a school reform effort" (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009, p.2).

In professional development based on teachers uncovering their White privileges, teachers are often led to see their privileges, list them, give testimony to their existence, tell stories of their own experiences, or engage in other activities where they come to understand privileges non-White teachers do not have (Kivel, 2002; Gallavan, 2005). Lensmire’s research found that these activities do not lead to much change on the part of the teacher because the teacher views participation in professional development as the desired change (Lensmire, 2012). Brown (2006) explained that professional development must lead school leaders to act and noted that school administrators change only through critical reflection, rational discourse, and policy
Brown and colleagues recommended that leadership preparation programs implement ways for future leaders of social justice and equity leaders to grow in awareness, acknowledgment, and change.

Professional development for anti-bias/anti-racist teachers varies widely in implementation and practice. Authors and publishers such as Seed Project (Wellesley, 1987), Facing History (*Facing History and Ourselves*, 2022), and others offer professional development plans, activities, and programs (Grant & Agusto, 2008). These programs do not have benchmarks or rubrics for evaluations. Burns and Miller asserted that these professional development programs lack standards because definitions for anti-bias/anti-racist professional development are not clearly defined (2017). However, Murray and Brooks-Immel (2019) believed that all educators and professionals should have anti-bias/anti-racist professional development. They recommended that schools benefit by offering training to faculty, staff, students, and administrators at all levels.

Broad general standards for professional development do exist. Forty states have adopted professional development standards from the NSDC (National Staff Development Council) *Standards for Staff Development* (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009) to outline teachers' goals for effective professional development. However, wide variability can pose challenges to assessment once professional development in a school system is implemented. Standards for professional development for anti-bias/anti-racist or related categories are not agreed upon by experts (Cochran-Smith, 2009).

The AACTE (The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education) began training new teachers in social reform efforts in the 1970s. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) fused standards and measures for social equity in
its 1976 and 2000 Standards. Researchers continued to find differing standards and definitions for Cultural competence (Cochran-Smith, 2009). Some researchers recommended that teachers choose the set of anti-bias/anti-racist standards that fit them (Brown, 2004). An agreed-upon set of standards may assist teachers in becoming more anti-bias.

Conference Attendance

Many types of professional development are available for teachers to choose from or attend by requirement. Lichtenberg and Goodyear (2012) outlined three distinct techniques for learning: formal, informal, and independent (Jones & Dexter, 2014). Formal education means taking a graduate course or attending a formal Seminar program with prescriptive outcomes against which researchers can evaluate the value and degree of knowledge (Neimeyer, Taylor, and Cox, 2012). National, regional, or local conferences were typically placed in this category, as they have a vision and goals. Informal learning refers to reading articles or watching webinars where a teacher may not have a formal predetermined learning goal. Many teachers and administrators viewed attending conferences as professional development activities (Baur, 2007). What draws teachers to conferences is the opportunity to learn alongside like-minded colleagues, be reenergized in their chosen profession, and learn more about content they have the autonomy to choose to learn.

Of the formal and informal types of professional development mentioned, the regional conference was the single most popular professional development event among teachers in terms of being well-liked, highly attended, and comprised of activities teachers desire to participate in compared to other professional learning opportunities offered (Conway, 2008; Eros, 2013; Kraft, Blazar, and Hogan, 2018). In a large-scale report developed for the Economic Policy Institute,
Garcia and Weiss (2019) found that 9 out of 10 teachers have attended or plan to attend a conference or workshop.

Borg (2015) explained that K-12 teacher conferences are regional or national venues where teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, social workers, psychologists, and other school-based professionals converge to exchange ideas about novel teaching strategies, new ways to look at significant issues in education, perspectives on improving student achievement, or new technology and tools for the practice. Rowe (2017) offered that non-commercial academic conferences result in annual spending of $8.9 – 39.9 billion depending on the year, as some conferences do not meet annually; this further demonstrates their popularity. Darling-Hammond (2017) described professional teacher conferences as "catalysts for the continuous engagement of teachers, creating the intersection of professional learning communities within the school and across the profession" (p. 18).

The definition of the national or regional conference is somewhat broad, which can make the application of the professional development research surrounding conferences challenging. Experts may organize conferences across many days; conferences can be held in a scheduled venue or a school; they can be traditional in nature, or non-traditional in style—such as a boot camp, edcamp, or unconference. Conferences vary significantly in style, focus, and subject. Büyükyavuz's (2016) research found that although the average conference lasts two to three days for teachers, participants only attended four to six sessions. In his research, Rowe (2019) found one website that advertised almost eight hundred conferences, another website that listed two hundred, and another source that compiled over six hundred annual education conferences. In Rowe's study, most of these conferences were aimed at higher education, academia, or scientific research fields. Education conferences may range from small, local, content-specific events with
fewer than fifty attendees to mega-events with thousands of attendees, such as the National Science Teachers Association Conferences (NSTA), which boasts over 9,000 attendees annually (Reiff & Cline, 2016). Rowe (2019) reminded us that due to the general administration of conferences and the lack of reliable statistical reporting, researchers cannot name the average conference attendance size value. The literature often does not delineate K-12 conferences from other professional conferences on education, which is another significant gap.

Using data in future planning assists conferences in being more valuable to attendees. In the past, it has been challenging to evaluate conference attendance. Researchers have long accepted that professional learning occurs at conferences, despite the difficulty in measuring what teachers gain from conference attendance (Kolb, 1984). However, previous research did not analyze how conference sessions, keynotes, and round tables improved teacher practice. More recently, ongoing work has examined the effectiveness of conference attendance (Kordts-Freudinger, Al-Kabbani, & Schaper, 2017). This research is necessary because individuals cannot consume all the offerings at large-scale conferences and often only attend a few sessions.

Although there is less empirical research on K-12 conference attendance than broad categories of conferences, such as medical, scientific, or higher education, there are some promising findings on traditional teacher professional development in such conferences (Guskey & Yoon, 2009). The bulk of the empirical analysis focused on respondents' feelings regarding attendance, self-reports of their motivation for attending, and self-reports of outcomes some length of time after conference attendance (Borg, 2014; Büyükyavuz, 2016; Maloney, 2017; Vega & Connell, 2008; Rowe, 2017; Rowe, 2019; Long, 2011).

Dogan and Yurtseven (2018) conducted a comprehensive analysis and found traditional professional development, such as conferences and workshops, statistically non-significant as a
direct effect on instructional quality. Guskey and Yoon (2009) stated that teacher conferences "are not the poster child of ineffective practice that they are often made out to be" (p. 496). Smith and Gillespie (2007) found that conferences could provide professional learning on the chosen teacher topic in a shorter time and for less money, making them efficient forms of professional development.

These competing empirical findings regarding conference attendance require researchers to look deeper into the studies which link conference attendance to effective professional development. For example, what motivates teachers to attend conferences and workshops? Büyükyavuz (2016) found that the keynote speaker was the most crucial motive for attending a conference, with the location being the second most important motive. Carpenter (2015) found similar motives, with 19% of conference respondents choosing to attend their conference based on proximity. Carpenter's research revealed that of the respondents in their study, one in five attended the conference solely because of past attendance. Server's (2009) research of one specific conference found that 23.8% of respondents had participated in the conference five times in the past five years, and 16% had attended the conference two or three times within a five year span. The motivation to re-attend conferences speaks to the value the teacher assigns to the professional learning opportunity.

Having previously found value in attending a conference is not the only motivating factor for teachers. Carpenter (2015) found that teachers are motivated to attend conferences based on their learning needs. For example, he found that 13% of his respondents referred to the quality of the discussions found at edcamps (a non-conventional style of the conference) to motivate their attendance. Vega and Connell (2007) found in their study of 794 respondents that a significant reason education professionals attend conferences is "professional rejuvenation and networking"
(p. 503). Their research revealed that attendance was incredibly impactful if the teachers came from small, rural schools or were in the mid-life of their career; the teachers had a deep appreciation for the encouraging, enthusiastic environment. For reasons like these, teachers often report positive outcomes with conference attendance. One example is found in a study by Borg (2014), in which sixty-six participants completed surveys on their experiences following a conference; the survey responses demonstrated positive feelings on behalf of the teachers. Additionally, Long (2011) found that the changes in participants’ classrooms post-conference attendance impacted students' learning in all but seven (15.2%) classrooms.

The research bears out several benefits to educational professionals, including collaboration, engaging with significant thought leaders in the field, and engaging in the broader professional community. Tysick (2002) stated, "Collaboration opportunities come primarily through networking and attending specific events. Conferences are fertile ground for socializing, which builds friendships based on common interests." Teachers attended conferences to gain professional knowledge, exchange such knowledge, engage in peer-to-peer communication, and gain much-needed technology professional development (Natarajan, 2008; Riendeau, 2006; Abram, 2008; Pesko, 2006). Similarly, Ur (2012) asserted that through attending conferences, teachers can develop their knowledge of the latest research and contemporary issues in the field, learn new teaching strategies and classroom methods, familiarize themselves with professional developmental technology and systems for schools, and establish professional connections both locally and nationally. Cole (2012) stated, "If an individual is seeking to increase their knowledge about the presented topic or be stimulated by new educational ideas, then a conference could serve that purpose" (p.17).
Conference attendance allows teachers to unite with other educators with commonalities (mindset, topics of choice, content area) to network. Beginning teachers may feel isolated and search for a conference to build connections (Benson, 2008). Killion and Baker found that these collegial connections may stave off teacher turnover among beginning educators (Killian & Baker, 2004). Music teachers viewed networking with other music educators as a welcome retreat from their isolating contexts (Rudaitis, 1996; Sindberg, 2011; 2014). English language teachers reported something similar: Crandall (cited in Borg 2014) stated that the National Council of Teachers of English annual conference might have more potential to engage and refresh an English teacher than any other learning experience.

Although traditional wisdom stated that the further away from the schoolhouse a professional development is, the less likely it will be helpful for the participants (Garcia & Weiss, 2019), Cole's research (2012) found conference attendance to be as helpful as in-house professional development. Murray (2010) argued that teachers attending conferences would be more likely to attempt to use new techniques in the classroom through what they learned at the conference. Murray found that conference attendance encouraged educators to share their learning and expertise with colleagues and teammates. Maloney's research (2017) found that conferences provide access to groundbreaking ideas from around the globe, supplemented by expert critiques, which a teacher would not have access to in their local schoolhouse. Conference attendance can provide attendees with opportunities to upgrade their existing knowledge base and broaden their horizons, thereby increasing self-assurance. Researchers found that professionals who attend a conference become members of a community that shares mutual desires and passions (Rowe, 2018).
Despite these benefits, Garcia and Weiss (2019) reported that the conference is "by far the most common category of activity as well as the least effective and least highly regarded." Critics asserted that conferences can result in teachers knowing about a new practice at a shallow, superficial level but not having the opportunity to attain deep understanding from a conference to successfully enact change in their practice (DuFour et al., 2005). Several empirical studies have found that job-embedded professional development based at the school level is statistically more likely to be related to school and student achievement (Kraft, Blazar, and Hogan 2018; ESSA 2015; Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation 2014; Hirsh et al., 2016; Quint, 2012), leading researchers to conclude that conferences and workshops lack effectiveness. It is interesting to point out that teachers in wealthy high-achieving schools are far more likely to have the opportunity to attend a conference, while teachers serving students in high-poverty schools are more likely to participate in professional learning such as peer observation rather than a conference (Garcia & Weiss, 2019).

Summary

The student body in American schools has become more diverse (Lauridsen & Lauridsen, 2018), and high-quality professional development for anti-bias/anti-racist educators is necessary and mandated by schools in Illinois and other states for current teachers; however, the significant gaps in professional agreement implementation standards and empirical research demonstrate that more study is necessary. Though professional development has a foundation in multiple research efforts, data on teachers' perceptions of an immersive camp-style professional development experience designed to encourage anti-bias/anti-racism mindset change continues to be lacking. This research aims to provide educators with survey research data based on
teachers' perceptions of anti-bias/anti-racism professional development. The following chapters will discuss the theoretical frameworks necessary for a study examining a potential solution, the Social Justice Summer Camp, and the relationships between conference attendance and educators becoming anti-bias/anti-racists. The findings of the statistical analysis and the recommendations for future research are found in the final chapters.
CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Three main theories informed this study to focus on educator change. System Justification Theory is vital because it helps explain why educators see that schools need to change but may be reticent to change. Hall's Concerns-Based Adoption Model is essential because it informs the researchers' lens through which to view various data related to educator classroom anti-bias/anti-racist change. The Racial Identity Formation Theory is an integrated framework because it informs us how White teachers may come to mindset changes and see themselves as enactors of change in an oppressive environment.

System Justification Theory

Teachers who recognize oppression in their schools as a barrier to creating an anti-bias/anti-racist classroom may still justify the status quo and accept those barriers. System Justification Theory suggests that despite apparent and oppressive inequality, Americans continue to perceive American systems, such as the education system, as just (Jost et al., 1994; Jost et al., 2003). Jost posited that one reason for this perception is that the oppressed are not resisting the world; they are coping with it. Researchers of this theory presented evidence that one makes peace with the way things are, the status quo, as a coping mechanism.

According to this theory, people have historically defended and rationalized systems as fair and just rather than oppressive (Jost & Thompson, 2000). They may feel more comfortable justifying the status quo. The literature cited that system justification is palliative and makes people more comfortable (Reyna, 2008). System Justification Theory has been used to explain
how people behave in many political, social, cultural, and economic systems. This theory has explained how, historically, many tyrannical powers have been able to stay in the hierarchy despite oppressed masses having the ability to overthrow them. Their stakeholders viewed them in some ways as benevolent, which complicated the work of oppressed people to notice, name, and dismantle oppression. This theory states that one way people behave is to defend the goodness of the system, as demonstrated by several researchers (Brescoll et al., 2013; Cutright et al., 2011; Liviatan & Jost, 2014).

The theory explains the possible psychological motivations behind why people justify the status quo (Jost & Hunyady, 2005). First, justifying the status quo, even if it is oppressive, provides us with certainty and stability (Jost, 2019). Research showed that people are afforded a sense of safety and security by believing in the goodness of the system, even if this is counterfactual to their own experience (Jost et al., 2003; Kivel, 2017; Learner, 1980). There are also relational benefits to justifying the system; as Jost et al. (2003) stated, "It is almost a truism of social science that people hold attitudes and opinions that serve their interests and the interests of the groups to which they belong" (p.14). For example, in an unjust school system, teachers who justify it have relational benefits with colleagues, supervisors, students, and the families they serve who also justify the system. Our in-group preferences and desire to maintain our place in a group will also motivate people to justify the system (Jost, 1994).

Researchers posited that those who notice, name, and attempt to dismantle the status quo risk ostracism (Bergerson, 2003; Jost, 2020; White, 2011). They risk tolerating social punishment and may be cut off from friends, family, colleagues, and superiors (Jost, 2020). In addition to relational risks, those perceived to be rebellious may face financial and physical threats. Often people do not understand how activists cannot just accept the way things are.
System Justification Theory posits that those who do not accept the status quo may be viewed as deviants, out-group members, and non-team players (Jost, 2020).

The theory also states that when justifiers notice unjust oppression, they justify it with defenses, such as stereotypes. Lippman (2009) argued that individuals stereotype because it uplifts their status and excuses their conduct. However, the System Justification Theory reminds us that stereotypes are rarely individual, and instead, much like oppression itself, stereotypes are systemic (Jost, 2020). Stereotypes do the ideological work for maintaining and legitimizing the status quo. For example, to defend the idea that women often do not have as much equality in the workplace, women will use stereotypes that men are more assertive to justify these inequalities rather than to dismantle them. These stereotypes lead society to accept the status quo despite apparent oppression.

This lens is essential because it may explain how and why a considerable teaching force chooses not to dismantle apparent educational inequalities. Educators continue to justify the status quo as explained by system justification. There are relational advantages to viewing schools as fair and just places. Anti-bias/anti-racist professional development has become critical.

**Hall's Concerns-Based Adoption Model**

The research illustrates that change can be difficult for educators. System Justification Theory explains one of the social-psychology reasons why status quo change is so challenging for the individual educator. To bridge the gap created by competing forces, Hall’s Concerns Based Adoption Model can be used to explain why professional development may be the desired solution to managing complex change.
Kapustka and Damore (2009) explained that the Concerns-Based Adoption Model Theory is the model that was designed in the early 1970s and used through the mid-1980s by researchers at the University of Texas Research and the Development Center for Teacher Education. The Concerns Based Adoption Model is a critical lens because the theory relates directly to change preceded by professional development. It is a system-wide model that explains and brings about change through professional development. These researchers, who focused on implementing educational innovations, asserted that rather than what was being implemented, the process to change is the most important part of the change itself.

The framework contained three main parts: The Stages of Concern, the Innovation Configuration Map, and the Use Levels (Anderson, 1997). The Stages of Concern process involves surveying and interviewing educators to determine their attitudes and beliefs about a new program and its implementation. The seven stages of concern are: unconcerned, information, personal, management, consequence, collaboration, and refocusing. In the unconcerned stage, educators may have heard something about the impending policy implementation, but they are distracted by competing priorities. In the informational stage, educators are interested and may want to learn additional information. In the personal stage, concerns begin to set in and be voiced by educators. Educators begin to think about the required time, materials, and energy implementation in the management stage. The consequences stage consumes the educator with the ramifications this implementation will have for their students. Educators begin to share ideas and add their thoughts and implementation strategies in the collaboration stage. Finally, during refocusing, educators take ownership and improve upon the original implementation (Hall & Hord, 1987).
The Concerns-Based Adoption Model uses innovation configuration maps to help teachers implement changes with clarity. Rather than sending teachers back to their classrooms with no ideas but few plans for how to implement, innovation configuration maps are steps in an action plan that provide clear and specific descriptions of what implementation looks like in practice. In the map, a critical step may be broken into 3-4 sub-steps and may present a rubric illustrating where teachers fall on an implementation continuum (Kistler & Wilkerson, 2018), as shown in Figure 5.

**Figure 5:**

*Concerns-Based Adoption Model Map*

In the Concerns Based Adoption Model theory, administrators play a central role. The Concerns-Based Adoption Model assumes that educators will be inherently resistant to change.
Therefore, it encourages administrators to look beyond their current beliefs to find value in the change for those it will affect: the students and their teachers (Straub, 2009). Fullan (1999) asserted that administrators should have a broad picture of teachers' concerns before implementations. Brzycki and Dudt (2005), in their analysis of CBAM, asserted that administrative support is crucial for the success of the initial implementation stages of change.

Concerns-Based Adoption Model theorists contend it is of the utmost importance for administrators to manage the change by controlling the degree and nature of the implementation and being flexible in response to concerns and implementation (Anderson, 1997). This centering of administrators as early adopters and agents of managing chances makes their roles in the Concerns Based Adoption Model framework critical to successful change for the rest of the educators they serve.

The Concerns-Based Adoption Model considers how components of a change framework—including the changes and activities of the leaders—contribute to bringing about the desired change. It also considers the stages of concern for the adopters or educators being asked to make the change (Hall et al., 1974). These considerations mean the complex use levels differ from just use to nonuse. The Concerns-Based Adoption Model's eight use levels are nonuse/unaware, orientation, preparation, mechanical use, routine use, refinement, integration, and renewal (Hall & Hord, 2006). Roach, Kratochwill, and Frank asserted that administrators can strengthen the chance that teachers’ use levels will increase by providing professional development, coaching, co-teaching, or mentoring to support educators as they implement change.
Racial Identity Formation Theory

System Justification Theory uses a social psychology lens to explain why change is difficult for educators. Hall’s concerns-based adopters model explains how professional development can be the conduit to affecting that difficult change. Racial Identity Formation can help explain why—even with a great level of professional development in place—change can be a challenge. Understanding Racial Identity Development Theory as a fundamental dimension of adolescent development is necessary if educators desire to reach all students and increase the academic success of all youth with an accurate reflection of culturally competent classrooms and pedagogical practices. The work on Racial Identity Development is closely related to the work of cultural competence, as referenced in Chapter Two.

In the groundbreaking work *Talking about Race, Learning about Racism* (1992), Beverly Daniel Tatum cited Helms (1990). They defined racial identity development as a sense of group or collective identity based on one's perception that he or she shares a common racial heritage with a particular racial group; Racial Identity Development Theory concerns the psychological implications of racial-group membership, that is, belief systems that evolved in reaction to perceived differential racial-group membership (p. 3).

Although this definition is suitable for most scholarly work, it should be noted that other definitions expand or specify Helm's nearly universally accepted explanation. An earlier explanation from Gay (1985) states that the differing emerging theories of the time were critical because:
Each, in its way, accounts for an ideological metamorphosis of ethnic identity, assumes that the transformation is a liberating process that symbolizes a psychologically healthier state of being, and uses the idea of developmental stages to account for the movement of individuals from negativism to positivism in their Self Ethnic Identities. (p. 45)

Omi and Winant (2005) defined racial formation as "the socio-historical process by which racial categories are created, lived out, transformed, and destroyed." Sue et al. (1998) asserted that the Racial Identity Development Theory attempts to explain how ascribed or perceived belonging to a specific racial group impacts attitudes about the self and others within the same racial or different racial groups (Sue & Sue, 2013). In synthesizing these definitions, one can conclude that Racial Identity Development Theory explains how an individual develops a sense of who they are by focusing specifically on race.

Racial identity development is an outcome over time (Yip, Seaton, and Sellers, 2006). This development is based on one's perception that they share a joint racial group similar to their own (Tatum, 1992). The racial socialization of youth contributes to identity development and requires the young self to position oneself within a racial group (Stevenson & Arrington, 2009). Early works from social identity theory sought to explain youth social development: "collective identity recognizes that individuals reflect group norms through individual actions" (Wendt, 1994). Identity confusion occurs when one fails to form a sense of identity (Cote & Levine, 1987). Identity statuses may be diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, or achieved (Kroger, Martinussen, and Garcis, 2010). Maturing, increasing age, and life experiences lead to the achievement of identity (Eccles, 2007). Racial identity development models added a complex racial layer to these developmental identity ideas. Historically, these basic identity development understandings have informed Racial Identity Development Theory.
There are several significant sub-theories of racial identity development. Ponterotto and Park-Taylor (2007) asserted that over twenty racial identity development models exist. For this work, the researcher will focus on White racial identity formation (Helms, 1993). All major racial identity development models share some common attributes because most identity development models have ultimately emerged from Social Identity Theory and social psychology (Stets & Burke, 2000). These models are based on the research of Erikson (1968), Marcia (1967), and Cross (Chavez & Guido-DiBrito, 1999). This joint development path gives the models their commonalities and differences regardless of the ethnic or cultural group to which one belongs (Chong, 2015). Youth and adults in racial identity development stages experience common factors (Helms, 1995).

The basic patterns of racial identity development note that during adolescence, there is an increase in identity exploration, including racial exploration (Quintana, 2007; Umana-Taylor et al., 2014). A standard psychological process found during racial identity development, regardless of race, is the notion that exposure to or witnessing discrimination stimulates racial identity development in the person (Quintana, 2007; French, 2006). Most racial identity development trajectories include the development of positive in-group affiliation, which usually increases over time (French, 2006). Most persons going through racial identity development develop positive in-group identities and esteems with their racial group (Quintana, 2007; Seidman, 1996; French, 2006; French, 2000).

**White Racial Identity Development**

The research and theory on White racial identity formation can be divided into two groups: those that subscribe to a static model (racial self-designation, preference, or
identification) (Choney & Rowe, 1994), and those that prescribe a stage-wise progression (Sabnani, Ponterotto, and Borodovsky, 1991). Hardiman's (1982) White Identity Development Model, as cited by Sabnani and colleagues (1991), consisted of five stages. (See Figure 6.)

**Figure 6:**

*Stages of White Racial Identity Development*

In the first stage, Pre-contact, social awareness is lacking. Specifically, White children lack an understanding of social roles and norms. This stage marks the beginning of awareness of racial differences (Tatum, 1992). If the child experiences acceptance during this stage, the child
creates an unconscious identification with Whiteness and often accepts stereotypes of other races.

In stage two, Disintegration, the White child or person begins to reflect on race assumptions (Kerwin et al., 1993). They begin to feel dissonant feelings regarding being White and its dominance, leading to guilt or anger. In the third stage, Resistance, there is a rejection of racist beliefs, a rejection of White guilt, and a rejection of their former acceptance of White identity. Youth and adults develop concern and empathy with minority groups during this stage. In the final stage, Redefinition, they develop an anti-racist White identity (Lawrence & Tatum, 1997). One may begin to define Whiteness in a way that is not dependent on dominance, be ready to recognize the uniqueness of their like and racially unlike peers, and develop pride in their group membership.

This model was somewhat different from Helms' 1990 White Racial Identity Development model. In Helms’ model, during stage one, Contact, the child is unaware of their being a racial being (Chavez & Guido-Dibrito, 1999). Helm's model was slightly different in that this stage is not the beginning of racial awareness; racial awareness happens in the second stage, during which time the child is forced to confront, acknowledge, or accept that they are White (Tokar & Swanson, 1991). This stage begins with introduction to others who are not White; their understanding of their Whiteness is superficial or nonexistent (Helms, 1990). People in the Contact stage may enjoy racism because they have not had to confront any ideation. Their encounters with Black Americans may be used to learn about stereotypical Black Americans (Arnold, Carreiro-King, and Helms, 1997). Stage two is also characterized by expansion of knowledge regarding race, brought on by encounters with members of other racial and ethnic
groups (Tatum, 1992). Over time, Whites in this stage learn to observe their own identity in terms of characteristics other than race.

The Disintegration stage is when the person undergoes conscious acknowledgment of their Whiteness, even if conflicted (Helms, 1990). For children, this is when many White children are hushed, shamed, and forbidden from discussing White differences (Thandeka, 2013). For example, a White child who encounters a Black child for the first time may ask questions and find themselves hushed. White adults and caregivers may socialize with the child and encourage the child not to talk about race or ask questions about race (Pahlke, Bigler, and Suizzo, 2012). In this stage, the child or adult may be caught between White and minority culture, oppression, and humanity (Arnold, Carreiro-King, and Helms, 1997).

When White people are confronted by their Whiteness and forced to examine their White values, they enter into the Reintegration stage of White racial identity development (Helms, 1990), which is characterized by conflict between wanting to conform to group (White) norms and values and at the same time wanting to be viewed and to view themselves as much more humanistic, holding no racist values and norms. This conflict often results in feelings and attitudes of guilt and anger, occasionally resulting in a denial of the understanding that people are different (Arnold, Carreiro-King, and Helms, 1997). During reintegration, one may retreat into the White culture, develop anti-Black, pro-White, and anti-minority stances, and experience fear and anger toward minorities.

Instead of seeing that racial problems exist in society, the individual in the reintegration stage may believe that racial problems exist outside themselves and outside of Whiteness. They may accept White and minority racial inferiority (Arnold, Carreiro-King, and Helms, 1997). White people also may stay in this stage and not progress into future stages across their lives,
which is relatively easy if their social group is relatively homogenous. Arnold, Carreiro-King, and Helms (1997) asserted that our society makes staying in this stage more convenient, and a "personally jarring" racial event would be needed to remove one from this stage. Similar to the conflict stage, White people begin feeling angry and guilty. The White person may begin an immature preoccupation with minority culture and develop paternalistic attitudes toward minority issues (Chavez & Guido-Dibrito, 1999). Once the person begins to question their previous definitions of Whiteness, they have begun the move into the later stages of White racial identity development (Arnold, Carreiro-King, and Helms, 1997). It is at this stage that a person may have broken through the competing priorities of System Justification Theory and grown enough in their own racial identity development to begin the work of noticing, naming, and dismantling oppressive systems in their classrooms.

When Whites progress past this stage into Pseudo-Independence, they become increasingly aware of the racism inherent in the world around them and the role they may play in system-wide racism in their worldview as White people. Helms (1990) asserted that if one can move past the Disintegration phase, one can move into the Pseudo-Independent stage of intellectual acceptance and curiosity regarding minorities and develop a bicultural or transcendent worldview (Lawrence & Tatum, 1997; Arnold, Carreiro-King, and Helms, 1997), similar to the final stage in Hardiman's work.

In moving to this stage, dissonance occurs as obliviousness breaks down, and Whites become aware of inconsistencies (Helms, 1995 & 2008). Whites may become conflicted over irresolvable racial and moral dilemmas frequently perceived as opposites, for example: believing they are non-racist, yet not wanting their son or daughter to marry a minority group member.

People experiencing racial dissonance believe that all men are created equal, yet physically
witness society treating people of color as second-class citizens. Their friends and family may not acknowledge oppression, yet White people in the dissonance stage see it. In this stage, they seek to quell their tumultuous feelings (Arnold, Carreiro-King, and Helms, 1997).

Dissonance can cause people to become increasingly conscious of Whiteness, and they may experience more guilt, depression, helplessness, or anxiety, similar to the other White racial identity development models. They may feel ashamed, angry, and depressed. Rationalizations may help them exonerate themselves: "I am only one person; what can I do?" or "Everyone is racist, even Blacks." Often dissonance causes Whites to retreat into the protective confines of White culture or, more progressively, towards insight and revelation. At the dissonant stage, one may not progress any further in their White racial identity development. The stagnation of progress through these stages can occur at anytime in one’s racial identity development (Arnold, Carreiro-King, and Helms, 1997).

The act of redefining one's White self leads to the next stage: Immersion/Emersion. In this stage, one seeks to answer complex racial questions regarding their identity. One seeks to determine what being White means. In this stage, one seeks to create a White identity shaped by allies and role models for viewing the White identity in favorable terms (Helms, 1993).

The last stage is Autonomy, in which the White subject internalizes a positive White racial identity and takes on a commitment to living as an anti-racist ally. In the final stage, Whites accept that the dominant culture will not accept them as White allies (Helms, 1993). They begin to enact coping mechanisms in specific companies and contexts (such as work and school) similar to those enacted by minorities in other identity development models. This stage can also offer much peace to Whites who have experienced guilt and shame. In this final stage, one continues to self-reflect and examine one's White behavior in multiracial contexts.
The Importance of Understanding Racial Identity Development

It is essential to study Racial Identity Development Theory to become more aware of the effects of systemic and individual forms of racism within identity development and to position a researcher to better understand the subjects and findings in their research. This knowledge helps one to evaluate more fully how immature racist and unknowing racist behaviors and attitudes influence daily behaviors, such as bias (Helms, 1990). By more deeply understanding the researcher's relationship with racism, the participants and subjects related to racism, the minority students served in schools, the identity development of those students, and the students’ often-fraught relationship with racism, one begins to see how cultural competency is an incredibly urgent practice.

As a theoretical framework, racial identity development creates a lens through which the researcher may position themselves along a continuum of their own identity development and that of their subjects. When we think of the delimitations of one's biases in dissertation-style research, one is bolstered by the ability to enact this lens. For effective professional development for cultural competency, one must move towards an anti-bias/anti-racist White racial identity. Without the development lens, the researcher is floundering to see how that movement takes place. In this way, racial identity development theory is a critical study theory.

Summary

This work was informed by three major theoretical frameworks: System Justification Theory, Hall’s Concerns Based Adoption Model, and Racial Identity Development Theory. All frameworks were researched in order to develop an awareness of why—if all research points to better serving diverse students—greater change has yet to happen in American schools. These
frameworks position the researcher to understand more clearly the data analysis and findings reported in the coming chapters. The following chapters will discuss the Social Justice Summer Camp as a setting for quantitative survey research of participants' perceptions, the findings for statistical relationships between conference attendance and educator anti-bias/anti-racist classroom practice changes, and recommendations for teachers, administrators, and future research.
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study aimed to examine educator participants' perceptions of the Social Justice Summer Camp relative to anti-bias/anti-racist changes in their mindsets and classroom practices. After attending an immersive four-day interactive professional development conference to build teachers' skills in serving their diverse students, their perceptions and intentions to change were explored. The study's goal was to determine if a relationship exists between demographic characteristics or perceptions of participants in the Social Justice Summer Camp and their change in anti-bias/anti-racist classroom practices. Anti-bias classroom practices are those practices that actively challenge bias, stereotypes, and all forms of oppression (Lin, Lake, & Rice, 2008). Anti-Racist classroom practices reflect the idea that all racial groups are equal. Anti-racist individuals support policies that undo racial inequities (Kendi, 2019).

Research Questions

Data were collected electronically through web-based survey methods to address the following questions:

1. Was the alignment of the Social Justice Summer Camp to your district priorities related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?
2. Was the support you received to attend the camp related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

3. Was the participant willingness to apply what they learned related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

4. Was the participant’s perception of the usefulness of the camp related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

5. Was the support you received from your school leadership to apply what you learned at the camp related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

6. Was the gender of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

7. Was the race of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

8. Was the school employment status of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

9. Was the education level of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?
For this study, the researcher used survey research employing non-experimental research in which the independent variable was not manipulated. The researcher examined participants' perceptions and actions after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp. The researcher did so without the direct intervention of the conditions the subjects experienced. As such, cause-and-effect relationships are limited and were not explored.

As illustrated in Chapter Two of this research, evaluating professional development can be quite complex. As such, the foundational research for this study was grounded on levels two and four of Guskey’s Five Levels of Professional Development Evaluation (see Appendix E), which include participants’ learning and use of skills learned at an anti-bias/anti-racist professional development.

A survey research design was an effective and efficient data collection method to survey current participants and participants of the previous four Social Justice Summer Camps. The survey allowed the researcher to identify generalizations about conference participants. Online surveys increased the likelihood of anonymity and honest responses from participants (Ritter & Sue, 2007).

The survey instrument included demographic information, assessed teachers' attitudes toward the conference, and asked them to indicate if they would change their classroom practices after attending the conference. This survey research used two qualities of research best practices: participant confidentiality, and standardized collection and analysis procedures, to ensure accurate reporting (Scheuren, 2004). The researcher targeted pre-K teachers through college educators, including teachers and administrators who attended at least one complete Social Justice Summer Camp. The researcher was on site with Q.R. codes and links for 2022 attendees
to complete the survey and the end of the Social Justice Summer Camp. The researcher electronically sent the survey to all attendees of the 2017-2021 Social Justice Summer Camps for educators.

Researchers choose to use survey research with quantitative methods for several reasons. The general purpose of quantitative research is to investigate the topic by measuring variables in quantifiable terms. Best practices employed in this study include gathering data using a structured research instrument, using representative sample sizes, ensuring replicability of the study, composing clearly defined research questions, and using computer-assisted analysis. Survey research methods were the most accurate option for studying data gathered and observed at the Social Justice Summer Camp.

Survey Data Analysis using SPSS was chosen to test these variables. It was helpful in this research design because it provides both a significance statistic (p-value) and statistics pinpointing which categories account for the differences found in the data. The researcher employed Fisher’s exact test. All variables were tested for the assumption of homoscedasticity; however, all except the continuous variable “age” failed the criteria. Thus, Fisher’s exact test was chosen, as it does not require this assumption. Parametric analyses, such as regression analyses, were not conducted because variables were coded as categorical, non-continuous variables. (See Figure 7.)
Figure 7:

Frequency of Respondents’ Age

The analysis from Fisher’s exact test sought to determine if there are relationships between educators’ perceptions of the Social Justice Summer Camp and educator change in anti-bias/anti-racist classroom practices. The analyses also sought to determine if there were relationships between the demographics of the Social Justice Summer Camp attendees and educator changes in anti-bias/anti-racist classroom practices. The data was obtained from a survey solicited from 229 attendees of the Social Justice Summer Camp between 2017-2022. The survey data were collected using Qualtrics and analyzed in SPSS.

Setting

This study was conducted at the well-established annual immersive Social Justice Summer Camp conference at a mid-size state university in northwestern Illinois. This conference
and professional development were chosen as the setting by the researcher because the conference planners employ many of the characteristics of high-quality professional development known to encourage educator change, as illustrated in Chapter Two. Taking place for the fifth year annually (interrupted only by the 2020 and 2021 years), the conference was organized by university faculty to build the skills of educators when working with diverse populations. The organizers’ intended outcomes are providing social justice professional development and closing opportunity gaps for the diverse learners served by attendees. The conference is a four-day, three-night, “candid and non-judgmental exploration of multiculturalism, privilege, identity, oppression and more” (McGowan, 2019, p. 4).

The main goal of conference organizers is to help participants recognize, examine, question, and replace their implicit bias (McGowan, 2019). One district administrator participant from 2019 commented, “Unless we become uncomfortable, we’re never going to change. We’re never going to grow, and that is what we have been doing with our social justice activities.” Keynote speakers in current and past conferences have included Fulbright Scholars, teacher education department chairs from prominent universities, criminal justice professors, and recent experts in the field. A sampling of breakout sessions might cover diversity in children’s and young adult literature, immigrant students, students experiencing trauma, and social justice in the content areas. Past conference panel discussions include LGBTQIA+ issues, minority myths, students with disabilities, and intellectual threats. The organization of the conference, including evening films complete with discussions, requires participants to learn and explore alongside colleagues they may not know. However, conference organizers have been careful to create a safe space that allows participants to reflect more deeply and be more honest with themselves. The conference encourages attendees to grow their racial identity development.
The conference content and intent is more global than just to discuss the topics of race and ethnicity. One goal is to help teachers put anti-bias/anti-racist practices in their classrooms in order to create an inclusive, welcoming environment for all students. Attendees are encouraged to understand how to effectively interact with and be responsive to diverse students across identities; recognizing individuals’ intersectionality is crucial in recognizing how any given student can be both privileged and marginalized—a reality that can be complex. As such, participants are encouraged during sessions to replace judgment with curiosity (McGowan, 2019). They become immersed in this curiosity by experiencing challenges to their thinking, exploring their misconceptions, or identifying their privilege. One principal commented,

“It gives us practical ways to implement social justice in our schools. (Teachers) have a direct impact on our students’ learning, and it’s important that they have that cultural competency so that our students feel they are a part of a greater community and are being set up for success wherever they go in life.” (McGowan, 2019, p.1)

Conference organizer James Cohen stated, “Schools bear an “ethical and moral” obligation to teach children and adults to behave humanely. We are living in an era where people feel emboldened to express themselves in ways that are hurtful and are harmful to people who do not necessarily look, think, act, believe, or speak as they do” (McGowen, 2019). His words demonstrate how this conference has the potential to address the problem statement referenced in Chapter One.

Due to the shutdown caused by the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020 and 2021, the organizers hosted a podcast series in 2020 and a virtual film series in 2021 for previous participants. These participants were not included in the study, as their participation was in a context so different from that of the immersive conference attendees; they created a different sample. The ability to compare the two groups was limited in this study, as no research questions addressed the participation of online, virtual attendees.
Survey Instrument

This study used a survey design to collect data from a convenience sample of educator participants at the Social Justice Summer Camp. In alignment with best practices for survey research, this study used a single survey to provide information for one point in time (Mertens, 2010). As the urgent need for anti-bias/anti-racist professional development has already been established, a survey research design for this research is appropriate to investigate relationships between conference attendance and educator change in practice.

Attendees at the 2022 Social Justice Summer Camp were able to participate in the survey at the end of the conference through either an anonymous QR code or an anonymous link (see Appendix D.) The researcher also solicited past attendees through email. Participants were granted anonymity to the greatest extent possible, and an option to opt out of the survey was provided. The survey included an introduction regarding the researcher; the reason for the survey; an explanation of how the data would be collected, distributed, and stored; an explanation of how the results would benefit research; a description of how security and anonymity would be preserved; and a discussion of any risks to completing the survey. Informed consent was also collected during this introduction.

The survey consisted of 21 close-ended, multiple-choice items. The advantages of such items are that they can be quickly described during quantitative data analysis, with greater reliability (Mertens, 2010). Participants can more easily and more quickly respond to multiple-choice items. However, multiple-choice items limit the respondent's answers and do not allow for qualitative data collection. This design was chosen to generalize survey respondents’ perceptions so that conclusions could quickly be drawn based on circumstantial evidence rather than direct observation of education change in classroom practices.
The survey entitled "Educators’ Perception of a Social Justice Summer Camp" consisted of items selected from “Sample Items for Surveying Participants' Views of Professional Development” (see Appendix B.) This study adapted and expanded items #2-8 from the Learning Forward Guide and took less than 10 minutes to complete. The survey consisted of four sections that gathered information about educators in the following areas: (a) feelings and beliefs towards the camp, (b) changes to mindsets or practices that occurred after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp, (c) demographic characteristics, including age, gender, employment status, race-ethnicity, education, and marital status, and (d) personal likes and dislikes of the conference.

The first section of the survey asked educator participants to choose from multiple-choice response options regarding:

1. The primary purpose of the conference.
2. The usefulness of the conference for making anti-bias/anti-racist practice changes.
3. The extent to which the conference met professional learning needs.
4. The extent to which the outcomes of the camp aligned with their school or district’s priorities for school improvement.
5. The support that they received from their principal (or other school leader or school-based professional development staff) to participate in the Social Justice Summer Camp.
6. The support that they received from their principal (or other school leader or school-based professional development staff) to apply what they learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp in their classroom.
7. How the Social Justice Summer Camp compares with other professional development in which they have participated during the past six months.
The second section of the survey asked questions regarding mindset and practice changes they have made or plan to make after attending the conference. It addressed the following topics:

1. How likely is it that they will apply what they learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp in their classroom.
2. If they have applied or intend to later apply what they learned at the Social Justice Summer Camp.
3. If their attitude toward anti-bias/anti-racist classrooms changed after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp.

The third section of the survey collected demographic data to describe the research sample. This demographic data was collected from respondents' schools, based on employment (teacher, administrator, paraprofessional, university instructor), education level (associates through post-graduate degree), age, marital status (single, married, domestic partnership, divorced, widowed), racial group (White, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native American or American Indian, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, some other race, ethnicity, or origin), and gender (male, female, non-binary, intersex, transgender, genderqueer, gender non-conforming, prefer not to say). All demographic items included the option "I choose to self-report" with an open-ended answer.

Data Analysis

The predictor variables were gender, race/ethnicity, school-based employment, level of education, marital status, usefulness of the professional development, alignment of the conference to their school improvement plans, and school-based leadership support for
participating in the Social Justice Summer Camp. The outcome variables were perceptions of the conference participants and changes in mindset and classroom practices.

There were 229 current and past participants in the 2017-2022 annual Social Justice Summer Camp invited to respond to the survey. Several past participants (39) were no longer reachable through their available contact information and could therefore not complete a survey. Of the remaining 190 participants in the sample, 74 began a survey. Of those begun, 57 of the 74 responses contained enough data to be used in the analysis. From the sample of 57, 50 participants were female, 28 were of White racial identity, 34 were married, and 27 were employed as teachers.

Variables were coded for descriptive and data analysis (see Appendix G). Although the demographic characteristic of age was a continuous variable because survey respondents reported their actual age in years, the remaining demographic variables (marital status, education level, school-based employment, gender, race/ethnicity) were coded as categorical. The researcher coded the outcome categorical variable items yes/no, as illustrated in Appendix H.

Limitations and Delimitations

It is difficult to calculate the impact the global Covid-19 pandemic can have on research and conference attendance. The survey and conference participants may have been more vital if not conducted during a pandemic and endemic times. During the initial solicitation, especially to past attendees, many emails to educator attendees "bounced back" without explanation, possibly indicating that they were working from home, no longer employed by the district, or had changed their district email address.
Sampling

This survey asked for limited qualitative information. Therefore, relatively less information explains why participants choose various perceptions and indications on the survey. The survey of attendees was not conducted using random sampling; instead, the researcher used convenience sampling. Therefore, the generalization of findings from the study is not recommended. The outcomes of this research help spark further discussion and lead to further research.

Participants

The participation of educators attending the Social Justice Summer Camp is a limitation. 24.8% of those who were allowed to complete the survey did so. There were 71 responses to the surveys, but only 57 of those responses contained enough data to be included in the final data analysis. Of the final 57 responses, these educators reflect attendees from the 2017-2022 annual conference years. They attended sessions with keynote speakers, participated in discussions, and asked different questions. Because these groups of educators are non-equivalent, the researcher did not conclude any causal relationships. The survey was conducted in the summer, as the conference is an annual summer offering when educators are more available to have the time to participate. Summer survey participation among educators on summer break is likely lower than during the school year.

Ethical Considerations

The researcher made every effort to conduct this research with ethics as the principal value. These ethics were considered by valuing anonymity, integrity, and professionalism. While
conducting the study, the researcher refrained from influencing the results to obtain a particular outcome despite participating in the conference. However, during the conference, the researcher did not mention the study until after the closing remarks were complete. Attendees were not given access to the survey until after the conference's conclusion, or via email a year or more later in the case of attendees from past conferences.

The research did advise participants that outcomes would be used by the camp organizers to obtain funding for future Social Justice Summer Camp opportunities through publications and grant opportunities. As indicated in the consent statement (see Appendix D), every effort was made to ensure that participants gave informed consent and were treated with dignity and respect. For example, participants' names and identifying information were not collected. IP addresses and emails were not collected. Complete surveys, which could be used to narrow down survey respondents via characteristics such as age, race, and employment status, were maintained in anonymous files accessible only by the researcher.

**Summary**

This study employed a survey research design to address the purposes and research questions of the researcher. In this chapter, the researcher explains the research design, research setting, survey design, sampling method, and data collection strategies. The study context, including the Social Justice Summer Camp, was described in detail to clarify the educators and environment used in the research. The survey design section explained the process of creating and distributing the survey. The data analysis section provided precise details from the descriptive analysis, chi-survey data analysis, and the coding of the categorical variables. In the following chapters, the outcomes of the research questions and null hypotheses will be explained.
as the study's findings, along with recommendations for future studies and conference organizers.
CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS

This study explored participants' perceptions of the annual Social Justice Summer Camp conference from 2017-2022 at Northern Illinois University, a midsized state university in the Midwest. The researcher sought to identify relationships between educator perceptions and their indications of change to anti-bias/anti-racist classroom practices. The study also sought to identify a relationship between collected educator participant demographics and their willingness to change to anti-bias/anti-racist classroom practices. This chapter provides descriptive and statistical findings from a completed study.

The following research questions guided this study to address the research purpose:

1. Was the alignment of the Social Justice Summer Camp to district priorities related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

2. Was the support participants received to attend the camp related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

3. Was participant willingness to apply what they learned related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?
4. Was participants’ perception of the usefulness of the camp related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

5. Was the support participants received from school leadership to apply what was learned at the camp related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

6. Was the gender of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

7. Was the race of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

8. Was the school employment status of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

9. Did attendees’ education level relate to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?

From 57 participants who had attended at least one annual Social Justice Summer Camp, data was collected through a one-time brief online survey. The survey took fewer than ten minutes for participants to complete. The survey remained open for six weeks for participants to complete. Data was analyzed in SPSS for descriptive statistics survey data analysis to determine if variables were related.

Assumptions

In survey data analysis using Fisher’s Exact Test, assumptions must be taken into account. Fisher’s exact test for this analysis employed two-by-two columns and rows. It is
assumed that the row and column totals are fixed and not random. For this survey data analysis, the assumption held true. Each subject may only fit into one cell of the analysis table and may contribute data to only one cell. This assumption was met for this survey data analysis. Fisher’s exact test also assumes that allocation in the cells is mutually independent within the constraints of fixed marginal totals. For example, a subject is not in one cell because a separate subject’s data appears in a different cell.

**Demographics**

Appendix G presents a descriptive analysis of demographic study variables, including age, marital status, school employment, race/ethnicity, gender, and education level. Data indicated that the average study participant was 43.25 years ($SD=9.53$, range $=25.0 - 70.0$ years). The sample was over three-quarters female ($n=50; 87.7\%$). Approximately half of the study participants were of a White racial/ethnic identity ($n=28; 49.1\%$), had the highest education level of a Master's degree ($n=31; 54.4\%$), had a marital status of married/domestic partnership ($n=34, 59.6\%$), and had school employment of teacher ($n=27, 47.4\%$). (See Figure 8).

**Descriptive Analysis**

The tables in this section present a descriptive analysis of several of the study’s questions. Data indicated that of the most common responses to item Q8: “Which of the following statements best describes the primary purpose of the Social Justice Summer Camp?” 68.4\% of the responses indicated, "To help me understand anti-bias/antiracist education" ($n=39$), and 61.4\% of the responses indicated "To help me apply/implement social justice in my classroom" ($n=35$) as the camp’s primary purpose.
Figure 8:

*School-Related Employment of Respondents*
**Table 1:**

*Q8. Which of the following statements best describes the primary purpose of the Social Justice Summer Camp?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To communicate new ideas for me to consider using in my classroom</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide an opportunity for me to learn from other teachers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help me understand anti-bias/anti-racist education</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help me apply/Implement social justice in my classroom</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common response to item Q9: “The extent to which the social justice boot camp met your anti-bias/antiracist professional learning needs” was, "It addressed most of my anti-bias/antiracist professional learning needs," with 50.9% of responses (n=29). These findings demonstrate that educators perceive that the Social Justice Summer Camp met their learning needs, as illustrated in Appendix G.

The most common response to item Q10: “To what extent was the Social Justice Summer Camp aligned with your school or district priorities for school improvement?” was, "The professional development was closely aligned with priorities for instructional improvement," with 59.6% of responses (n=34). The findings demonstrate that educators believe the Social Justice Summer Camp aligned with school improvement efforts, as illustrated in Table 2.
Table 2:

Q10. To what extent was the Social Justice Summer Camp aligned with your school or district priorities for school improvement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The professional development was very closely aligned with priorities for instructional improvement.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professional development was somewhat aligned with goals for instructional improvement.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professional development was not aligned with priorities for instructional improvement.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professional development was inconsistent with priorities for instructional improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data indicated the most common responses to the item Q11: “Which of the following statements best describes the support that you received from your principal (or other school leader or school-based professional development staff) to participate in the Social Justice Summer Camp?” were, "I did not discuss the professional development with the principal," with 42.1% of responses (n=24). The findings demonstrate that educators perceived that their school leadership supported their Social Justice Summer Camp attendance (see Appendix G).

The most common response to item Q12: “Which of the following statements best describes the Social Justice Summer Camp compared to another professional development I participated in
during the last 12 months?” was, "This professional development was more useful than other professional development that I have participated in,” with 77.2% of the responses (n=44). The findings demonstrate that educators did believe the Social Justice Summer Camp was more useful than other professional developments they attended in the last six months (see Appendix G).

The most common response to item Q13: “Which of the following statements best describes the likelihood that you will apply what you learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp in your classroom?” was, "I have already applied what I learned in my classroom," with 31.6% of the responses (n=18). The findings demonstrate that educators do believe they will apply what they learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp, as illustrated in Table 3.

The most common response to item Q14: “The following statement best describes the likelihood that you will change your classroom management practices based on what you learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp” was, “I have already made classroom management changes based on what I learned,” with 36.8% of the responses (n=21). The findings demonstrate that educators do make changes to their classroom management practices after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp, as shown in Table 4.

The most common response to item Q15: “Which of the following statements best describes the usefulness of the Social Justice Summer Camp for making anti-bias/antiracist practice changes?” was, "It was a good start, and I look forward to using the new ideas in my classroom," with 47.4% of responses (n=27) (see Table 5). This survey question does not align with a specific research question but sheds light on attendees' perceptions.
Q13. Which of the following statements best describes the likelihood that you will apply what you learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp in your classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have already applied what I learned in my classroom.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have already applied what I learned in my classroom, and it seemed to work well.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have already applied what I learned in my classroom, but it was not appropriate for my students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to applying what I learned in my classroom in the next few weeks.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to applying what I learned in my classroom sometime later this year.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to apply what I learned, but I don’t have the materials that I need</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think that these things will work with my students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4:

Q14. Which of the following statements best describes the likelihood that you will make changes in your classroom management practices based on what you learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have already made classroom management changes based on what I learned.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have already made classroom management changes in my classroom based on what I learned, and it seemed to work well.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have already made classroom management changes based on what I learned, but it was not appropriate for my students.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to making classroom management changes based on what I learned in the next few weeks.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to making classroom management changes based on what I learned sometime later this year.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to make classroom management changes based on what I learned, but I don’t have the materials that I need.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think that these classroom management changes will work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5:
Q15. Which of the following statements best describes the usefulness of the Social Justice Summer Camp for making anti-bias/anti-racist practice changes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was a good start, but I have a lot of questions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was a good start, and I look forward to using the new ideas in my classroom</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It provided everything I need to use the new ideas in my classroom</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think that these ideas will work very well in my classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was a good start</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common response to item Q16: “Which of the following statement best describes the likelihood that you will make changes in your pedagogical practices based on what you learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp?” was, "I have already made pedagogical changes based on what I learned," with 29.8% of the responses ($n=17$), and "I have already made pedagogical changes based on what I learned in my classroom, and it seemed to work well," with
24.6% of the responses \((n=14)\). The findings demonstrate that educators change their classroom pedagogical practices after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp, as shown in Table 6.

**Table 6:**

*Q16. Which of the following statements best describes the likelihood that you will make changes in your pedagogical practices based on what you learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have already made pedagogical changes based on what I learned.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have already made pedagogical changes based on what I learned in my classroom, and it seemed to work well.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to making pedagogical changes based on what I learned in my classroom in the next few weeks.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I look forward to making pedagogical changes based on what I learned in my classroom sometime later this year.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to make pedagogical changes based on what I learned, but I don’t have the materials that I need</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think that these pedagogical practices will work with my students.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common response to item Q17: “Which of the following statement best describes the changes in your mindset during the Social Justice Summer Camp?” was "My mindset was changed a great deal," with 40.4% of the responses \((n=23)\). The findings
demonstrate that educators change their mindsets after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7:

Q17. Which of the following statements best describes the changes that took place in your mindset during the Social Justice Summer Camp?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My mindset was changed completely.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mindset was changed a great deal.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mindset was changed somewhat.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mindset was not changed much.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This professional development did not change my mindset at all.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This professional development did not change my mindset because I was already quite familiar with this topic.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common responses to item Q18: “Which of the following statements best describes your anti-bias/antiracist self-perception after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp?” were, "I now view myself as anti-bias/antiracist" with 43.9% of the responses (n=25),” and, "It was a good start, and I look forward to becoming more anti-bias/antiracist,” with 42.1% of the responses (n=24). The findings demonstrate that educators view themselves as anti-bias/anti-racist after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp.
The most common response to item Q19: “Which of the following statements best describes the support you receive from your principal to apply what you learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp in your classroom?” was, "I have not discussed what I learned with the principal,” with 40.4% of responses. (n=23). The findings demonstrate that educators may believe their school-based leadership discourages them from applying what they learned at the Social Justice Summer Camp, as illustrated in Table 8.

Table 8:

| Q19. Which of the following statements best describes the support that you received from your principal to apply what you learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp in your classroom? |
|---|---|---|
| Variable | N | % |
| The principal has encouraged me to apply what I learned in my classroom. | 17 | 29.8 |
| The principal has encouraged me to apply what I learned in my classroom and has offered to help. | 8 | 14 |
| The principal has not encouraged me to apply what I learned in my classroom. | 3 | 5.3 |
| I have not discussed what I learned with the principal. | 23 | 40.4 |
| The principal has not encouraged me to apply what I learned in my classroom because we are still on summer break | 6 | 10.5 |
Survey Data Analysis

Analysis of the data collected from survey responses was addressed Fisher’s exact test. Fisher’s exact test was used because of the assumption of minimum cells. The analysis was conducted using SPSS with categorical variables coded yes or no (0 or 1). The variable recoding can be found in Appendix H. Analysis was conducted to address the research questions and determine whether respondents' perceptions of the Social Justice Summer Camp after attendance were related to educator classroom management, pedagogy, overall mindset, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception (see Appendix I).

Alignment of the Camp to School Improvement

Fisher’s Exact Test indicated that the alignment of the Social Justice Summer Camp to school improvement efforts was not significantly related to the item which assessed the attendee’s likelihood of classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change. This analysis was conducted to address research question 1: “Was the alignment of the Social Justice Summer Camp to your district priorities related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?” Fisher’s exact test for alignment by classroom management change was .330 for the pedagogical change, .330 for mindset change, and 1.00 for anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change. Fisher’s exact test indicates educators both made changes (or planned to make changes) and perceived that the Social Justice Summer Camp was aligned with the efforts of their school’s improvement plans.
The variable alignment of the camp by reported pedagogical change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>(X^2(\text{df}))</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of the Camp</td>
<td>48 (84)</td>
<td>2 (3.5)</td>
<td>1.303 (1)</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligned</td>
<td>48 (84)</td>
<td>2 (3.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not align</td>
<td>6 (10.5)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support from School Leadership to Attend

Survey Data analysis indicated that the support received from school leadership to attend the Social Justice Summer Camp was not significantly related to the items which assessed the attendee’s likelihood of classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change. This analysis was conducted to address research question two: “Was the support you received to attend the camp related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?” Fisher’s exact test of support for attending by classroom management change was .576 (table x). For the pedagogical change it was 1.00, for mindset change, .775, and for anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change Fisher’s exact test was 1.00. The findings indicate that although educators may not perceive their school leadership supported them in attending, this variable is unrelated to the variables for change.
The variable support from school leadership to attend by classroom management change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Classroom Management</th>
<th></th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n ( % )</td>
<td>n ( % )</td>
<td>X²(df)</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from School leadership</td>
<td>.669 (1) .576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported</td>
<td>31 (54)</td>
<td>2 (3.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not support</td>
<td>23 (40.3)</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendees’ Likelihood of Applying What They Learned

Survey Data analysis indicated that the likelihood of participants applying what they learned was significantly related to the items which assessed the attendee’s likelihood of classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change. This analysis was conducted to address research Question 3: “Was participant willingness to apply what they learned related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?” Fisher’s exact test of support for attending for classroom management change was .103 (not significant); for pedagogical change it was .002 (significant); for mindset change it was .536 (not significant); and for anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception, Fisher’s exact test was .035 (significant). Cramer’s V for the anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change was .701. This significance statistic would indicate a moderately strong correlation. Cramer’s V for the pedagogical change statistic was .809, indicating a strong relationship. The researcher concluded that a significant relationship exists between the participants’ likelihood of applying what they learned and the items that
assessed the participants’ likelihood of pedagogical change and anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change.

Usefulness of the Camp

Survey data analysis indicated that participants’ perceptions of the usefulness of the camp was significantly related to the items that assessed the attendees’ likelihood of classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change. This analysis was conducted to address research Question 3: “Was participant’s perception of the usefulness of the camp related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?” Fisher’s exact test of the variable “usefulness of the camp” for classroom management change was .103 (not significant); for pedagogical change it was .002 (significant); for mindset change it was .536 (not significant); and for anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change, Fisher’s exact test was .035 (significant). Cramer’s V for the anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change was .701. This significance statistic would indicate a moderately strong correlation. Cramer’s V for the pedagogical change statistic was .809, indicating a strong relationship. The researcher concludes that a significant relationship exists between the participant’s perception of the usefulness of the camp and the attendee’s likelihood of pedagogical change and anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change.
The variable usefulness of the camp by reported pedagogical change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pedagogical change</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>X²(df)</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of usefulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is useful</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
<td>2 (100.0)</td>
<td>.08 (1)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not useful</td>
<td>2 (3.6)</td>
<td>53 (96.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support from Leadership to Apply what was Learned

Survey Data analysis indicated that participants’ perceptions of the support they received from their building-based leadership to apply what they learned was not significantly related to the items which assessed the attendee’s likelihood of classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change. This analysis was conducted to address research Question 5: “Was the support you received from your school leadership to apply what you learned at the camp related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?” Fisher’s exact test of the variable “usefulness of the camp” for classroom management change was 1.00 (not significant); for pedagogical change it was 1.000 (not significant); for mindset change it was .391 (not significant); and for anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change, Fisher’s exact test was .035 (not significant). The researcher concluded that the participants’ perception of the support they received from their principal and school leadership is not significantly related to the attendee’s likelihood of classroom management, pedagogical, mindset, or self-perception change.
changes. Regardless of the principal’s support to apply what they learned, educators make practice changes.

Gender and Change

Survey Data analysis indicated that a participant’s gender was not significantly related to the items that assessed the attendee’s likelihood of classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change. This analysis was conducted to address research Question 6: “Was the gender of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?” Fisher’s exact test of the variable gender for classroom management change was 1.000 (not significant); for pedagogical change it was 1.000 (not significant); for mindset change it was .667 (not significant); and for anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change, Fisher’s exact test was 1.000 (not significant). The researcher concluded that the participant’s gender is not significantly related to the attendee’s likelihood of classroom management, pedagogical, mindset, or self-perception changes. Regardless of gender, educators make changes after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp.

The variable Gender by reported pedagogical change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pedagogical Change</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>( X^2(df) )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>(82.4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(5.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(12.2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Data analysis indicated that a participant’s race (coded as White or other) was not significantly related to the items that assessed the attendee’s likelihood of classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change. This analysis was conducted to address research Question 7: “Was the race of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?” Fisher’s exact test of the variable race for classroom management change was .611 (not significant); for pedagogical change it was .611 (not significant); for mindset change it was 1.000 (not significant); and for anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change, Fisher’s exact test was 1.000 (not significant). The researcher concluded that the participant’s race is not significantly related to the attendee’s likelihood of classroom management, pedagogical, mindset, or self-perception changes. Both White and non-White educators make changes after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp.

### The variable Race by reported pedagogical change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pedagogical Change</th>
<th></th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th></th>
<th>X²(df)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26 (45.6)</td>
<td>2 (3.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08 (1)</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28 (49.1)</td>
<td>1 (1.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey data analysis was conducted to determine relationships between level of school employment (coded as teacher or other) to the items that assessed the attendee’s likelihood of classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change. This analysis was conducted to address research Question 8: “Was the school employment status of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?” Fisher’s exact test of the variable race for classroom management change was 1.000 (not significant); for pedagogical change it was .239 (not significant); for mindset change it was .784 (not significant); and for anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change, Fisher’s exact test was 1.000 (not significant). The researcher concluded that the participant’s school employment is not significantly related to the attendee’s likelihood of classroom management, pedagogical, mindset, or self-perception changes. Both teacher and non-teacher educators make changes after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp.

In order to more fully answer research question 8, the researcher chose to compare the variable school employment level when coded “administrator and other” to the four indicated change variables: classroom management, pedagogy, mindset, and anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception. Survey data analysis indicated that the participant’s level of school employment (coded as administrator or other) was not significantly related to the items that assessed an attendee’s likelihood of classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change. Fisher’s exact test of the variable race by classroom management change was 1.000 (not significant); for pedagogical change it was .209 (not significant); for mindset change it was .784 (not significant); and for anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change, Fisher’s exact test was 1.000 (not significant).
significant); for mindset change it was 1.000 (not significant); and for anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception Fisher’s Exact test was .298 (not significant). The researcher concluded that the participant’s school employment as an administrator is not significantly related to the attendee’s likelihood of classroom management, pedagogical, mindset, or self-perception changes.

**Education Level and Change**

Survey data analysis indicated that a participant’s level of education was not significantly related to the items that assessed the attendee’s likelihood of classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change. The variable education level was coded “advanced degree or other”. Participant responses indicating no degree, associates, and bachelor were coded as “other” (N=15). Master’s degree and doctor or professional degree were coded as “advanced degree” (N=42). This analysis was conducted to address research Question 9: “Was the education level of attendees related to classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, or anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change?” Fisher’s exact test of the variable race by classroom management change was .166 (not significant); for pedagogical change it was .559 (not significant); for mindset change it was .521 (not significant); and for anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change, Fisher’s exact test was 1.000 (not significant). The researcher concluded that the participant’s level of education is not significantly related to the attendee’s likelihood of classroom management, pedagogical, mindset, or self-perception changes. Despite level of education, attendees make changes after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp.

Overall, participants reported that after participating in the Social Justice Summer Camp, they would make changes in their classroom practices—both in terms of pedagogy and
classroom management. Fewer participants reported changes in their mindsets. Still fewer participants reported new learning. Most participants responded positively to their perceptions of the Social Justice Summer Camp.

Summary

These findings add depth to understanding the perceptions of professional development for anti-bias/anti-racism. Additional findings related to research questions found that educators make classroom management and pedagogical practice changes after participating in the Social Justice Summer Camp. The findings are that perceptions were not related to teacher actions. 94% of attendees reported that after participating in the Social Justice Summer Camp, they would make pedagogical and classroom management changes in their classroom practices. As will be discussed in the next chapter, there were some significant findings related to administrators’ perceptions and educator change after participating. There were also findings related to White participants and non-teacher educators. Based on the findings and responses, the researcher will also discuss implications for planning professional development. Continued research into the understanding of why educators choose to attend the conference is warranted, as nearly every attendee takes positive anti-bias/anti-racist action. Continued research is also recommended regarding the quality and characteristics of those actions to understand how they influence the classroom, students, and school environment after attending professional development
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

This chapter summarizes and discusses the findings of this survey research study which explored the relationships between conference participants and educator change after participating in the Social Justice Summer Camp. Educators serve increasingly diverse classrooms and urgently need access to unique skills to teach their diverse students, which educators can gain through high-quality professional development for anti-bias/anti-racist classroom practices (Aguilera, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2000; Milner, 2021; Rodriguez & Swalwell, 2021). Policymakers have long called for teachers to become more culturally competent and have encouraged high-quality professional development to achieve classroom practices that better serve diverse populations (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Darling-Hammond & DePaoli, 2020; Gay, 2018; Ladson-Billings, 1998).

The need to make anti-bias/anti-racist classroom practice changes has been urgent. This urgency has been crystalized since the summer of 2020 with the tragic deaths of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and Ahmad Aubery. Researchers have found a lack of empirical findings on what type of professional development for these activities would lead to educator change (West & Eaton, 2019). For example, in the school district where the researcher serves as curriculum director, the schools have hosted professional development on cultural competency and bias education, which have been well received. The teacher evaluation sheets for them demonstrate their popularity. The subject matter of these professional development offerings is not necessarily the challenge. Instead, the structure of these single in-service meetings has been the
more challenging question. These learning opportunities do not meet the research-based suggestions for the length of time for implementation or the types of activities research has shown to be effective.

While it was expected that several statistical relationships between conference participation and educator change would be found, the results showed that many relationships were not statistically significant because almost all attendees reported being likely to make changes. The overwhelmingly positive results of the study and its correlation to the existing literature indicate recommendations for scaling the conference and marketing the Social Justice Summer Camp to more attendees. The findings, which align with those of the literature review, indicate there is also an urgent call for more research into anti-bias/anti-racist professional development for educators (Brown, 2006; Burns & Miller, 2017; Greenwald & Lai, 2020; Lensmire et al., 2013; Murray & Brooks-Immel (2019).

Themes

As detailed in Chapter Five, key findings emerged from exploring the participants’ perceptions of the Social Justice Summer Camp. Four significant themes emerged from the statistical analysis:

- Participants perceived that their leadership did not support attending or applying what they learned from the conference.
- A clear contrast exists between mindset change, reported learning, and behavior change.
- Participants are likelier to report a pedagogical or self-perception change if they also viewed the camp as helpful in making changes.
● White participants perceived a different experience than their non-White peers.
● Classroom educators (full-time teachers) perceived the conference experience differently than their non-classroom educator peers.

Lack of Leadership Support

The theme of administrator and school-based leadership support was evident. Participants responded to the survey, perceiving that their school-based leaders may not support them in attending or applying what they learned at the conference. Some respondents felt this way even though their administrators paid for them to attend the conference. Other attendees may not have requested district or public funds to attend the conference. Survey question 11 asked respondents to indicate the support they believed they received from their school-based leadership for attending the Social Justice Summer Camp. Of the responses, 44% indicated they did not perceive that their school-based leadership supported their attendance at the conference. Only 21% reported that their principal encouraged them to attend the Social Justice Summer Camp.

This finding was revealed in responses to question 19, which indicated that 56% of respondents did not believe their school-based leadership or principal would support them in applying what they learned in their classroom. Furthermore, 40% of respondents admitted not discussing the conference with their leadership. This perception indicates the controversial nature of teachers attending anti-bias/anti-racist professional development, as it suggests that many participants were uncomfortable telling their principal about it. The perception also highlights the competing priorities in schools (Alderman, 2021), suggesting that principals might discourage attendance because they need their staff to attend to other competing matters, such as reading, math, technology, or social-emotional initiatives.
A related finding to this theme was the alignment of the content of the Social Justice Summer Camp to school improvement efforts. Only 12.3% of participants reported that the conference did not align with their school’s or district’s efforts for improvement, while 28% reported that it only somewhat aligned with stated improvement goals. It was found that 23% of district-level administrators thought the conference aligned with improvement efforts. This perception may indicate that attending educators either do not perceive their schools as supportive of anti-bias/anti-racist practices or do not see how the conference will assist their schools in improving learning goals.

As found in the literature review, competing priorities in schools create a barrier to teachers gaining anti-bias/anti-racist teacher skills (Alderman, 2021), as referenced in the problem statement. The study intended to address the problem of teachers’ lack of access to these skills. The researcher found that competing school priorities create additional barriers to gaining these skills. Educators who believe the Social Justice Summer Camp does not align with their school improvement goals may not attend the camp; additionally, they will likely not seek other opportunities to learn more about better serving their diverse populations (Byrd, Rastogi, & Elliot, 2020; Mageh-Nagar & Firstater, 2019; Sleeter, 2015).

**Mindset Change**

The central theme of change demonstrated a contrast in participants’ willingness to change practices versus the willingness to change their mindsets. Almost all attendees (94%) indicated they had made or intended to make practice changes in their classrooms. This finding reveals that most of those attending the Social Justice Summer Camp are already predisposed to change their classroom settings. Nevertheless, a smaller percentage (68%) of
attendees believed the primary purpose of the Social Justice Camp was to help them understand anti-bias/anti-racist education. An even smaller percentage (32%) indicated they had not made and did not intend to change their anti-bias/anti-racist mindset.

Additionally, 25% of teachers and 30% of school and district administrators indicated that they did not make mindset changes because they were already quite familiar with the topic. This data contrasts with the overwhelming perception that they are willing and ready to make anti-bias/anti-racist practice changes. The research on educator change referenced in Chapters One and Two indicates that teachers change their mindset and actions (Guskey, 2002; Pajares, 1992). Here the researcher finds that participants were overwhelmingly willing to change actions before changing their mindsets, in line with the research which found beliefs can be changed through practices (Buehl & Beck, 2015; Richardson, 1996). This dissonance leads one to question if they perhaps attended the conference as a learner already in the appropriate mindset, ready to take action.

Change Related to Usefulness

The availability heuristic—a cognitive bias—is the tendency to overestimate the likelihood of events with greater “availability” in memory. Survey data analysis using Fisher’s exact test found a significant relationship between attendees’ reported likelihood of applying what they had recently learned at the Social Justice Summer Camp and the variable's reported likelihood of pedagogical change and self-perception change. Cramer’s V analysis shows the relationship was quite strong. In other words, if an attendee reported they were likely to apply what they learned, they also reported that they were likely to change their pedagogical practices. They were more likely to report that they changed the way they now perceive themself as an
anti-bias/anti-racist educator. Data from Fisher’s exact test also demonstrated that if participants reported the Social Justice Summer Camp as being very useful, they were much more likely to report pedagogical change and anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change.

The availability heuristic can be influenced by how recent or emotionally charged the memory or experience is. Although Cramer’s V data represents strong relationships, the researcher cautions that the data may be affected by the cognitive bias of respondents, who participated in an emotionally charged professional development and may overestimate the actual change they have made or will make in their classrooms.

**White Educators’ Response**

The responses and demographics of White participants and how they differed from their non-White peers was an important theme. The White educator cohort differed from their peers substantially in terms of demographics. White attendees reported being married or in a domestic partnership at 71%, while 53% of Hispanic/Latinx respondents and 41% of Black respondents indicated the same. This statistic indicates the homogeneity of the White educator cohort and contrasts with the greater diversity in the non-White cohort. Of the group, 54% of the White educators were employed as teachers, while only 40% of the Hispanic/Latinx educators were employed as teachers; the percentage of teachers in the Black educator demographic was even smaller, at 23.5%. Only 3% of the school administrators were White, while 37% of school administrators were Hispanic/Latinx or Black. In contrast, 51% of district administrators attending the conference were Hispanic or Black, while 16% of the district administrator attendees were White. None of the administrators attending the conference reported being Asian. Although these statistics are not as helpful in making inferences regarding conference
perceptions, they help note that the White educator participants differed demographically from the non-White educator participants.

These differences become starker when applied to the perceptions evaluated in the study. White educators were more likely to feel discouraged by their administrator from attending the conference (6.5% vs. 0%) and more likely to have not discussed attending the conference with their administrator (51.1% vs. 35%). 71% of White educators indicated this professional development was more valuable than others they had attended, while 52.9% of Black educators indicated the same. White educators were less likely (25%) to indicate that the conference's purpose was to learn new ideas for their classroom than their non-White peers (40%). 32.3% of White educators indicated that professional development did not change their mindset because they were already quite familiar with the topic, compared to 20.5% of non-White respondents.

No White educators indicated that the Social Justice Summer Camp provided everything they needed to apply new ideas in their classroom, while 17.8% of Black respondents indicated that they did believe the camp provided what they need. Analysis and alignment to the research from White racial identity development (Choney & Rowe, 1994; Helms, 1990; Helms, 1993; Kerwin et al., 1993; Tatum, 1992) indicates these perceptions are likely if many participants are in the middle stages of their identity development. This pattern becomes more significant when considering how to scale the conference for White educators, who comprise 84% of the teaching force and are more likely to experience effective professional development if they perceive themselves to be in the middle or later stages of racial identity development.
Non-Teacher Educators

Non-teacher educator responses differed from those of teacher responses. For example, some paraprofessional responses were more positive than teacher responses. 66% of paraprofessionals viewed themselves as anti-bias/anti-racist after attending the conference, while only 40% of teachers indicated this exact change in viewpoint. 100% of paraprofessional respondents perceived this specific PD opportunity as more valuable than any other in the last 12 months. However, paraprofessionals were even more likely to have not discussed attending the conference with their principal, at an increase of almost 50%. This significant theme highlights the lack of professional development opportunities for paraprofessionals in most American schools (Buysse, Winton, & Rouse, 2009; Wallace et al., 2001). Paraprofessionals may have rated the conference more highly because they have fewer opportunities to attend high-quality opportunities for training.

Professional development funding opportunities for positions such as paraprofessional are scarce at the state and federal levels (Kimbrel, 2018; McKenzie & Lewis, 2008). Again, competing priorities are more likely to prevent paraprofessionals from receiving quality professional development annually, let alone opportunities to learn more about anti-bias/anti-racist classroom practices.

Divergent Themes

The researcher found that all surveyed educators who did not believe the conference aligned with school improvement efforts were administrators. The group who perceived that the camp did not align indicated they would not change classroom practice. However, because the sample in this population of administrators was low (N=1), the findings are less believable. One
of the questions raised by this finding encourages more research at the next Social Justice Summer Camp; it asks, “Do other administrators who know the camp does not align with their school improvement efforts choose not to attend?” Overall, most administrators reported positive perceptions of the Social Justice Summer Camp. This finding is consistent with the literature from the theoretical framework of Hall’s Concerns Based Adoption Model, which states that administrators are early adopters and usually precede their educator staff in willingness to make changes (Hall & Hord, 2006).

Considerations of Previous Research and Theories

The literature review demonstrated that effective professional development relies on several characteristics, including being content-specific, collaborative, and interactive. An overwhelming number of studies also show conferences should be social, focus on the teacher’s real work, be based on discourse, and include models and demonstrations. This finding rang true for this study as well; the Social Justice Summer Camp shared the typical characteristics of effective training, and most respondents indicated the likelihood of changing classroom practices after attending the conferences.

The research indicated that teachers could overestimate the effectiveness of professional development (Barr, 2015; Conway, 2008; Yoon et al., 2007), which was also found in this study. The literature on conference attendance concluded that most teachers make classroom practice changes after attending high-quality conferences, which was replicated here (Rowe, 2018; Maloney, 2018; Murray, 2010).

The theoretical frameworks, including System Justification Theory, Racial Identity Development Theory, and Hall's Concerns Based Adoption Model, were also born out of the
study. For example, the fact that administrators were less likely to change and apply what they learned at the conference is reminiscent of the tenets of system justification theory, which states that one prefers the status quo to make changes, even when one acknowledges the need for change (Jost et al., 1994; Jost et al., 2003). The attendees' responses show that most participants are in the middle stages of their racial identity development. They have become mature enough in their racial development to want to attend the conference to better address the differences among students in their classrooms (Lawrence & Tatum, 1997; Arnold, Carreiro-King, and Helms, 1997). Their responses to survey items relating to learning more about new skills to use in their classroom were lower than their non-White peers (25% vs. 40%), indicating they have yet to realize that they do not know everything about how to serve as a White educator in a class with non-White students. As referenced in Chapter Two, understanding the need to learn more to be in harmony in a heterogeneous society is a characteristic of those in the later stages of racial identity development (Helms, 1990 & 1993).

Hall’s Concerns-Based Adaptors’ Model states that for an idea or new initiative to succeed, one must address the concerns of the teachers who will be implementing the change (Hall, 1974). That central tenet applies to this study. Roughly 15% of attendees were concerned that this conference did not align with their schools' goals for improvement. Over 40% of attendees were concerned that their principal or school-based leadership did not support their participation in the conference or in applying what they learned in their classroom. One in ten participants stated they were unsure if they were anti-bias/anti-racist educators. About 30% of attendees were concerned that there was no need for change because they already knew quite a bit about the topics of the conference. A barrier for these participants to implement anti-bias/anti-racist change in their classroom practices will remain until these concerns are addressed (Hall &
Hord, 2006; Roach, Kratochwill, & Frank, 2009); perhaps such concerns will be addressed by their school systems or by conference organizers at future Social Justice Summer Camps for educators.

The literature spoke directly to the systemic barriers to better serving diverse student populations, including lack of preparation and required coursework (Edwards & White, 2018; Epstein, 2011; Sleeter, 2008). Survey question twelve, which asked educators to indicate the usefulness of this conference compared with other professional development opportunities they have participated in, revealed that educator participants likely spend more time learning about content areas and how to teach them rather than anti-bias/anti-racist classroom practices. This systemic barrier to better serving diverse students is not because teachers do not desire to serve diverse students better, but because topics similar to those covered in the conference are not typically prioritized in schools. Although no attendees indicated that they had not received professional development in the last twelve months, 77.2% indicated that the conference was more valuable than any other professional development they have attended in the last twelve months.

**Research Question Summaries**

Overall, results from descriptive data suggest that most educators who participated in the Social Justice Summer Camp made classroom practice changes after attending. Essentially, educators who participated in the Social Justice Summer Camp believe they have already made classroom practice changes after attending or believe that they will make classroom practice changes. As indicated by previous research, teachers who engage in anti-bias/anti-racist professional development are more likely to create a classroom experience that is anti-bias/anti-
racist to serve their diverse students (Burke, 2017; Derman-Sparks & Ramsey, 2011; Nash & Allen, 2021; Streyle, 2020).

Furthermore, quantitative results showed that educators found the Social Justice Summer Camp helpful in meeting their learning needs and more useful than other professional development they had attended that year. Participation in the Social Justice Summer Camp promoted educator mindset, practice, and anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change. These findings add to the literature on the link between anti-bias/anti-racist professional development in the form of conference attendance and educator change.

The researcher found that educators did perceive that the Social Justice Summer Camp met their needs and believed they would apply what they learned at a rate of 96.5% to 3.5%. Some educators did perceive that their school leadership supported their attendance or in applying what they learned at the Social Justice Summer Camp. However, this percentage was much fewer, with 56.1% of respondents reporting support and 43.9% reporting they did not perceive support. 77.2% of educators believed the Social Justice Summer Camp was more valuable than other professional developments they attended in the last twelve months. These findings indicate that most participants took away positive perceptions of the Social Justice Summer Camp.

Additionally, the researcher found that 39% of educators did not change their mindsets after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp. Additionally, 94.7% of educators reported they would change their classroom management and pedagogical practices after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp. Furthermore, 98.2% of educator respondents in this survey view themselves as anti-bias/anti-racist after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp. Most
attendees make classroom practice changes, including classroom management and pedagogical changes, mindset changes, and anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception changes.

For this data sample, after participating in the Social Justice Summer Camp, meeting the professional learning needs of the participant is not related to changes in practice or mindset. The Social Justice Summer Camp's alignment to school improvement is unrelated to educator change, and school-based leadership support in the Social Justice Summer Camp is unrelated to educator change. This finding is likely because of the high response rate across all responses of being willing to change. The findings demonstrate that educators make changes regardless of their support from school-based leadership or the camp’s alignment with school improvement goals.

The demographics of age, gender, marital status, education level, school-related employment, and race were all unrelated to educator change after participating in the Social Justice Summer Camp. The findings are that regardless of the participant's age, marital status, gender, job function in the school system, or education level, attendees report a high likelihood of classroom management change, pedagogical change, mindset change, and anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception change after participating in the Social Justice Summer Camp.

Implications

Results indicate an opportunity for recommendations for teachers, administrators, policymakers, and conference organizers. The Social Justice Summer Camp has enormous potential for effectively assisting educators in creating an anti-bias/anti-racist mindset, making class management changes, making pedagogical changes, and making self-perception changes. Emphasis on the immersive nature of the Social Justice Summer Camp, which creates a collaborative discussion-based professional learning experience, can be directly linked to
educator change for anti-bias/anti-racist practice. Considering that previous researchers found teachers report being unprepared to meet the needs of their diverse classrooms (Edwards & White, 2018; Epstein, 2011; Li et al., 2017; Moore, Giles, & Vitulli, 2021), the Social Justice Summer Camp, if brought to scale, has the potential for providing teachers with the necessary understandings and skills to create anti-bias/anti-racist classrooms.

**Recommendations for Administrators**

As indicated by the findings of descriptive analyses of survey items and research questions, it is recommended that administrators support their employees in attending, participating in, and applying what they learn from the Social Justice Summer Camp. As public school administrators progress through their career, they must facilitate adult learning and development in the anti-bias/anti-racist context. They should observe with intention while coaching for equity as they conduct their school leadership duties. For example, they should establish and empower equity teams while prioritizing equitable instruction. Administrators should attend similar conferences to reveal and recognize their biases and ensure their work as school leaders is neither performative nor based on deficit ideologies. Administrators are recommended to fully support the teachers in serving diverse students (Berument, 2019; Matthews, 2005; Sleeter, 2015).

Additionally, because the system makes it more difficult for teachers to dismantle oppressive systems in schools, administrators must ensure that systems that are barriers to creating anti-bias/anti-racist classrooms are noticed, named, and interrupted. Administrators should avoid fear in this work, address the problem head-on, and continue to question their perceptions and biases by engaging in necessary conversations about race (Jost, 2020). Anti-
bias/anti-racist work is challenging. Administrators are encouraged to seek the support of colleagues, the support of district leaders, and opportunities such as high-quality professional development like the Social Justice Summer Camp for educators.

Administrators should also employ the culturally responsive leadership practices referenced in Chapter Two. Administrators should display and model awareness of the historical structures, such as Whiteness and the oppressive school system, as readily impacting student experiences. Another culturally responsive practice they should employ is building community relationships; this includes building community relationships with students from diverse backgrounds and holding positive, unwavering, affirming views of these students. For example, they must acknowledge and view the cultural wealth of students as valuable assets.

Recommendations for Teachers.

The recommendations in this section are equally as audacious as those in the previous section. Teachers face competing priorities of instructing students, preparing lesson plans, communicating grades and progress to families, and completing other duties as assigned (Hall & Hord, 1987). Therefore, the researcher recommends that teachers prioritize anti-bias/anti-racist classrooms in the same manner as other duties are priorities. Teachers should also seek high-quality professional development, maintain the relationships they build at conferences, and collaborate with other like-minded colleagues for the good and sake of their diverse populations and in order to create anti-bias/anti-racist classrooms (Burke, 2017; Derman-Sparks & Ramsey, 2011; Nash & Allen, 2021; Streyle, 2020).

Teachers should address their implementation concerns frequently, with their racial identity development in mind. If their concern is a matter of trust from their administrators (as
indicated in the present study), they should examine how they may seek out transparency from their principal. They should facilitate conversations respectfully and appropriately, finding interest convergence to be supported in creating anti-bias/anti-racist classrooms school-wide. Suppose their concern is a personal challenge, as indicated in the survey. In that case, the theoretical underpinnings from Chapter One (System Justification Theory, Hall’s Concerns-Based Adoption Model, and Racial Identity Development Theory) indicate that educators should seek more professional development and caucus with like-minded colleagues and experts (Burke, 2017; Derman-Sparks & Ramsey, 2011; Nash & Allen, 2021; Streyle, 2020).

**Recommendations for Conference Organizers**

The limited study conducted at the 5th annual Social Justice Summer Camp yielded outcomes indicating conference organizers can make changes. Data from this quantitative analysis indicates that conference organizers may not have reached the perceived expertise of the participants. A surprising 26.3% of conference attendees indicated that they did not change their mindsets because they were already quite familiar with anti-bias/anti-racist practices. This finding would indicate that some conference attendees perceive themselves as members of an expert group, and perhaps sessions that either help participants uncover their knowledge and understand gaps or sessions that reveal new and surprising information would be purposeful. Another recommendation is that conference organizers study the conference content and attendees’ experience more deeply to determine gaps in their knowledge. It is also recommended that they publish and present the conference’s success.
Recommendations for Future Research

Anti-bias/anti-racism professional development is required by policy for teachers in most states and is urgently called for to help teachers better serve their diverse students. There is, therefore, ample opportunity for research into the effectiveness and outcomes of such professional development.

- The Department of Education should continue to fund research that develops and promotes high-quality anti-bias/anti-racist professional development for educators.
- Those researching the effectiveness of anti-bias/anti-racist professional development for educators should aggressively pursue publication and presentation at all venues.
- Consideration should be given to research that uncovers or tests the effectiveness of anti-bias/anti-racist professional development related to direct student outcomes, including achievement, discipline, and later adult success.
- As the literature spoke directly to the competing and systemic barriers to change, further research is urged to uncover why educators attending similar conferences do not encounter such barriers and use this information to remove those barriers for other educators.
- In order to reach many more educators, the Department of Education and policymakers should consider ways to scale and make similar Social Justice Summer Camps affordable in other states.

Conclusions

This study aims to determine relationships between conference attendees’ perceptions and change variables, like other studies examining attendees’ perceptions at educator
conferences. The researcher hypothesized that there would be a relationship between willingness to change toward anti-bias/anti-racist classroom practices and the educator demographics, and that educators would be more likely to change their anti-bias/anti-racist classroom practices after participating in the Social Justice Summer Camp. Overwhelmingly, there was a clear link between having attended or attending the Social Justice Summer Camp and reporting having already made changes or intending to make anti-bias/anti-racist changes in their classroom practices. However, the researcher found few statistically believable relationships between a willingness to change and educator characteristics, including race, gender, occupation, or education level. This lack of significant p values is primarily caused by the lack of variability in responses among attendees. Regardless of educator demographics, attendees were overwhelmingly willing to change or had already made changes.

As cited in the literature review from Chapter Two, previous research recommended immersive social, discussion-based professional development and content related directly to teachers’ work. The camp would be a good option for educators considering attending an offering such as the Social Justice Summer Camp to improve their ability to serve their diverse student populations. Its location on the university campus and the summer multi-day time commitment may make some consider turning to another source for professional development. However, this study and others demonstrate that a conference with these characteristics can be successful in helping teachers make anti-bias, anti-racist classroom practice changes. For instance, 96.4% of respondents intended to make classroom practice changes.

How often have people left a professional development feeling it was a waste of time? In this study, only two survey respondents indicated that the conference did not help make changes. The immersive nature of the Social Justice Summer Camp makes it a promising method of
providing high-quality anti-bias/anti-racist professional development, and policymakers should seek efforts to scale its success.


Anderson, M. B. (2018). A Seat at the Table: African American Youth’s Perceptions of K-12 Education. *Frederick D. Patterson Research Institute, UNCF*.


Derman-Sparks, L., & Ramsey, P. G. (2011). *What if all the kids are White?: Anti-bias multicultural education with young children and families.* Teachers College Press.


diverse students, families, and communities: Strategies for preparing preservice teachers. 

Egalite, A. J., & Kisida, B. (2017). The effects of teacher match on students’ academic 

Emdin, C. (2016). For White folks who teach in the hood... and the rest of y'all too: Reality 
pedagogy and urban education. Beacon Press.

Erichsen, K., & Reynolds, J. (2020). Public school accountability, workplace culture, and teacher 
morale. Social Science Research, 85, 102347. 
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2019.102347


https://www.facinghistory.org/

Fish, R. E. (2019). Standing out and sorting in: Exploring the role of racial composition in racial 
2573-2608.

Flores, A. (2007). Examining disparities in mathematics education: Achievement gap or 

contexts in education.

Development in Education, 43(1), pp. 106–120.  
https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2015.1131733

A. (2019). A meta-analysis of procedures to change implicit measures. Journal of 

Are we losing the dream?—The civil rights project at UCLA.  
https://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/a- 
multiracial-society-with-segregated-schools-are-we-losing-the-dream


Harry, B., & Klingner, J. (2014). *Why are so many minority students in special education?* Teachers College Press.


Helms, J. E. (2008). *A race is a nice thing to have: A guide to being a White person or understanding the White persons in your life.* (2nd ed.). Microtraining Associates.

Hern, K., Snell, M., and Henson, L. (2020). *Still getting there: How California’s AB 705 is (and is not) transforming remediation and what needs to come next.* Public Advocates.


Howard, Gary R. *We can’t teach what we don’t know: White teachers, multiracial schools.* Teachers College Press, 2016.


Milner, H. R. (2021). *Start where you are, but don’t stay there: Understanding diversity, opportunity gaps, and teaching in today's classrooms.* Harvard Education Press.


Orfield, G., Kucsera, J., & Siegel-Hawley, G. (2012). *E Pluribus... separation: Deepening double segregation for more students—the civil rights project at UCLA.* https://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/mlk-national/e-pluribus...separation-deepening-double-segregation-for-more-students


APPENDIX A

IRB EXEMPTION
Exempt Determination

03-Jun-2022
Erin Rae (Z1787593)
Curriculum and Instruction

RE: Protocol # HS22-0462 "What do teachers gain from anti-bias/anti-racist professional development?"

Dear Erin Rae,

Your application for institutional review of research involving human subjects was reviewed by the Office of Research Compliance, Integrity, and Safety on 03-Jun-2022 and it was determined that it meets the criteria for exemption.

Although this research is exempt, you have responsibilities for the ethical conduct of the research and must comply with the following:

**Amendments**: You are responsible for reporting any amendments or changes to your research protocol that may affect the determination of exemption and/or the specific category. This may result in your research no longer being eligible for the exemption that has been granted.

**Record Keeping**: You are responsible for maintaining a copy of all research related records in a secure location, in the event future verification is necessary. At a minimum these documents include: the research protocol, all questionnaires, survey instruments, interview questions and/or data collection instruments associated with this research protocol, recruiting or advertising materials, any consent forms or information sheets given to participants, all correspondence to or from the IRB, and any other pertinent documents.

Please include the **protocol number**: (HS22-0462) on any documents or correspondence sent to the IRB about this study.

If you have questions or need additional information, please contact the Office of Research Compliance, Integrity, and Safety at 815-753-8588.

Please see the RIPS website for guidance on the impact of COVID-19 on research (including face-to-face data collection) [https://www.niu.edu/divresearch/covid/index.shtml](https://www.niu.edu/divresearch/covid/index.shtml)
APPENDIX B

SAMPLE ITEMS FOR SURVEYING PARTICIPANTS’ VIEWS OF

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Appendix B
Sample items for surveying participants' views of professional development

Planners should conduct their own searches for instruments and data collection strategies that may be appropriate for their evaluations. Use these and other search terms to locate helpful documents on the Internet.

- Looking at student work.
- Assessing/evaluating program impact.
- Measuring/assessing teacher knowledge (add a content area to the search terms).
- Evaluating training (and/or training programs).
- Program evaluation/impact evaluation.
- Logic model/theory of change.

The following items can be adapted and used in surveys of participants' views of their professional learning.

1. Understanding the purpose of the professional development.

Sample item: Which of the following statements best describes the primary purpose of (insert the name of the professional development)? (Select one.)

The purpose of the professional development was:
A. To communicate new ideas for me to consider using in my classroom.
B. To provide an opportunity for me to learn from other teachers.
C. To help me understand (insert content of professional development).
D. To help me apply/implement (insert content of professional development or other descriptor) in my classroom.
E. Not clear.
F. Other (specify).

Note: In using this or a similar item, be sure that one response option includes the intended purpose of the professional development.
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2. Ratings of the usefulness of key components of the professional development.

   Sample item: Which of the following statements best describes the usefulness of (insert the name of the professional development or a specific component)? (Select one.)
   A. It was a good start.
   B. It was a good start, but I have a lot of questions.
   C. It was a good start, and I look forward to using the new ideas in my classroom.
   D. It provided everything I need to use the new ideas in my classroom.
   E. I don't think that these ideas will work very well in my classroom.
   F. It's too soon to tell.

3. Perceptions of the extent to which the professional development met participants' needs.

   Sample item: Indicate the extent to which (insert the name of the professional development) met your professional learning needs. (Select one.)
   A. It addressed my professional learning needs completely.
   B. It addressed some of my professional learning needs.
   C. It did not address my professional learning needs.
   D. This professional development did not help much because I was already familiar with this topic.

4. Ratings of the alignment of the content of the professional development with improvement priorities.

   Sample item: To what extent was (insert the name of the professional development) aligned with (school/district) (goals/priorities) for improving instruction? (Select one.)
   A. The professional development was very closely aligned with (goals/priorities) for instructional improvement.
   B. The professional development was somewhat aligned with (goals/priorities) for instructional improvement.
   C. The professional development was not aligned with (goals/priorities) for instructional improvement.
   D. The professional development was inconsistent with (goals/priorities) for instructional improvement.
   E. I don't know.
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5. Perceptions of support and encouragement to participate in the professional development.

Sample item: Which of the following statements best describes the support that you received from your principal (or other school leader or school-based professional development staff) to participate in (insert the name of the professional development)? (Select one.)
   A. The principal strongly encouraged me to participate.
   B. The principal encouraged me to participate.
   C. The principal tried to discourage me from participating.
   D. I did not discuss the professional development with the principal prior to participating.

6. Perceptions of support and encouragement to apply new knowledge and skills.

Sample item: Which of the following statements best describes the support that you received from your principal to apply what you learned in (insert the name of the professional development) in your classroom? (Select one.)
   A. The principal has encouraged me to apply what I learned in my classroom.
   B. The principal has encouraged me to apply what I learned in my classroom and has offered to help.
   C. The principal has not encouraged me to apply what I learned in my classroom.
   D. I have not discussed what I learned with the principal.

Note: Additional items and responses can focus on encouragement from other school leaders, school-based professional development staff, and other teachers.
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7. Ratings of the likelihood of applying new knowledge and skills in the classroom.

   Sample item: Which of the following statement best describes the likelihood that you will apply what you learned in (insert the name of the professional development) in your classroom? (Select one.)

   A. I have already (practiced/applied) (skill/practice) in my classroom.
   B. I have already (practiced/applied) (skill/practice) in my classroom, and it seemed to work well.
   C. I have already (practiced/applied) (skill/practice) in my classroom, but it was not appropriate for my students.
   D. I look forward to (practicing/applying) (skill/practice) in my classroom in the next few weeks.
   E. I look forward to (practicing/applying) (skill/practice) in my classroom sometime later this year.
   F. I would like to (practice/apply) (skill/practice), but I don’t have the materials that I need.
   G. I don’t think that these things will work with my students.

8. Overall ratings of the usefulness of the professional development compared with other professional development.

   Sample item: Which of the following statements best describes how (insert the name of the professional development) compares with other professional development in which you have participated during the past six months (or other period)? (Select one.)

   A. This professional development was more useful than other professional development that I have participated in.
   B. This professional development was about the same as other professional development that I have participated in.
   C. This professional development was less useful than other professional development that I have participated in.
   D. I don’t have an opinion.
   E. I don’t have an opinion because I haven’t participated in any other professional development in the last six months.
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June 6-9, 2022

Camp Website

Monday, June 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:00-4:30</td>
<td>Registration/Check-In</td>
<td>*NHCC Lobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00-6:00</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>NHCC Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00-6:30</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td>NHCC Swing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30-8:00</td>
<td><strong>Keynote #1: Venus Evans-Winter</strong></td>
<td>NHCC Swing Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuesday, June 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00-8:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>NHCC Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15-9:15</td>
<td>Morning Plenary: Joseph Flynn</td>
<td>NHCC Swing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-11:00</td>
<td>Systemic Oppression Activity: Michael Manderino</td>
<td>NHCC Swing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:15</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>NHCC Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-1:45</td>
<td>Undocumented Immigrants and Refugees: What are the facts and implications for the classroom?</td>
<td>NHCC Swing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45-2:10</td>
<td>Snack available on 3rd floor in Graham Hall</td>
<td>Graham Hall #335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10-3:10</td>
<td><strong>Breakout Session #1</strong></td>
<td>Graham Hall #332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dana Isawi: Trauma-Informed Strategies for Supporting Students</td>
<td>Graham Hall #332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melanie Koss: Rethinking Columbus: The Importance of Multiple Perspectives</td>
<td>Graham Hall #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrine Wickens: Constructions of Children &amp; Childhood and LGBTQ-</td>
<td>Graham Hall #334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15-3:50</td>
<td>Processing and Reflecting Conversations</td>
<td>In classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-5:00</td>
<td><strong>Keynote #2: Gholdy Muhammad</strong></td>
<td>Cavan Auditorium GA 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30-6:30</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>NHCC Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-9:00</td>
<td>Film Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Summer of Soul</em> (2021) (Moderated by Michael Manderino and Joseph Flynn)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Class Divide</em> (2016) (Moderated by Dana Isawi and James Cohen)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NHCC = New Hall Community Center*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00-8:00</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>*NHCC Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15-9:15</td>
<td>Morning Plenary: Michael Manderino</td>
<td>NHCC Swing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-11:00</td>
<td>Barnga Game</td>
<td>NHCC Swing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:10</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>NHCC Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:30</td>
<td><strong>Breakout Session #1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Evar Strid: Language and Prejudice in Education: Valuing All</td>
<td>Graham Hall #332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varieties of Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sawsan Jaber: Advocating for Our Arab and Muslim Students in the</td>
<td>Graham Hall #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mariana Rickleffs: Language Ideologies and Social Justice Issues</td>
<td>Graham Hall #334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katy Jaekel: Supporting Queer and Trans Students in and out of the</td>
<td>Graham Hall #336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zehra Tahir: Representation Matters</td>
<td>Graham Hall TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-1:35</td>
<td>Snack available on 3rd floor in Graham Hall</td>
<td>Graham Hall #335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:35-2:35</td>
<td><strong>Breakout Session #2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linh Nguyen: Minority Leaders: Challenges and Impacts</td>
<td>Graham Hall #332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mayra Carerra and Sawsan Jaber: Forming a Student Equity Board</td>
<td>Graham Hall #334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lydia Gerzel-Short: Crossing Divides and Building Effective Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities: Collaborative Communication and Culturally Responsive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40-3:40</td>
<td><strong>Breakout Sessions #3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for Using Digital Texts and Tools</td>
<td>Graham Hall #342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natalie Young: All My Life I Had to Fight: Burnout and the Black</td>
<td>Graham Hall #332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Flynn: Call Me If You Get Lost!: The Travels of Hip Hop, Pedag</td>
<td>Graham Hall #333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ogy, and Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quortne R. Hutchens: The Anti-Blackness of It All: Pedagogical Praxis</td>
<td>Graham Hall #334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Educational Environments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kimberly Hart: Cultivating Communities of Wellness Through Trauma-</td>
<td>Graham Hall #342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informed Community Healing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-5:00</td>
<td><strong>Keynote #3: J.Q. Adams</strong></td>
<td>Cavan Auditorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30-6:30</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>NHCC Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00-9:00</td>
<td>Film Series</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crip Camp (2020) (Moderated by Michael Manderino and James Cohen)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Moderated by Joseph Flynn and Dana Isawi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thursday, June 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00-8:00</td>
<td>Check-out during/right after breakfast: Turn in all keys to front desk.</td>
<td>NHCC Lobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:15-9:30</td>
<td>Breakfast</td>
<td>NHCC Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-10:15</td>
<td>Morning Plenary: Jung Kim</td>
<td>NHCC Swing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-10:30</td>
<td>Joseph Flynn, Michael Manderino, &amp; Dana Isawi: MCE at the School/District Level: Presentation/Directions</td>
<td>NHCC Swing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-12:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>NHCC Swing Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-1:00</td>
<td>Lunch with dessert/snack</td>
<td>NHCC Cafeteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-3:00</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>NHCC Swing Room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NHCC = New Hall Community Center*
APPENDIX D

SOCIAL JUSTICE SUMMER CAMP FOR EDUCATORS SURVEY
Q1: *Informed Consent*

You are invited to participate in a research study about your perceptions of the Social Justice Camp. This research study aims to examine the data and perceptions of participants. Erin Rae, a doctoral student at NIU, is conducting this study. Participation in this study is voluntary. If you agree to participate in this study, you will complete the survey following this informed consent. It will take you 10 minutes to complete the survey.

Participating in this study may not benefit you directly, but it will help us learn more about participants’ perceptions of the camp. You may find that answering some of the questions may make you uncomfortable, but we expect that this would not be different from the things you discuss with colleagues or friends. You may skip any questions you do not want to answer and end the survey at any time. The information you will share with us if you participate in this study will be confidential to the law’s full extent. The survey data will be kept in password-protected cloud and server storage. We will not collect your email address or IP address. Identifying information will be de-linked from survey data. Only the Study Director and other researchers can see the survey you participated in. No one at NIU will be able to see your survey or even know whether you participated in this study. When the study is completed, and the data have been analyzed, participants' responses will be destroyed. While the investigator(s) will keep your information confidential, there are some risks of data breaches when sending information over the internet beyond the investigator's control.

*Please note: You must be 18 or older to participate in this study.*

- I give consent. (1)
- I opt out of the survey. (2)

Q2: *Age*

▼ 18 (1) ... 104 (87)
Q3: Gender
- Non-Binary (1)
- Female (2)
- Male (3)
- Intersex (5)
- Transgender (6)
- Gender queer (7)
- Gender non-conforming (8)
- I prefer not to say (9)
- Prefer to self-describe (10) 

Q4: Marital Status
- Single, never married (1)
- Married or domestic partnership (2)
- Widowed (3)
- Divorced (4)
- Separated (5)
- Prefer to self-describe (6) 

Q5: School-Related Employment

- Teacher (1)
- Counselor (2)
- Social Worker (3)
- School Administrator (4)
- District Administrator (5)
- Para Professional (6)
- Consultant (7)
- Academic (8)
- Other (9)

Q6: Education

- No schooling completed (1)
- Nursery school to 8th grade (2)
- Some high school, no diploma (3)
- High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent (for example: GED) (4)
- Some college credit, no degree (5)
- Trade/technical/vocational training (6)
- Associate degree (7)
- Bachelor’s degree (8)
- Master’s degree (9)
- Professional degree (10)
- Doctorate degree (11)
- Other (12)
Q7: Race

- White (1)
- Hispanic or Latino (2)
- Black or African American (3)
- Native American or American Indian (4)
- Asian (5)
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander (6)
- Some other race, ethnicity, or origin (7)
- Prefer to self-describe (8) ____________________________________________
- Prefer not to say (9)

Q8: Which of the following statements best describes the primary purpose of the Social Justice Summer Camp?

- To communicate new ideas for me to consider using in my classroom. (1)
- To provide an opportunity for me to learn from other teachers. (2)
- To help me understand anti-bias/anti-racist education. (3)
- To help me apply/implement social justice in my classroom. (4)
- Other (specify) (5) ____________________________________________
- The Social Justice Summer Camp was not purposeful. (6)
Q9: *Indicate the extent to which the social justice boot camp met your anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs.*

- It addressed my anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs completely. (1)
- It addressed most of my anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs. (5)
- It addressed some of my anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs. (2)
- It did not address my anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs. (3)
- This professional development did not help much because I was already familiar with this topic. (4)

Q10: *To what extent was The Social Justice Summer Camp aligned with your school or district priorities for school improvement?*

- The professional development was very closely aligned with priorities for instructional improvement. (1)
- The professional development was somewhat aligned with goals for instructional improvement. (2)
- The professional development was not aligned with priorities for instructional improvement. (3)
- The professional development was inconsistent with priorities for instructional improvement. (4)
- I don’t know. (5)

Q11: *Which of the following statements best describes the support that you received from your principal (or other school leader or school-based professional development staff) to participate in the Social Justice Summer Camp?*

- The principal strongly encouraged me to participate. (1)
- The principal encouraged me to participate. (2)
- The principal tried to discourage me from participating. (3)
- I did not discuss the professional development with the principal prior to participating. (4)
Q12: Which of the following statements best describes the Social Justice Summer Camp compared to another professional development participated in during the last 12 months?

- This professional development was more useful than other professional development that I have participated in. (1)
- This professional development was about the same as other professional development that I have participated in. (2)
- This professional development was less useful than other professional development that I have participated in. (3)
- I don’t have an opinion. (4)
- I don’t have an opinion because I haven’t participated in any other professional development in the last 12 months. (5)

Q13: Which of the following statement best describes the likelihood that you will apply what you learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp in your classroom?

- I have already applied what I learned in my classroom. (1)
- I have already applied what I learned in my classroom, and it seemed to work well. (2)
- I have already applied what I learned in my classroom, but it was not appropriate for my students. (3)
- I look forward to applying what I learned in my classroom in the next few weeks. (4)
- I look forward to applying what I learned in my classroom sometime later this year. (5)
- I would like to apply what I learned, but I don’t have the materials that I need. (6)
- I don’t think that these things will work with my students. (7)
Q14: Which of the following statement best describes the likelihood that you will make changes in your classroom management practices based on what you learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp?

- I have already made classroom management changes based on what I learned. (1)
- I have already made classroom management changes based on what I learned in my classroom, and it seemed to work well. (2)
- I have already made classroom management changes based on what I learned in my classroom, but it was not appropriate for my students. (3)
- I look forward to making classroom management changes based on what I learned in my classroom in the next few weeks. (4)
- I look forward to making classroom management changes based on what I learned in my classroom sometime later this year. (5)
- I would like to make classroom management changes based on what I learned, but I don’t have the materials that I need. (6)
- I don’t think that these classroom management changes will work with my students. (7)

Q15: Which of the following statements best describes the usefulness of the Social Justice Summer Camp for making anti-bias/anti-racist practice changes?

- It was a good start. (1)
- It was a good start, but I have a lot of questions. (2)
- It was a good start, and I look forward to using the new ideas in my classroom. (3)
- It provided everything I need to use the new ideas in my classroom. (4)
- I don’t think that these ideas will work very well in my classroom. (5)
- Slightly useful. (6)
- It was a good start, and the questions I still have are: (7)
Q16: Which of the following statement best describes the likelihood that you will make changes in your pedagogical practices based on what you learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp?

☐ I have already made pedagogical changes based on what I learned. (1)

☐ I have already made pedagogical changes based on what I learned in my classroom, and it seemed to work well. (2)

☐ I have already made pedagogical changes based on what I learned in my classroom, but it was not appropriate for my students. (3)

☐ I look forward to making pedagogical changes based on what I learned in my classroom in the next few weeks. (4)

☐ I look forward to making pedagogical changes based on what I learned in my classroom sometime later this year. (5)

☐ I would like to make pedagogical changes based on what I learned, but I don’t have the materials that I need. (6)

☐ I don’t think that these pedagogical practices will work with my students. (7)

Q17: Which of the following statement best describes the changes that took place in your mindset during the Social Justice Summer Camp?

☐ My mindset was changed completely. (1)

☐ My mindset was changed a great deal. (2)

☐ My mindset was changed somewhat. (3)

☐ My mindset was not changed much. (4)

☐ This professional development did not change my mindset at all. (5)

☐ This professional development did not change my mindset because I was already quite familiar with this topic. (7)
Q18: Which of the following statements best describes your anti-bias/anti-racist self-perception after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp?

- I now view myself as anti-bias/anti-racist. (1)
- It was a good start, but I'm not sure if I'm anti-bias/anti-racist. (2)
- It was a good start, and I look forward to becoming more anti-bias/anti-racist. (3)
- I don’t think I can be anti-bias/anti-racist in my classroom. (5)
- It was slightly useful for becoming anti-bias/anti-racist. (6)

Q19: Which of the following statements best describes the support that you receive from your principal to apply what you learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp in your classroom?

- The principal has encouraged me to apply what I learned in my classroom. (1)
- The principal has encouraged me to apply what I learned in my classroom and has offered to help. (2)
- The principal has not encouraged me to apply what I learned in my classroom. (3)
- I have not discussed what I learned with the principal. (4)
- The principal has not encouraged me to apply what I learned in my classroom because we are still on summer break. (5)
APPENDIX E

LEVELS OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION
## Guskey’s Five Critical Levels of Professional Development Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Level</th>
<th>Typical Questions Addressed</th>
<th>Typical Info. Gathering Methods</th>
<th>What is Measured or Assessed?</th>
<th>How Will Information Be Used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Participants’ Reactions | • Did participants like it?  
• Was time well spent?  
• Did the material make sense?  
• Will it be useful?  
• Was the presenter knowledgeable?  
• Did the physical conditions of the activity support learning? | • Questionnaires administered at the end of sessions.  
• Focus groups  
• Interviews  
• Personal learning log  
• MeetingWorks internet-based sessions  
• Analysis of threaded discussion forums | • Initial satisfaction with experience. | • To improve program delivery and design |
| 2. Participants’ Learning | • Did participants acquire the intended knowledge or skill? | • Paper and pencil tests  
• Simulations and demonstrations  
• Participant reflections (oral and/or written)  
• Participant portfolios  
• Case study analysis  
• MeetingWorks internet-based sessions  
• Analysis of threaded discussion forums | • New knowledge and/or skills of participants | • To improve program content, format, and organization |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Level</th>
<th>Typical Questions Addressed</th>
<th>Typical Info. Gathering Methods</th>
<th>What is Measured or Assessed?</th>
<th>How Will Information Be Used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. Organization support and change | • What was the impact on the organization?  
• Did it affect organizational climate or procedures?  
• Was implementation advocated, facilitated, and supported?  
• Was the support public and overt?  
• Were problems addressed quickly and efficiently?  
• Were sufficient resources made available?  
• Were successes recognized and shared? | • District and school records  
• Minutes from meetings  
• Questionnaires  
• Focus groups  
• Structured interviews with participants and school or district administrators  
• Participant portfolios  
• MeetingWorks internet-based sessions  
• Analysis of threaded discussion forums | • The organization’s advocacy, support, accommodations, facilitation and recognition | • To document and improve organizational support  
• To improve future change efforts |
| 4. Participants’ use of new knowledge or skills | • Did participants effectively apply the new knowledge and skills? | • Questionnaires  
• Structured interviews with participants and their supervisors  
• Participant reflections (oral and/or written)  
• Participant portfolios  
• Direct observations  
• Video or audio tapes  
• Concerns-based Adoption Model | • Degree and quality of information | • To document and improve the implementation of program content |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Level</th>
<th>Typical Questions Addressed</th>
<th>Typical Info. Gathering Methods</th>
<th>What is Measured or Assessed?</th>
<th>How Will Information Be Used?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5. Student Learning Outcomes | • What was the impact on students?  
   • Did it affect student performance or achievement?  
   • Did it influence students’ physical or emotional well-being?  
   • Are students more confident as learners?  
   • Is student attendance improving?  
   • Are dropouts decreasing? | • Student records  
   • School records  
   • Questionnaires  
   • Structured interviews with students, parents, teachers, and/or administrators  
   • Participant portfolios | • Student learning outcomes:  
   1. cognitive (performance and achievement)  
   2. affective (attitudes and dispositions)  
   3. psychomotor (skills and behavior) | • To focus and improve all aspects of program design, implementation, and follow-up  
   • To demonstrate the overall impact of professional development |
APPENDIX F
PERMISSIONS
Hi Erin,

Thanks for your request. The information on the REL website is in the public domain, so please feel free to use the example below. We do ask, however, that you credit REL Appalachia and include a link to the website. The suggested citation is below:


Also, if you are willing, it would be great if you could share how you plan to use the example. We’re doing some additional work related to innovation configuration maps this year, and it would be valuable to share this information with the team.

Please feel free to reach out if you have any additional questions.

Best,
The REL Appalachia team
Erin,

Learning Forward is pleased to grant you permission to use the following article. We ask that you please ensure that the following citation and credit line appear with the material.

Used with permission of Learning Forward, www.learningforward.org. All rights reserved.


Thank you for your interest in our work.

Christy Colclasure  
Senior Associate, Member Services  
Learning Forward  
The Professional Learning Association  
504 South Locust Street  
Oxford, OH 45056  
513-523-6029 phone  
513-523-0638 fax  
www.learningforward.org
Hi Erin,

You are welcome to use this information. All that I ask is that complete references to the original source be cited throughout.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best wishes,

Tom

---

Thomas R. Guskey, Ph.D.
Professor Emeritus, University of Kentucky
2108 Shelton Road, Lexington, KY 40515 USA
Phone: +1-859-221-0077

www.tguskey.com | Email: guskey@uky.edu | Twitter: @tguskey
APPENDIX G

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS: TABLE 2
Table 2

Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Study Variables (n=57)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( M=43.25, SD=9.53, )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN/MAX=25.0-70.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Binary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to self- describe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college/no degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/Domestic Partnership</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Administrator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Administrator</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicate the extent to which the social justice boot camp met your anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs.
It addressed my anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs completely 17 29.8
It addressed most of my anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs 29 50.9
It addressed some of my anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs 9 15.8
It did not address my anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs 0 0.0
This professional development did not help much because I was already familiar with this topic 2 3.5

Which of the following statements best describes the support that you received from your principal (or other school leader or school-based professional development staff) to participate in the Social Justice Summer Camp?
I did not discuss the professional development with the principal prior to 24 42.1
The principal encouraged me to participate 12 21.1
The principal strongly encouraged me to participate 20 35.1
The principal tried to discourage me from participating 1 1.8

Which of the following statements best describes the Social Justice Summer Camp compared to another professional development participated in during the last 12 months.
This professional development was more useful than other professional development that I have participated in. 44 77.2
This professional development was about the same as other professional development that I have participated in. 9 15.8
This professional development was less useful than other professional development that I have participated in. 2 3.5
I don’t have an opinion. 2 3.5
I don’t have an opinion because I haven’t participated in any other professional development in the last 12 months 0 0.0

Which of the following statements best describes your anti-bias/antiracist self-perception after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp?
I now view myself as anti-bias/anti-racist. 25 4 3.9
It was a good start, but I'm not sure if I'm anti-bias/anti-racist. 7 12.3
It was a good start, and I look forward to becoming more anti-bias/anti-racist 24 42.1
I don’t think I can be anti-bias/anti-racist in my classroom. 0 0.0
It was slightly useful for becoming anti-bias/anti-racist. 1 1.8
APPENDIX H

VARIABLE RECODING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coded as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicate the extent to which the social justice boot camp met your Anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs.</td>
<td>It addressed my Anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It addressed most of my Anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It addressed some of my Anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It did not address my anti-bias/anti-racist professional learning needs.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This professional development did not help much because I was already familiar with this topic.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Coded as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To what extent was The social Justice Camp aligned with your school or district priorities for school improvement?</strong></td>
<td>The professional development was very closely aligned with priorities for instructional improvement</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The professional development was somewhat aligned with goals for instructional improvement.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The professional development was not aligned with priorities for instructional improvement.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The professional development was inconsistent with priorities for instructional improvement.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t know.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coded as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which of the following statements best describes your anti-bias/antiracist self-perception after attending the Social Justice Summer camp?</strong></td>
<td>I now view myself as anti-bias/anti-racist</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was a good start, and I look forward to becoming more anti-bias/anti-racist.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was slightly useful for becoming anti-bias/anti-racist.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was a good start, but I am unsure if I am anti-bias/anti-racist.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Coded as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not think I can be anti-bias/anti-racist in my classroom.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following statements best describes the support that you</td>
<td>The principal strongly encouraged me to participate.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received from your principal (or other school leader or school-based</td>
<td>The principal encouraged me to participate.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional development staff) to participate in the social Justice</td>
<td>The principal tried to discourage me from participating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp?</td>
<td>I did not discuss the professional development with the principal prior</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to participating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following statements best describes the support that you</td>
<td>The principal has encouraged me to apply what I learned in my classroom.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>receive from your principal to apply what you learned in the Social</td>
<td>The principal has encouraged me to apply what I learned in my classroom</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Camp in your classroom?</td>
<td>and has offered to help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The principal has not encouraged me to apply what I learned in my</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classroom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have not discussed what I learned with the principal.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The principal has not encouraged me to apply what I learned in my</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classroom because we are still on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Which of the following statements best describes the Social Justice Summer Camp compared to another professional development participated in during the last 12 months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coded as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This professional development was more useful than other professional development that I have participated in.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This professional development was about the same as other professional development that I have participated in.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This professional development was less useful than other professional development that I have participated in.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have an opinion.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have an opinion because I haven’t participated in any other professional development in the last 12 months</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Coded as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following statement best describes the likelihood that you will apply what you learned in the social Justice camp in your classroom?</td>
<td>I have already applied what I learned in my classroom. I have already applied what I learned in my classroom, and it seemed to work well.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have already applied what I learned in my classroom, but it was not appropriate for my students I look forward to applying what I learned in my classroom in the next few weeks.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I look forward to applying what I learned in my classroom sometime later this year.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to apply what I learned, but I don’t have the materials that I need.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t think that these things will work with my students</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Coded as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following statement best describes the likelihood that you will make changes in your classroom management practices based on what you learned in the Social Justice camp</td>
<td>I have already made classroom management changes based on what I learned in my classroom, and it seemed to work well.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have already made classroom management changes based on what I learned in my classroom, but it was not appropriate for my students.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have already made classroom management changes based on what I learned.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I look forward to making classroom management changes based on what I learned in my classroom in the next few weeks.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I look forward to making classroom management changes based on what I learned in my classroom sometime later this year.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to make classroom management changes based on what I learned, but I don’t have the materials that I need.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t think that these classroom management changes will work with my students.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Coded as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following statements best describes the usefulness of the Social Justice Camp for making anti-bias/anti-racist practice changes?</td>
<td>It was a good start.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was a good start, but I have a lot of questions.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was a good start, and I look forward to using the new ideas in my classroom.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly useful</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was a good start, and the questions I still have are…</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It provided everything I need to use the new ideas in my classroom.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t think that these ideas will work very well in my classroom.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coded as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which of the following statement best describes the changes that took place in your mindset during the Social Justice Summer Camp?</td>
<td>My mindset was changed completely.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My mindset was changed a great deal.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My mindset was changed somewhat.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My mindset was not changed much.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This professional development did not change my mindset at all.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This professional development did not change my mindset because I was already familiar with this topic.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Coded as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Which of the following statement best describes the likelihood that you will make changes in your pedagogical practices based on what you learned in the Social Justice camp?</strong></td>
<td>I have already made pedagogical changes based on what I learned.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have already made pedagogical changes based on what I learned in my classroom, and it seemed to work well.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have already made pedagogical changes based on what I learned in my classroom, but it was not appropriate for my students.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I look forward to making pedagogical changes based on what I learned in my classroom in the next few weeks</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I look forward to making pedagogical changes based on what I learned in my classroom sometime later this year.</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to make pedagogical changes based on what I learned, but I don’t have the materials that I need</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t think that these pedagogical practices will work with my students</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AFTER VARIABLE RECORDING
Educators perceive that the Social Justice Summer Camp met their learning needs

Do not perceive needs met  2  3.5
Do perceive needs met  55  96.5

Educators believe the Social Justice Summer Camp aligned with school improvement efforts

Do not believe aligned  7  12.3
Do believe aligned  50  87.7

Educators perceive that their school leadership supported their attendance of the Social Justice Summer Camp

Do not perceive support  25  43.9
Do perceive support  32  56.1

Educators believe the Social Justice Summer Camp was more useful compared to other professional developments they attended in the last six months.

Do not believe more useful  13  22.8
Do believe more useful  44  77.2

Educators believe they will apply what they learned in the Social Justice Summer Camp.

Do not believe will apply  2  3.5
Do believe will apply  55  96.5

Educators make changes to their classroom management practices after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp

Do not make changes  3  5.3
Do make changes  54  94.7

Educators make changes to their classroom pedagogical practices after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp

Do not make changes  3  5.3
Do make changes  54  94.7

Educators make changes to their mindsets after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp

Do not make changes  18  31.6
Do make changes  39  68.4
Educators view themselves as anti-bias/anti-racist after attending the Social Justice Summer Camp.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not view themselves</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do view themselves</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educators believe their school-based leadership supports them in applying what they learned at the Social Justice Summer Camp

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not believe</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do believe</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>