

SPECIAL ISSUE
Policies and Practices of Promise
in Teacher Evaluation

education policy analysis
archives

A peer-reviewed, independent,
open access, multilingual journal



Arizona State University

Volume 28 Number 56

April 13, 2020

ISSN 1068-2341

**Teacher Accountability, Datafication and Evaluation:
A Case for Reimagining Schooling¹**

Jessica Holloway

Research for Educational Impact (REDI) Centre, Deakin University
Australia

Citation: Holloway, J. (2020). Teacher accountability, datafication, and evaluation: A case for reimagining schooling. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 28(56).

<https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.28.5026> This article is part of the special issue, *Policies and Practices of Promise in Teacher Evaluation*, guest edited by Audrey Amrein-Beardsley.

Abstract: The purpose of this commentary is to push the boundaries (real and perceived) of how we think about teacher accountability, education and the purpose of schooling in contemporary times. It takes as a starting point a view that recent changes to the Every Student Succeeds Act does little to shift the underpinning logics of high-stakes teacher accountability that ultimately threaten the stability and adaptability of public schools. Building from this presumption, it explores more universal features of contemporary schooling practices (e.g., standardization, datafication and evaluation) that undermine

¹ This work was supported by the Australian Research Council [grant number DE190101140]: Jessica Holloway.

teacher expertise, autonomy and professional discretion. The purpose is to provide a new lens for thinking about the role of education and to radically disrupt the ‘norms’ we have come to accept as necessary features of modern schooling. Ultimately, it serves as a thought experiment to provide some space for imagining new possibilities and thinking “outside of” the traditional accountability “box.”

Keywords: accountability; datafication; teacher evaluation; Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

Accountability de los maestros, *datification* y evaluación: Un caso para reinventar la escolarización

Resumen: El propósito de este comentario es ampliar los límites (reales y percibidos) de cómo pensamos acerca de la accountability de los maestros, la educación y el propósito de la educación en los tiempos contemporáneos. Toma como punto de partida una visión de que los cambios recientes a la Every Student Succeeds Act hacen poco para cambiar las lógicas subyacentes de la accountability de los maestros de alto riesgo que en última instancia amenazan la estabilidad y la adaptabilidad de las escuelas públicas. Partiendo de esta presunción, explora características más universales de las prácticas escolares contemporáneas (por ejemplo, estandarización, datos y evaluación) que socavan la experiencia docente, la autonomía y la discreción profesional. El propósito es proporcionar una nueva lente para pensar sobre el papel de la educación y perturbar radicalmente las “normas” que hemos llegado a aceptar como características necesarias de la escuela moderna. En última instancia, sirve como un experimento mental para proporcionar algo de espacio para imaginar nuevas posibilidades y pensar “fuera de” la “caja” de accountability tradicional.

Palabras-clave: Accountability; datafication; evaluación docente; Every Child Succeeds Act (ESSA)

Accountability dos professores, *datification*, e avaliação: Um caso para reinventar a escolarização

Resumo: O objetivo deste comentário é expandir os limites (reais e percebidos) de como pensamos sobre a accountability dos professores, a educação e o objetivo da educação nos tempos contemporâneos. Ele assume como ponto de partida que mudanças recentes na Every Student Succeeds Act pouco contribuem para alterar as lógicas subjacentes da accountability dos professores de alto risco, que acabam ameaçando a estabilidade e a adaptabilidade das escolas. público. Com base nessa premissa, ele explora características mais universais das práticas escolares contemporâneas (por exemplo, padronização, dados e avaliação) que minam a experiência de ensino, a autonomia e a discrição profissional. O objetivo é fornecer uma nova lente para pensar sobre o papel da educação e perturbar radicalmente as “normas” que passamos a aceitar como características necessárias da escola moderna. Por fim, serve como um experimento mental para fornecer algum espaço para imaginar novas possibilidades e pensar “fora” da “caixa” da accountability tradicional.

Palavras-chave: Accountability; datafication; avaliação docente; Every Child Succeeds Act (ESSA)

Teacher Accountability and Evaluation

Three years ago, I left my academic position in the US for one in Australia. While the geographic distance was obviously immense, it was the cultural and professional differences that I found most confronting. Studying teacher accountability in Australia – after many years of living and researching it in the US – was both eye-opening and productive for pushing my thinking around what *is*, and what *might be*, in education. Perhaps most importantly, I realized that what I had come to understand about education policy (particularly teacher accountability) had been shaped by American perspectives, conditions and research. It is no real secret that U.S. education research is notoriously insular, yet I still found myself amazed by the extent to which my ability to comprehend alternative versions of policy were constrained by my previous experiences.

The acceptance of my own naivety led me to question the assumptions I held about education more broadly. Furthermore, I began to consider how I could embrace the discomfort and de-center my understanding of “normal,” in order to re-imagine what might else be possible. With this view in mind, I write the following commentary about the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (i.e., Every Student Succeeds Act [ESSA]). As part of a special issue devoted to re-thinking teacher evaluation under ESSA, I aim to accomplish two things with this commentary.

First, I argue that, while measured critiques of ESSA-related policies and outcomes are critically important (see, for example, Close, Amrein-Beardsley & Collins, 2018), it is equally important to offer alternative critiques that more radically disrupt the accepted norms and logics that we have come to accept as necessary features of modern schooling. To this point, I start by re-situating the teacher evaluation critique within an international landscape. I do this to highlight how focusing narrowly on technical changes to policy and practice (e.g., shifting authority back to the states; minimizing the use of student test scores to measure teacher quality, etc.) limits our capacity to imagine *fundamentally* different versions of schooling. I draw on the growing subfield of “datafication” (Kitchin, 2014; Lupton, 2018; Selwyn, 2015; Williamson, 2017a) to illustrate how evolving and emerging data-related techniques and technologies are dramatically undermining teacher expertise and authority, regardless of changes under ESSA.

Then, I attempt to make a case for why urgent re-articulations of schooling are necessary in present times. I follow calls from scholars who see current trends in education, such as the hyper-focus on standardization, evaluation and datafication of schooling, as contributing to a number of global crises (Hursh, Henderson & Greenwood, 2015; Silova, Komatsu & Rappleye, 2018). Thus, I argue that the present time urgently demands a radical re-thinking of education, not only because of the dangers associated with excessive datafication (described below), but also because of pressing social and political challenges that require collective action.

Datafication of Education

Contemporary teacher accountability systems globally have become rooted in testing, evaluation and dis/incentivization as means for shaping teacher practice and defining teacher ‘quality’ (Berliner 2018; Lingard, 2010; Smith 2016). In the name of equity, student protection, and global competitiveness, high-stakes accountability practices have steadily weakened teacher expertise, authority and professionalism by constraining the capacity for teachers to exercise professional discretion (Bradbury & Roberts-Holmes, 2017; Hardy, 2018; Perryman, 2009). In the US, for example, teachers are not only responsible for complying with multiple strands of standards, including content (e.g., Common Core State Standards), teaching (e.g., InTASC standards), and discipline-specific standards (e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics/English), but they

must also fulfill requirements for evaluation frameworks and rubrics (e.g., Danielson Framework for Teaching) associated with state- and/or federal-level policies (Garver, 2018; Taubman, 2009).

New policy changes, such as those associated with ESSA, minimize some federal controls over teacher evaluation. However, despite these technical changes to accountability, there is a burgeoning market of new digital technologies (e.g., data dashboards, observation apps, etc.) that subject teachers to unprecedented levels of surveillance and control (Buchanan & McPherson, 2019; Lupton & Williamson, 2017). While these technologies are not technically associated with federal policies, they do operate synchronously with such policies because of their data-orientation. One example of such interaction is how digital technologies have provided a platform for schools to engage in the “data-driven” practices that many accountability policies require. Steadily, data-based technologies have become a ubiquitous presence in education (Selwyn, 2015).

A growing subfield of education researchers are calling this the “datafication” of education, where every aspect of schooling, students, teachers, etc., is rendered as data to be collected, analyzed, surveilled, and controlled (Bradbury 2019; Bradbury & Guy-Holmes, 2018; Buchanan & McPherson, 2019; Selwyn, 2015; Williamson, 2017a). The “datafied teacher,” in particular, faces increased pressures to rely on numerical data (e.g., standardized achievement tests, value-added model output) and evaluative tools (e.g., observation rubrics) to guide their pedagogical decisions and classroom practices (Holloway, 2019; Bradbury & Roberts-Holmes, 2017; Hardy, 2018). In these data environments, the “quality” of the teacher is narrowly defined by numbers, while “improvement” is defined as increasing these numbers, rather than improving practice and fostering collaboration (Perryman, 2009; Taubman, 2009).

Similar negative consequences have been extensively studied and attributed to high-stakes testing systems for decades (see Amrein-Beardsley & Berliner, 2011; Hursh, 2008; Taubman, 2009). However, the “datafication” turn marks a distinct impact on the “professional teacher,” as digital data techniques proliferate our reliance on, access to, and ability to capture more data about teachers and their practice than ever before. Datafication scholars suggest that our fundamental understanding of individual people (in this case, teachers) becomes entangled with these data pictures (Lupton & Williamson, 2017; Selwyn, 2015) insofar as a teacher’s data profile begins to supersede the actual teacher as the main site of surveillance and control (Thompson & Cook, 2014).

This shift in focus has significant implications for teacher expertise, authority and accountability. In a broad sense, the datafication of education is increasingly dependent on large datasets and the same logics that “big data” analytics, such as “algorithmic governance” (Beer, 2017; Kitchin, 2014). While not all forms of datafication require large datasets per se, quantifiable measures of performance and predictive analytics are the prevailing features of datafied schools. As such, the types of knowledge that are increasingly accepted as “true” measures of student and teacher performance are constructed not between a teacher and student, but by data engineers sitting at computers, miles away from the classroom. Not only does this third-party involvement undermine teacher professional discretion, it also raises serious questions about (1) how vendors can be held accountability, (2) what sorts of financial and other private interests might conflict with the interests of the public, and (3) how teacher and student data privacy can be ensured.

Despite these potential dangers, datafication is, arguably, an inevitable part of our lives. In fact, most of our social existence is datafied, to some extent, which is only possible because of the data that we ourselves regularly submit to various programs (Lupton, 2018; van Dijck, 2014). In schools, datafication is only made possible because years of ripe conditions have normalized surveillance and the quantification of schooling matters. For example, previous policy infrastructures in the US, such as standardized testing systems and performance monitoring of No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2003), or value-added models and frequent observations of Race to the Top (2009), have put in place material and symbolic conditions that make data collection and monitoring a part

of our everyday practice in schools (Taubman, 2009). Even while specific policies, like NCLB and ESSA, bend and morph over time,² the logics that underpin them, and the infrastructures built to sustain them, enable new techniques and technologies to emerge. What this means is that once ideas and practices become normalized, then new, perhaps more invasive, varieties become possible.

For now, seemingly innocuous technologies, like online data dashboards or popular classroom communication platforms that connect teachers and parents (e.g., ClassDojo; Williamson, 2017b) may not seem that bad. However, recent technologies present additional questions about where the limits of datafication should be drawn. These include, for example, Pakistan experimenting with biometrics to track and reduce teacher absenteeism and China using cameras to allow parents to monitor their child's classroom (UNESCO, 2017). Others include wearable technologies that track student/teacher location, eye-tracking devices that measure engagement, artificial intelligence (AI) that assesses students' work, and so on. While such technologies might seem rather extreme right now, it is important to recognize that these intrusions are only possible because of previous conditions that have normalized surveillance and control.

Simultaneously, imagining alternative versions of our constructed and accepted "reality" becomes very difficult. This presents interesting questions about the degree to which "datafication" might transform education. While fears about constant data surveillance and tracking might be easily dismissed as dystopian, it is worth considering how ideas and technologies adapt from known and accepted norms.

Re-imagining Education

The prevalence of numbers, metrics and data within education is consistent with modern, Westernized views of "what counts" as knowledge more broadly (Silova, 2019; Sterling et al., 2018). There is an epistemological and ontological view that our problems and solutions of the world can be understood through statistical calculations (see Gorur, 2014). Criticizing this view, Silova, Komatsu, and Rappleye (2018) boldly asserted that:

As we prepare to face the climate change catastrophe, we need to radically rethink our starting assumptions about modern mass schooling – ones rooted in the 'modernist Western paradigm' (Sterling et al., 2018) – and consider whether education is in fact a solution or a cause of the trouble we now face (2018, n.p.).

They, like many critical scholars, have argued that we are in a moment of crisis that demands urgent, collective action (Hursh, et al., 2015; Komatsu, Rappleye & Silova, 2019; Subedi & Daza, 2008). Issues like climate change, the rise of populism, far-right extremism, white supremacy, and so on, require collective efforts that are thoroughly incompatible with values like individualism, competition, standardization, and rapid, endless growth, which currently characterize education. Schools might seem like an unlikely site to address these problems, but, historically, schools are where values-based debates have been fought (see, for example, Au, 2008; Carlson & Apple, 1999; Giroux, 1992).

Relevant here are modes of datafication that threaten to not only dismantle education as a public good, but exacerbate the crises that democracies face on a global scale (see Zuboff, 2018 on the effects of datafication on the global economy). Thus, I urge readers who are interested in understanding the implications of ESSA (or any policy) to not automatically accept that we must remain within a data-thinking bubble (see also Hursh et al., 2015). For example, there is a growing number of educators who call for not only teaching about the environment, but to use the ethos of

² Even in the US, some states are beginning to reduce their reliance on rigid, test-based accountability to measure teacher performance (see Ross & Walsh, 2019).

sustainability to re-imagine what schools might look like. Borrowing from Holt's (2002) original call for "slow schools" (based on the "slow food" movement), some educators are rejecting the idea that education should only be about economic utility at the expense of working collectively to solve environmental and other social problems (Mortlock, 2018; Tanti, n.d.; Wilby, 2019). From "Forest Schools" in Scandinavia, to "Enviroschools" in New Zealand and "Bush Kinders" in Australia, we have numerous examples of how education can privilege natural surroundings and resources over standardized classroom materials and environments (Alcock & Ritchie, 2018; Sandseter & Lysklett 2017).

To do this, we can, and should, look to paradigms (e.g., Indigenous knowledges, de-colonizing theories, spiritual traditions, etc.) that offer alternative, socially-just, and democratically-oriented imaginaries of schooling. Rather than romanticize the past or assume that we ever truly had socially just schools, I ask that we look forward to imagine what schools might look like if we were to *completely abandon* our fixation on the standardization, datafication and evaluation. Admittedly, this is not pragmatic, nor is it intended to offer a simple solution. Rather, it is meant as an invitation to consider how might education be reimagined if we saw the "datafied" onto-epistemic paradigm (see Lupton, 2018) for what it is—a single framework that has, in many ways, trapped our way of thinking about what school *is*, and what it *can be*.

References

- Alcock, S., & Ritchie, J. (2018). Early childhood education in the outdoors in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education*, 21(1), 77-88.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s42322-017-0009-y>
- Au, W. (2008). Between education and the economy: High-stakes testing and the contradictory location of the new middle class. *Journal of Education Policy*, 23(5), 501-513.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930802148941>
- Beer, D. (2017). The social power of algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(1), 1-13.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2016.1216147>
- Bradbury, A. (2019). Datafied at four: the role of data in the 'schoolification' of early childhood education in England. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 44(1), 7-21.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2018.1511577>
- Bradbury, A., & Roberts-Holmes, G. (2017). *The Datafication of Primary and Early Years Education: Playing with Numbers*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315279053>
- Buchanan, R., & McPherson, A. (2019). Teachers and learners in a time of big data. *Journal of Philosophy in Schools*, 6(1).
- Carlson, D., & Apple, M. (1999). *Power/knowledge/pedagogy: The meaning of democratic education in unsettling times*. Westview Press.
- Close, K., Amrein-Beardsley, A., & Collins, C. (2018). State-level assessments and teacher evaluation systems after the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act: Some steps in the right direction. Nation Education Policy Center (NEPC). Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/state-assessment>
- Foucault, Michel. (2003). *The Essential Foucault: Selections from Essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984*. The New Press.
- Garver, R. (2019). Evaluative relationships: teacher accountability and professional culture. *Journal of Education Policy*, 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2019.1566972>
- Giroux, H. A. (1992). Educational leadership and the crisis of democratic government. *Educational Researcher*, 21(4), 4-11. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X021004004>

- Gorur, R. (2014). Towards a sociology of measurement in education policy. *European Educational Research Journal*, 13(1), 58-72. <https://doi.org/10.2304/eej.2014.13.1.58>
- Hardy, I. (2018). Governing teacher learning: understanding teachers' compliance with and critique of standardization. *Journal of Education Policy*, 33(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1325517>
- Holloway, J. (2019). Teacher evaluation as an onto-epistemic framework. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 40(2), 174-189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2018.1514291>
- Hursh, D. (2008). *High-stakes testing and the decline of teaching and learning*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hursh, D., Henderson, J., & Greenwood, D. (2015). Environmental education in a neoliberal climate. *Environmental Education Research*, 21(3), 299-318. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2015.1018141>
- Kitchin, R. (2014). Big Data, new epistemologies and paradigm shifts. *Big Data & Society*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951714528481>
- Komatsu, H., Rappleye, J., & Silova, I. (2019). Culture and the Independent Self: Obstacles to environmental sustainability? *Anthropocene*, 26: 1-13. 100198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ancene.2019.100198>
- Lingard, B. (2010). Policy borrowing, policy learning: Testing times in Australian schooling. *Critical Studies in Education*, 51(2), 129-147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508481003731026>
- Lupton, D. (2018). How do data come to matter? Living and becoming with personal data. *Big Data & Society*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951718786314>
- Lupton, D., & Williamson, B. (2017). The datified child: The dataveillance of children and implications for their rights. *New Media & Society*, 19(5), 780-794. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816686328>
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115 Stat. 1425. (2002). Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02/>
- Perryman, J. (2009). Inspection and the fabrication of professional and performative processes. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(5), 611-631. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930903125129>
- Ross, E., & Walsh, K. (2019). *State of the States 2019: Teacher and Principal Evaluation Policy*. National Council on Teacher Quality.
- Sandseter, E. B. H., & Lysklett, O. B. (2017). Outdoor education in the Nordic region. In C. Ringsmose & G. Kragh-Müller (Eds.), *Nordic social pedagogical approach to early years* (pp. 115–132). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-42557-3_7
- Silova, I., Komatsu, H., & Rappleye, J. (2018). Facing the climate change catastrophe: Education as solution or cause? [Blog post]. *Network for International Policies and Cooperation in Education and Training (NORRAG)*. Available at: <https://www.norrag.org/facing-the-climate-change-catastrophe-education-as-solution-or-cause-by-iveta-silova-hikaru-komatsu-and-jeremy-rappleye/>
- Subedi, B., & Daza, S. L. (2008). The possibilities of postcolonial praxis in education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 11(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613320701845731>
- Takayama, K., Sriprakash, A., & Connell, R. (2017). Toward a postcolonial comparative and international education. *Comparative Education Review*, 61(S1), S1-S24. <https://doi.org/10.1086/690455>
- Taubman, P. M. (2010). *Teaching by numbers: Deconstructing the discourse of standards and accountability in education*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203879511>
- Thompson, G., & Cook, I. (2014). Manipulating the data: Teaching and NAPLAN in the control society. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 35(1), 129-142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2012.739472>

- Van Dijck, J. (2014). Datafication, dataism and dataveillance: Big Data between scientific paradigm and ideology. *Surveillance & Society*, 12(2), 197-208.
<https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v12i2.4776>
- Wilby, P. (2019). Eton master who wants pupils to learn very slowly. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2019/aug/13/eton-master-wants-pupils-learn-slow-education-mike-grenier>
- Williamson, B. (2017a). *Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice*. Sage.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781529714920>
- Williamson, B. (2017b). Learning in the 'platform society': Disassembling an educational data assemblage. *Research in Education*, 98(1), 59-82.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0034523717723389>

About the Author

Jessica Holloway

Research for Educational Impact (REDI) Centre at Deakin University (Melbourne, Australia)

Jessica.holloway@deakin.edu.au

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9267-3197>

Jessica Holloway, Ph.D. is an Australian Research Council DECRA Fellow within the Research for Educational Impact (REDI) Centre at Deakin University (Melbourne, Australia). Her DECRA project, entitled “The Role of Teacher Expertise, Authority and Professionalism in Education,” investigates the role of education in modern democratic societies, with a particular focus on teachers and teacher expertise. Her work has appeared in journals such as the *Journal of Education Policy* and *Critical Studies in Education*. She is currently writing a book called *Metrics, Standards and Alignment in Teacher Policy: Critiquing Fundamentalism and Imagining Pluralism* (Springer, 2020).

About the Guest Editor

Audrey Amrein-Beardsley

Arizona State University

audrey.beardsley@asu.edu

Audrey Amrein-Beardsley, PhD., is a Professor in the Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. Her research focuses on the use of value-added models (VAMs) in and across states before and since the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). More specifically, she is conducting validation studies on multiple system components, as well as serving as an expert witness in many legal cases surrounding the (mis)use of VAM-based output.

SPECIAL ISSUE
Policies and Practices of Promise
in Teacher Evaluation

education policy analysis archives

Volume 28 Number 56

April 13, 2020

ISSN 1068-2341



Readers are free to copy, display, distribute, and adapt this article, as long as the work is attributed to the author(s) and **Education Policy Analysis Archives**, the changes are identified, and the same license applies to the derivative work. More details of this Creative Commons license are available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/2.0/>. **EPAA** is published by the Mary Lou Fulton Institute and Graduate School of Education at Arizona State University. Articles are indexed in CIRC (Clasificación Integrada de Revistas Científicas, Spain), DIALNET (Spain), [Directory of Open Access Journals](#), EBSCO Education Research Complete, ERIC, Education Full Text (H.W. Wilson), QUALIS A1 (Brazil), SCImago Journal Rank, SCOPUS, SOCOLAR (China).

Please send errata notes to Audrey Amrein-Beardsley at audrey.beardsley@asu.edu

Join **EPAA's Facebook community** at <https://www.facebook.com/EPAAAPE> and **Twitter feed** @epaa_aape.

education policy analysis archives
editorial board

Lead Editor: **Audrey Amrein-Beardsley** (Arizona State University)

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Associate Editors: **Melanie Bertrand, David Carlson, Lauren Harris, Eugene Judson, Mirka Koro-Ljungberg, Daniel Liou, Scott Marley, Molly Ott, Iveta Silova** (Arizona State University)

Cristina Alfaro
San Diego State University

Gary Anderson
New York University

Michael W. Apple
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Jeff Bale
University of Toronto, Canada
Aaron Bevenot SUNY Albany

David C. Berliner
Arizona State University
Henry Braun Boston College

Casey Cobb
University of Connecticut

Arnold Danzig
San Jose State University
Linda Darling-Hammond
Stanford University

Elizabeth H. DeBray
University of Georgia

David E. DeMatthews
University of Texas at Austin

Chad d'Entremont Rennie Center
for Education Research & Policy

John Diamond
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Matthew Di Carlo
Albert Shanker Institute

Sherman Dorn
Arizona State University

Michael J. Dumas
University of California, Berkeley

Kathy Escamilla
University of Colorado, Boulder

Yariv Feniger Ben-Gurion
University of the Negev

Melissa Lynn Freeman
Adams State College

Rachael Gabriel
University of Connecticut

Amy Garrett Dikkers University
of North Carolina, Wilmington

Gene V Glass
Arizona State University

Ronald Glass University of
California, Santa Cruz

Jacob P. K. Gross
University of Louisville
Eric M. Haas WestEd

Julian Vasquez Heilig California
State University, Sacramento
Kimberly Kappler Hewitt
University of North Carolina
Greensboro

Aimee Howley Ohio University

Steve Klees University of Maryland

Jaekyung Lee SUNY Buffalo

Jessica Nina Lester

Indiana University
Amanda E. Lewis University of
Illinois, Chicago

Chad R. Lochmiller Indiana
University

Christopher Lubienski Indiana
University

Sarah Lubienski Indiana University

William J. Mathis
University of Colorado, Boulder

Michele S. Moses
University of Colorado, Boulder

Julianne Moss
Deakin University, Australia

Sharon Nichols
University of Texas, San Antonio

Eric Parsons
University of Missouri-Columbia

Amanda U. Potterton
University of Kentucky

Susan L. Robertson
Bristol University

Gloria M. Rodriguez
University of California, Davis

R. Anthony Rolle
University of Houston

A. G. Rud
Washington State University

Patricia Sánchez University of
University of Texas, San Antonio

Janelle Scott University of
California, Berkeley

Jack Schneider University of
Massachusetts Lowell

Noah Sobe Loyola University

Nelly P. Stromquist
University of Maryland

Benjamin Superfine
University of Illinois, Chicago

Adai Tefera
Virginia Commonwealth University

A. Chris Torres
Michigan State University

Tina Trujillo
University of California, Berkeley

Federico R. Waitoller
University of Illinois, Chicago

Larisa Warhol
University of Connecticut

John Weathers University of
Colorado, Colorado Springs

Kevin Welner
University of Colorado, Boulder

Terrence G. Wiley
Center for Applied Linguistics

John Willinsky
Stanford University

Jennifer R. Wolgemuth
University of South Florida

Kyo Yamashiro
Claremont Graduate University

Miri Yemini
Tel Aviv University, Israel

archivos analíticos de políticas educativas
consejo editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editores Asociados: **Felicitas Acosta** (Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento), **Armando Alcántara Santuario** (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México), **Ignacio Barrenechea**, **Jason Beech** (Universidad de San Andrés), **Angelica Buendia**, (Metropolitan Autonomous University), **Alejandra Falabella** (Universidad Alberto Hurtado, Chile), **Carmuca Gómez-Bueno** (Universidad de Granada), **Veronica Gottau** (Universidad Torcuato Di Tella), **Carolina Guzmán-Valenzuela** (Universidade de Chile), **Antonia Lozano-Díaz** (University of Almería), **Antonio Luzon**, (Universidad de Granada), **María Teresa Martín Palomo** (University of Almería), **María Fernández Mellizo-Soto** (Universidad Complutense de Madrid), **Tiburcio Moreno** (Autonomous Metropolitan University-Cuajimalpa Unit), **José Luis Ramírez**, (Universidad de Sonora), **Axel Rivas** (Universidad de San Andrés), **César Lorenzo Rodríguez Uribe** (Universidad Marista de Guadalajara), **Maria Veronica Santelices** (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile)

Claudio Almonacid

Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación, Chile

Miguel Ángel Arias Ortega

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México

Xavier Besalú Costa

Universitat de Girona, España

Xavier Bonal Sarro

Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, España

Antonio Bolívar Boitia

Universidad de Granada, España

José Joaquín Brunner

Universidad Diego Portales, Chile

Damián Canales Sánchez

Instituto Nacional para la Evaluación de la Educación, México

Gabriela de la Cruz Flores

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

Marco Antonio Delgado Fuentes

Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Inés Dussel, DIE-CINVESTAV,

México

Pedro Flores Crespo

Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Ana María García de Fanelli

Centro de Estudios de Estado y Sociedad (CEDES) CONICET, Argentina

Juan Carlos González Faraco

Universidad de Huelva, España

María Clemente Linuesa

Universidad de Salamanca, España

Jaume Martínez Bonafé

Universitat de València, España

Alejandro Márquez Jiménez

Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, UNAM, México

María Guadalupe Olivier Tellez,

Universidad Pedagógica Nacional, México

Miguel Pereyra

Universidad de Granada, España

Mónica Pini

Universidad Nacional de San Martín, Argentina

Omar Orlando Pulido Chaves

Instituto para la Investigación Educativa y el Desarrollo Pedagógico (IDEP)

José Ignacio Rivas Flores

Universidad de Málaga, España

Miriam Rodríguez Vargas

Universidad Autónoma de Tamaulipas, México

José Gregorio Rodríguez

Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Colombia

Mario Rueda Beltrán Instituto de Investigaciones sobre la Universidad y la Educación, UNAM, México

José Luis San Fabián Maroto

Universidad de Oviedo, España

Jurjo Torres Santomé, Universidad

de la Coruña, España

Yengny Marisol Silva Laya

Universidad Iberoamericana, México

Ernesto Treviño Ronzón

Universidad Veracruzana, México

Ernesto Treviño Villarreal

Universidad Diego Portales Santiago, Chile

Antoni Verger Planells

Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, España

Catalina Wainerman

Universidad de San Andrés, Argentina

Juan Carlos Yáñez Velazco

Universidad de Colima, México

arquivos analíticos de políticas educativas
conselho editorial

Editor Consultor: **Gustavo E. Fischman** (Arizona State University)

Editoras Associadas: **Andréa Barbosa Gouveia** (Universidade Federal do Paraná), **Kaizo Iwakami Beltrao**, (Brazilian School of Public and Private Management - EBAPE/FGV), **Sheizi Calheira de Freitas** (Federal University of Bahia), **Maria Margarida Machado**, (Federal University of Goiás / Universidade Federal de Goiás), **Gilberto José Miranda**, (Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brazil), **Marcia Pletsch** (Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro), **Maria Lúcia Rodrigues Muller** (Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso e Science), **Sandra Regina Sales** (Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro)

Almerindo Afonso

Universidade do Minho
Portugal

Alexandre Fernandez Vaz

Universidade Federal de Santa
Catarina, Brasil

José Augusto Pacheco

Universidade do Minho, Portugal

Rosanna Maria Barros Sá

Universidade do Algarve
Portugal

Regina Célia Linhares Hostins

Universidade do Vale do Itajaí,
Brasil

Jane Paiva

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Maria Helena Bonilla

Universidade Federal da Bahia
Brasil

Alfredo Macedo Gomes

Universidade Federal de Pernambuco
Brasil

Paulo Alberto Santos Vieira

Universidade do Estado de Mato
Grosso, Brasil

Rosa Maria Bueno Fischer

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Jefferson Mainardes

Universidade Estadual de Ponta
Grossa, Brasil

Fabiany de Cássia Tavares Silva

Universidade Federal do Mato
Grosso do Sul, Brasil

Alice Casimiro Lopes

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Jader Janer Moreira Lopes

Universidade Federal Fluminense e
Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora,
Brasil

António Teodoro

Universidade Lusófona
Portugal

Suzana Feldens Schwertner

Centro Universitário Univates
Brasil

Debora Nunes

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Norte, Brasil

Lílian do Valle

Universidade do Estado do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Geovana Mendonça Lunardi

Mendes Universidade do Estado de
Santa Catarina

Alda Junqueira Marin

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de
São Paulo, Brasil

Alfredo Veiga-Neto

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande
do Sul, Brasil

Flávia Miller Naethe Motta

Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de
Janeiro, Brasil

Dalila Andrade Oliveira

Universidade Federal de Minas
Gerais, Brasil