

# LAWRENCE PUBLIC SCHOOLS EQUITY IMPACT ANALYSIS TOOL

<b>BUDGET PROPOSAL OPTION</b>	
<b>PARTICIPANTS ENGAGED IN EQUITY IMPACT ANALYSIS</b>	
<b>DATE</b>	

**Directions for Engaging in Discussions:** Once you are in your groups, select a chairperson, secretary, and review the Courageous Conversations Four Agreements used by USD 497 to engage in dialogue associated with race, equity, and inclusion.

## COURAGEOUS CONVERSATIONS FOUR AGREEMENTS:

1. Stay Engaged
2. Experience Discomfort
3. Speak Your Truth
4. Expect/Accept Non-Closure

Copyright © 2006 Corwin Press

## MIDWEST & PLAINS EQUITY ASSISTANCE CENTER (MAP CENTER) INTRODUCTION:

**Educational Equity**—when educational policies, practices, interactions, and resources are **representative of**, constructed by, and responsive to all people so that each individual has **access to, meaningfully participates in**, and has **positive outcomes** from high-quality learning experiences, regardless of individual characteristics and group membership. (Fraser, 2008; Great Lakes Equity Center, 2012, p.2).

The **MAP Center** advocates that policymakers, educators, and stakeholders in education systems engage in critical reflection regarding equity implications associated with continuous improvement to ensure that every step of the continuous improvement process—from vision creation, stakeholder engagement, needs assessment, goal creation, strategy formation, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting—centers the four constructs of equity.

## CENTERING EDUCATIONAL EQUITY IN DECISION-MAKING DISCUSSION FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL RATIONALE/EXPLANATION AND EVIDENCE

The following is a framework for identifying and analyzing equity implications of decisions made at various levels of the educational system. The purpose of the framework is to assist stakeholders in engaging in reflection and conversations related to the agency's role in leading a vision for educational equity that is inclusive of, but beyond the goal of "closing the achievement gap," towards realizing equitable learning opportunities for all. Centering equity and being able to recognize, name and address the history of systemic racism and oppression in the US is inclusive, not divisive (GLEC, 2021).

**To prepare for critical reflection on proposals, consider the following key framing questions:**

1. What is the intent behind the policy/proposal being reviewed?
2. Who will benefit from the proposed changes and who will not? (Freire, 1998)
3. Who is unintentionally being de-centered and/or marginalized?

**For each equity construct:**

1. Rate the extent to which the decision being reviewed centers the construct.
2. Provide a rationale statement to support your rating, as well as evidence.

**Charge: Use this framework to analyze the proposal through the lens of the four equity constructs. Write a response for each construct.**

<b>Rate the extent to which the proposal provides/ensures (Rationale/Explanation and Evidence):</b>	<b>To A Great Extent</b>	<b>Somewhat</b>	<b>Very Little</b>	<b>Not At All</b>
<p><b>Access</b> – All members of the educational community have entrance into, involvement with, and full participation of resources, conversations, initiatives, and choices, which are attentive to heritage and community practices (Paris, 2012).</p> <p><b>Key Considerations:</b> As a result of this proposal, who has/does not have access to... ?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High Yield Instructional Strategies</li> <li>• Appropriate, Responsive Supports</li> <li>• Culturally Sustaining Materials and Resources</li> <li>• Highly Qualified Teachers</li> <li>• Curriculum that Represents Them</li> <li>• Physically and Emotionally Safe Environment</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Representation</b> – Providing and having adequate presence of all when decision and choice making, as to examine the patterns of underlying beliefs, practices, policies, structures and norms that may marginalize specific groups and limit opportunity (Mulligan &amp; Kozleski, 2009; Chen et al, 2014).</p> <p><b>Key Considerations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the context in which the proposal is operating?</li> <li>• What perspectives, beliefs, assumptions, questions, and expectations are (not) represented in the proposed changes?</li> </ul>				
<p><b>Meaningful Participation</b> – Agency and voice are afforded to all members of a community, by intentionally centering members who have been historically on the margins including, but not limited to people living in under-resourced communities, people with dis/abilities, as well as racially, ethnically, and linguistically diverse individuals. Multiple perspectives are pursued and valued (Fraser, 1998).</p> <p><b>Key Considerations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who participates in framing the proposal?</li> <li>• Who does/does not participate in the proposal evaluation process?</li> </ul>				
<p><b>High Outcomes</b> – Efficacy of solutions benefit all towards self-determination and the ability to act as contributing citizens in a democratic society and global community.</p> <p><b>Key Considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the anticipated outcomes and/or consequences of our actions?</li> <li>• To what extent are the interests of dominant groups (i.e., people of Color, people with dis/abilities, people who identify as LGBTQ+, English learners, people living in disinvested communities), being served well by the proposal?</li> <li>• Which groups' interests are not being served well or are not considered by the proposal's intended outcomes?</li> </ul>				