



**International  
Cooperation in Education**

A liaison office at DIPF

# **Education in the Digital Age**

International Session at the 2020 AERA Annual Meeting

**Theme:**

**The Power and Possibilities for the Public Good  
When Researchers and Organizational  
Stakeholders Collaborate**

© April 2020

DIPF | Leibniz Institute for Research and  
Information in Education  
Rostocker Straße 6  
60323 Frankfurt am Main  
Phone +49 (0) 69.24708 - 735  
Fax +49 (0) 69.24708 - 328  
E-Mail: [cooperation@dipf.de](mailto:cooperation@dipf.de)  
<http://www.dipf.de>

## Content

<b>Agenda</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Panel Discussion: Education in the Digital Age. Perspectives from the U.S. and Germany</b>	<b>14</b>
<i>Joann Halpern</i>	
<b>Educational technology in Germany: Discourses and practices</b>	<b>15</b>
<i>Felicitas Macgilchrist</i>	
<b>Table 1</b>	
<b>Digitalization and Educational Measurement in Schools</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Digitalization and Educational Measurement in Schools: Introduction</b>	<b>17</b>
<i>Nina Jude and Jeanette Ziehm</i>	
<b>Handling data in instructional practice: Students' system feedback processing</b>	<b>19</b>
<i>Sieglinde Jornitz and Ben Mayer</i>	
<b>HPI's School Cloud: Digitally Optimizing Teaching and Learning</b>	<b>21</b>
<i>Joann Halpern</i>	
<b>Using Mobile Phones in Assessments: Examples from the United States</b>	<b>22</b>
<i>Fusun Sahin</i>	
<b>Digitalization and Survey Methodology in Schools</b>	<b>23</b>
<i>Juanita Hicks</i>	
<b>Table 2</b>	
<b>The Relationship between School Principals and Supervisory Authorities in the Context of Current Reform-Related Developments: An International Comparison</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Design-based School Improvement in Germany. Potentials of Research-Policy-Practice-Partnerships</b>	<b>27</b>
<i>Nina Bremm and Rick Mintrop</i>	

<b>Lost in translation – institutional logics and their effects on? The cooperation between school authority and school leaders</b>	<b>29</b>
<i>David Kemethofer and Livia Jesacher-Rößler</i>	
<b>Cooperation at a Regional Level – School Supervisory Authority and School Principals in the Thicket of Institutional Environments</b>	<b>31</b>
<i>Joel Malin and Donald Hackmann</i>	
<b>Leadership for College and Career Readiness: Presenting a Theoretical Framework</b>	<b>32</b>
<i>Donald G. Hackmann and Joel R. Malin</i>	
<b>The Relationship between School Principals and School Supervisory Authorities in the context of reform processes – a Dutch perspective</b>	<b>35</b>
<i>Annemarie Neeleman, Pascal Scholtius and Henrietta Steuten</i>	
<b>Table 3</b>	
<b>Educational (In-)Equity – Comparative Perspectives on Cultures of Schooling in Germany and the USA</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Negotiating racism in the classroom – comparative analyses in German and US Schools</b>	<b>39</b>
<i>Merle Hummrich and Dorothee Schwendowius</i>	
<b>Constructing Differences in Inclusive Teaching – Comparing Germany and the USA</b>	<b>41</b>
<i>Tanja Sturm and Benjamin Wagener</i>	
<b>Leadership for Educational Equity in Schools Serving Disadvantaged Communities in Germany and the USA</b>	<b>43</b>
<i>Esther Dominique Klein and Hanna Bronnert-Härle</i>	
<b>Table 4</b>	
<b>Defining Refugees and Refugee Education</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Moving beyond methodological nationalism to develop a transnational perspective on the educational pathways of displaced and dispossessed migrant youth</b>	<b>47</b>
<i>William Perez</i>	

<b>Refugee youths' educational and social participation: An ethnographic inquiry</b>	<b>48</b>
<i>Dilek Kayaalp</i>	
<b>Pensando en Rosa y los Otros Alumnos Transnacionales de Varios Perfiles que Encontrábamos en Mexico (Thinking About Rosa and Various Other Transnational Students We Have Encountered in Mexico)</b>	<b>49</b>
<i>Edmund T. Hamann</i>	
<b>New American Refugees: A case study of how a community of Nepali-speaking Bhutanese families experience school and educational policy in the Northeast</b>	<b>50</b>
<i>Cynthia Reyes, Hemant Ghising and Shana J. Haines</i>	
<b>Temporalities of Refugee Identity and Education</b>	<b>51</b>
<i>Amberley Middleton</i>	
<b>Gender differences in vocational interests: A comparison between native born, migrant and refugee adolescents</b>	<b>52</b>
<i>Florian G. Hartmann, Jutta von Maurice and Dominik Weigand</i>	
<b>Table 5</b>	
<b>Training Teachers to Educate Refugee and Humanitarian Migrant Youth</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Exemplary Practices of New Zealand Teachers Preparing Refugee Youth for Resettlement: The First Six Weeks</b>	<b>55</b>
<i>Jody McBrien</i>	
<b>Teachers coping with cultural diversity: Case studies on assessment practices, challenges and experiences in Austrian secondary schools</b>	<b>56</b>
<i>Herbert Altrichter, Katharina Soukup-Altrichter, Barbara Herzog-Punzenberger and Magdalena Fellner</i>	
<b>Change of curricula, teacher educators and support measures – how initial teacher education in Europe should be able to cope with (humanitarian) migrant students</b>	<b>58</b>
<i>Barbara Herzog-Punzenberger</i>	

<b>Training Teachers to Educate Refugee and Humanitarian Migrant Youth</b>	<b>59</b>
<i>Jihae Cha, Min Choi</i>	
<b>Isolating or Inclusive? Educating refugee youth in the United States</b>	<b>61</b>
<i>Jill Koyama</i>	
<b>Educating Newcomer Immigrant &amp; Refugee Youth in U.S. Schools</b>	<b>62</b>
<i>Monisha Bajaj</i>	
<b>Radical Acceptance: A framework for preparing teachers to support students with refugee and asylum seeker backgrounds</b>	<b>63</b>
<i>Maura Sellers</i>	
<b>Table 6</b>	
<b>Individuality and Responsibility: Challenges for Young People</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Fridays for Future: Determinants for Engagement on behalf of Sustainability</b>	<b>66</b>
<i>Janne Fengler, Stefanie Greubel and Jost Schieren</i>	
<b>Intentions and practices of Waldorf teachers in main lessons: creating educational practice that prepare pupils for being in the world in a ‘grown-up’ way</b>	<b>68</b>
<i>Aziza Mayo</i>	
<b>Social Emotional Learning Examined Through the Lens of One Urban Public Waldorf School</b>	<b>70</b>
<i>Ida Obermann</i>	
<b>Care Ethics in Teacher Preparation through Action Research</b>	<b>72</b>
<i>Colette Rabin</i>	
<b>CV’s</b>	<b>73</b>

## Agenda

12:00 – 12:30	<b>Panel Discussion: Education in the Digital Age. Perspectives from the U.S. and Germany</b>
Chair:	Annika Wilmers (DIPF   Frankfurt, Germany)
Speakers:	<b>Utilizing Technology to Humanize Learning: Perspectives from the U.S</b> <i>Joann Halpern (Hasso Plattner Institute, New York, USA)</i> <b>Educational technology in Germany: Discourses and practices</b> <i>Felicitas Macgilchrist (Georg Eckert Institute &amp; University of Göttingen, Germany)</i>

### 12:30 – 2:00          Six Parallel Roundtables

Table 1	<b>Digitalization and Educational Measurement in Schools</b>
Chairs:	Nina Jude and Jeanette Ziehm (DIPF   Frankfurt)
	<b>Digitalization and Educational Measurement in Schools: Introduction</b> <i>Nina Jude, Jeanette Ziehm (DIPF   Frankfurt)</i>
	<b>Handling data in instructional practice: Students' system feedback processing</b> <i>Sieglinde Jornitz, Ben Mayer (DIPF   Frankfurt)</i>
	<b>HPI's School Cloud: Digitally Optimizing Teaching and Learning</b> <i>Joann Halpern (Hasso Plattner Institute, New York)</i>
	<b>Using Mobile Phones in Assessments: Examples from the United States</b> <i>Fusun Sahin (American Institutes for Research, USA)</i>
	<b>Digitalization and Survey Methodology in Schools</b> <i>Juanita Hicks (American Institutes for Research, USA)</i>

<p><b>Table 2    The Relationship between School Principals and Supervisory Authorities in the Context of Current Reform-Related Developments : An International Comparison</b></p> <p>Chair:     Barbara Muslic (Freie Universität Berlin, Germany)</p>
<p><b>Design-based School Improvement in Germany. Potentials of Research-Policy-Practice-Partnerships</b>  <i>Nina Bremm (Pädagogische Hochschule Zürich, Switzerland), Rick Mintrop (University of California, Berkeley, USA)</i></p> <p><b>Lost in translation – institutional logics and their effects on? the cooperation between school authority and school leaders</b>  <i>David Kemethofer (Pädagogische Hochschule, Linz, Austria), Livia Jesacher-Rößler (Universität Innsbruck, Austria)</i></p> <p><b>Cooperation at a Regional Level – School Supervisory Authority and School Principals in the Thicket of Institutional Environments</b>  <i>Joel Malin (Miami University, USA), Donald Hackmann (Iowa State University, USA)</i></p> <p><b>The Relationship between School Principals and School Supervisory Authorities in the context of reform processes – a Dutch perspective</b>  <i>Annemarie Neeleman (CVO Rotterdam, The Netherlands), Pascal Scholtius, Henrietta Steuten (Comenius College Rotterdam, The Netherlands)</i></p> <p>Discussant: Barbara Muslic (Freie Universität Berlin, Germany)</p>

<p><b>Table 3    Educational (In-)Equity – Comparative Perspectives on Cultures of Schooling in Germany and the USA</b></p> <p>Chair:     Rick Mintrop (University of Berkeley, USA)</p>
<p><b>Negotiating Racism in the classroom – comparative analyses in German and US Schools</b>  <i>Merle Hummrich (Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Germany), Dorothee Schwendowius (Otto-von-Guericke-Universität Magdeburg, Germany)</i></p>



**Constructing Differences in Inclusive Teaching – Comparing Germany and the USA**

*Tanja Sturm (Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Germany), Benjamin Wagener (Universität Münster, Germany)*

**Leadership for Educational Equity in Schools Serving Disadvantaged Communities in Germany and the USA**

*Esther Dominique Klein (Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck, Austria), Hanna Bronnert-Härle (University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany)*

Discussant: *Julie Allen (University of Birmingham, UK)*

**Table 4 Defining Refugees and Refugee Education**

Chair: Alexander W. Wiseman (Texas Tech University, USA)

**Moving beyond methodological nationalism to develop a transnational perspective on the educational pathways of displaced and dispossessed migrant youth**

*William Perez (Loyola Marymount University, USA)*

**Refugee youths' educational and social participation: An ethnographic inquiry**

*Dilek Kayaalp (University of North Florida, USA)*

**Pensando en Rosa y los Otros Alumnos Transnacionales de Varios Perfiles que Encontrábamos en Mexico (Thinking About Rosa and Various Other Transnational Students We Have Encountered in Mexico)**

*Edmund T. Hamann (University of Nebraska-Lincoln, USA)*

**New American Refugees: A case study of how a community of Nepali-speaking Bhutanese families experience school and educational policy in the Northeast**

*Cynthia Reyes, Hemant Ghising, Shana J. Haines (University of Vermont, USA )*

**Temporalities of Refugee Identity and Education**

*Amberley Middleton (Cambridge University, UK)*

**Gender differences in vocational interests: A comparison between**

**native born, migrant and refugee adolescents**

*Florian G. Hartmann (University of the Bundeswehr Munich, Germany),  
Jutta von Maurice, Dominik Weigand (Leibniz Institute for Educational  
Trajectories, University of Bamberg, Germany)*

**Table 5 Training Teachers to Educate Refugee and Humanitarian  
Migrant Youth**

Chair: Lisa Damaschke-Deitrick (Lehigh University, USA)

**Exemplary Practices of New Zealand Teachers Preparing Refugee  
Youth for Resettlement: The First Six Weeks**

*Jody McBrien (University of South Florida, USA)*

**Teachers coping with cultural diversity: Case studies on  
assessment practices, challenges and experiences in Austrian  
secondary schools**

*Herbert Altrichter, Katharina Soukup-Altrichter, Barbara Herzog-  
Punzenberger, Magdalena Fellner (Johannes Kepler University Linz,  
University of Education Upper Austria, University of Innsbruck, Austria)*

**Change of curricula, teacher educators and support measures – how  
initial teacher education in Europe should be able to cope with  
(humanitarian) migrant students**

*Barbara Herzog-Punzenberger (University of Innsbruck, Austria)*

**Training Teachers to Educate Refugee and Humanitarian Migrant  
Youth**

*Jihae Cha, Min Choi (Teachers College, Columbia University, USA)*

**Isolating or Inclusive? Educating refugee youth in the United States**

*Jill Koyama (Arizona State University, USA)*

**Educating Newcomer Immigrant & Refugee Youth in U.S. Schools**

*Monisha Bajaj (University of San Francisco, USA)*

**Radical Acceptance: A framework for preparing teachers to support  
students with refugee and asylum seeker backgrounds**

*Maura Sellers (University of Newcastle, Australia)*

**Table 6 Individuality and Responsibility: Challenges for Young People**

Chair: Stefanie Greubel (Alanus University of Arts and Social Sciences, Germany)

**Fridays for Future: Determinants for Engagement on behalf of Sustainability**

*Janne Fengler, Stefanie Greubel, Jost Schieren, (Alanus University of Arts and Social Sciences, Germany)*

**Intentions and practices of Waldorf teachers in main lessons: creating educational practice that prepare pupils for being in the world in a 'grown-up' way**

*Aziza Mayo (University of Applied Sciences Leiden, the Netherlands)*

**Social Emotional Learning Examined Through the Lens of One Urban Public Waldorf School**

*Ida Obermann (Community school for Creative Education, Oakland, USA)*

**Care Ethics in Teacher Preparation through Action Research**

*Colette Rabin (San José State University, USA)*

**Panel Discussion: Education in the Digital Age.  
Perspectives from the U.S. and Germany**

*Joann Halpern*

# Educational technology in Germany: Discourses and practices

*Felicitas Macgilchrist*

This paper sketches contemporary discourses surrounding digital technology and schooling in Germany, highlights the associated practices of integrating digital technology into schools, and points to pressing questions for future research. One discourse dominated the discussion for over a decade: a celebratory, technoscientific discourse, urging schools and policymakers to integrate more technology so that Germany no longer “lags behind” the rest of the world. This position was critiqued from a second discourse, drawing on neuroscience, that pointed to the dangers of “digital dementia” when young people use digital devices. These writers often recommended no-screens policies for schools, and limits on young people’s “screen-time” (e.g. half an hour per day). More recently, a third discourse has taken precedence, drawing on educational research: “the primacy of the pedagogical”. Here, pedagogical concerns must take priority over technical issues. The core issue must be *how* technology is integrated into sensible learning scenarios. A marginal, fourth, discourse has accompanied these three positions, critiquing their primary focus on “learning” and “teaching”, rather than “education” and “society”. These writers ask what role educational technology, including the increasing analysis of students’ digital data traces, is playing in transforming social relationships and exploiting planetary resources. In utopian modes, they have suggested alternative concepts such as “convivial technology” or “decolonizing technology” to rethink and renew ways of using and reflecting on technology in schools. Future research, this paper suggests, needs to explore these concepts in more depth and pay close attention to how edtech and data analytics are exacerbating and/or alleviating socio-economic inequality. A particular issue facing Germany, and as yet under-researched, is how traditional inequalities between the types of schools in

Germany's tripartite educational system (Hauptschule, Realschule, Gymnasium) are impacted by today's practices of technology dis/integration.

## **Table 1**

### **Digitalization and Educational Measurement in Schools**

*Chairs: Nina Jude and Jeanette Ziehm*

### **Digitalization and Educational Measurement in Schools: Introduction**

*Nina Jude and Jeanette Ziehm*

The international liaison office at DIPF, ice (international cooperation in education), is once again organizing an international session as part of the AERA affiliated group meetings during the AERA meeting in 2020, this time focusing on research on digital strategies. The session consists of a plenary talk and several round tables presenting latest research project from Germany, the US and other countries. It aims at supporting international collaboration in different areas of educational research.

The planned round table “Digitalization and educational measurement in schools” aims at combining latest findings on digitalization in schools from both Germany and the US. In 2019, the German parliament paved the way for the so-called Digital Pact. Under this plan, the federal government will provide schools with €5 billion (\$5.65 billion) over five years to improve digital infrastructure. While electronic and digital learning platforms and apps targeted at schools and teachers are manifold, research is still needed on which of these tools really make an impact. So far, no data seems to be available showing how the available platforms can be used to strengthen teaching and learning. Especially in the field of evaluation or formative assessment, little is known about the existing program’s impact on students’ learning.

The presentations at this round table will exchange their view on challenges and future directions of digital pathways for educational measurement in schools. Current research findings will be presented and planned projects can be discussed in a bi-national audience.

This round table will be moderated by Nina Jude and Jeanette Ziehm. Presenters will talk about their research project for about 10 minutes each, handouts for participants are appreciated. The presentations are followed by a Q & A and a joint discussion slot of approx. 40 minutes.



## **Handling data in instructional practice: Students' system feedback processing**

*Sieglinde Jornitz and Ben Mayer*

Although the process of equipping schools with information technologies has moved at a slow pace in Germany, the national digital pact has added momentum to the development. This goes along with a hope for an increased individualization but also the expected increase in students' motivation, owing to the fact that the students can work on subject matters by themselves instead of discussing them in public in the classroom (Rabenstein et al. 2018).

The contribution is focused on pilot-analyses from lessons with digital instruments in German schools. The lessons – recorded at schools in Germany – and the learning software used, both provide a basis for the analyses. Within these lessons, students independently work on a subject using a digital learning software programme. The data provided by the software to lead and guide the learning process of the students reduce the interaction in the classroom and focusses it to an exchange of reactions between the student and the digital machine. International critical data studies already reveal convincingly for international acting learning software producers a multiplicity of at least problematic consequences (Friesen 2011; Manolev et al. 2019; Selwyn 2011; Williamson 2017; 2019).

By focusing on the learning software itself as well as on the empirically recorded interaction in the classroom, our analyses can show how the education interaction between students, between teacher and students and between the student and the computer change our way of thinking of education and the didactical arranged process (Jornitz & Leser 2018; Rabenstein et al. 2018).

The students' reflections and reactions to technically generated responses and data reveal that on the one hand the

assistance given by the software fails to address the students' problems while on the other hand, the students are tied to the software and learn how to get the best results by minimizing the understanding of the topic itself.

By our research, we can differ between the prescribed picture of the student and his or her learning path on the one hand and the empirically observable adjustment of the students by following or skipping this path on the other hand. The ongoing characteristic of data as neutral and an independent voice between the teacher and the student can be challenged by our research.

What we see, by looking closely to the software and the interaction of the students with the software is, that the so-called "adaptive" software "acts" in the reverse direction. It is the student who must understand the way the machine and its software is organized to follow its prescribed way of learning. By becoming familiar with the structure of the learning tool, he or she loses a close connection to the subject matter that should be treated and understood during school lesson. This kind of learning software and its data become a leading role under which teacher and students change their role and understanding. How to gain back power and set the technological tool in its pedagogical and social acceptable range, is an open and still unsolved question that is worth to be discussed at an international level.

## **HPI's School Cloud: Digitally Optimizing Teaching and Learning**

*Joann Halpern*

The Hasso Plattner Institute for Digital Engineering (HPI) is Germany's university excellence center for IT Systems Engineering. Among its numerous innovative projects are Schul-Cloud (School Cloud), which, in collaboration with Germany's Federal Ministry of Education and Research, is currently being tested throughout the country by approximately 200 schools. In addition to HPI researchers, schoolteachers, principals, and students were all involved in the development process. Schul-Cloud is enabling teachers and students in every subject – at schools with modern as well as those with outdated IT infrastructures – to have access to modern digital content. One of the primary goals of Schul-Cloud is to optimize both the teaching and learning processes. In addition to videos, apps, and interactive digital textbooks, it utilizes big data and learning analytics to provide teachers and learners with content suited for their specific needs. Learning analytics are also an integral part of openHPI, HPI's cutting-edge MOOC platform, which is being used by organizations, such as the WHO and SAP. Researchers are using openHPI to better understand how to increase retention rates among MOOC users, how to successfully integrate MOOCs into organizations, and how to improve content delivery to enhance learning.

## **Using Mobile Phones in Assessments: Examples from the United States**

*Fusun Sahin*

The United States is one of the countries with the highest mobile phone ownership in the world (Pew Research Center 2019a). In 2018, 96% of the population in the United States owned a mobile phone and 81% of the population owned a smart phone (Pew Research Center 2019b). This talk focuses on using mobile assessment (m-assessment) for teaching and learning in the US context by sharing various examples of m-assessment use. These examples span various use cases in different learning contexts and educational levels. Examples come from both informal and formal learning settings, both K-12 and professional development settings, as well as group and individual learning. The overall benefits for participant engagement, success, and opportunity to learn as well as challenges of implementing m-assessments will be discussed.

## **Digitalization and Survey Methodology in Schools**

*Juanita Hicks*

In the summer of 2016, the American Reading Company (ARC) program started its rollout in a US school district. The ARC program curriculum enhanced the standard English-language arts (ELA) curriculum for grades 3-9 by adding specific components targeted at increasing reading literacy. The ARC program included different reading units based on grade level, the assessment instrument, Independent Reading Level Assessment (IRLA), specialized instruction, student conferencing, color-coded book bins correlating to each grade/reading level in each classroom, and professional development for teachers. Throughout the school years from 2016-2018, students, teachers, and administrators had the opportunity to give feedback on the implementation and progress of ARC. The Research and Evaluation team found that after the first round of paper survey feedback, the quality of responses (e.g., open and honest) and response rates (especially for teachers and administrators) increased when the surveys were provided online. In addition to this, less data input errors, and less data cross-checking time was needed to analyze the responses when collected online; thus, making the data more reliable. From implementation year to final ARC year, the transition from paper surveys to online surveys greatly enhanced all logistical and data collection procedures, which allowed for results to be disseminated more efficiently.

## Table 2

### **The Relationship between School Principals and Supervisory Authorities in the Context of Current Reform-Related Developments: An International Comparison**

*Chair: Barbara Music*

Against the background of current school reforms, the coordination of different stakeholders' actions is focused in a special way, particularly the set of actions that is carried out by school leaders on the one hand and school supervisory authorities /governors on the other (Altrichter & Maag Merki, 2010). Principally different logics of system and action thus meet (such as different perspectives and interests). The formation of a relationship between school leaders and governors most of all depends on respective system conditions or country-specific, context-related and administrative conditions (e.g. school legislation, administrative frameworks, structural autonomy, accountability etc.).

Within the school context of coordination, the (actors') level of school supervisory authorities in terms of a school system level plays a particular role because it is a significant key level with respect to a matching link to the individual school level and the successful implementation of externally introduced reform measures and projects, such as test-based school reform (Rolff 2009). Hence, the school supervisory authority level presents a relevant context factor in regulating and shaping decision-making processes and competencies at the individual school level (Lucyshyn 2010).

The new governance paradigm and especially the shift in orientation from input to output governance – particularly in the case of the education system in Germany – has on the actors' level an impact on the actions and professional self-concepts as well as the professionalism of different actors

(Wissinger 2014). Owing to the new governance model, the functional realm of school governors and that of school principals are thus subjected to a fundamental change. This also affects the coordination pattern of relationships between governors and principals, pursuant to which the traditional distribution of relationships between the two levels of actors is relinquished and restructuring is assumed (Altrichter 2011; Muslic et al. 2013; Ramsteck et al. 2015; Ulber 2010). At first, this change relates to a withdrawal from a primarily administration-oriented functioning of school governance, which is now meant to focus on the schools' change management (Böttcher 2002, 2006). Yet, this is linked to an expansion of school governance responsibilities and actions, triggered by the education political changes (Brüsemeister & Newiadomsky 2008). While so far the school governance has mainly been concerned with supervisory activities in official, subject-related and legal matters, an expansion of school autonomy assigns a strengthened supportive and advisory role to the governance level as well as a controlling function. This highlights the endeavour to change the school governance instance from an intervention body to an advisory one which is supposed to promote school quality assurance (van Ackeren & Klemm 2009, p. 111), resulting in a change of the traditional school governance role which was marked by a bureaucratic, formalistic profile, moving toward an increasingly supportive, counselling area of tasks which also includes a controlling function (Füssel & Leschinsky 2008). Support for teachers, subject conference heads and principals offered by school governors is also expanded (Ehren et al. 2013, p. 4) Moreover, this means an establishment of confidential working relationships between school supervisory authorities and individual schools (e.g. Louis et al. 2005).

Against this background, this roundtable provides an opportunity to address the particular relationship between school principals and school supervisory authorities from international perspectives taking into account various country-

specific conditions and contexts. Four papers from different countries (*high stakes countries*, e.g. USA, the Netherlands, and *low stakes countries*, e.g. Germany, Austria) will be presented and discussed from an international comparative perspective:



## **Design-based School Improvement in Germany. Potentials of Research-Policy-Practice-Partnerships**

*Nina Bremm and Rick Mintrop*

Schools, especially those in disadvantaged areas and those who have to deal with performance deficits and often also with difficulties in their process quality, are challenged by continuous improvement needs (Bremm et al. 2017). However, many schools do not find it easy to comply with this requirement. If problems seem overwhelming and individual and/or collective effectiveness diminishes, external data provided by school administration (tests, inspections, etc.) appear, only as a reflection of already known realities. External advice then often is experienced as little informed about the "real" problems of the school and appears as trivial and unhelpful. In this way, school is framed and cultivated as a place in which "one really knows the reality" and defends it against negative feedback and judgments from outside. The result is that schools become more and more closed to advice e.g. from school inspection or external data sources (Mintrop & Zumpe 2019).

"Design-based School Improvement", "Continuous Quality Improvement" or "Improvement Science" are labels that describe a certain logic of organizational improvement that aims to provide practitioners with a certain logic of improvement steps which, taken together, should initiate an effective improvement dynamic as well as agency for improvement within a school or a school district (Mintrop 2019). Problems are framed; Point A, the starting position is precisely named; Point B, the intended target is described in concrete terms; in a 'theory of action' you make yourself clear how you intend to get from A to B; Practical measurands accompany the process so that successes - even small ones - can be seen. Especially in schools where problems are experienced as

overwhelming, the procedure can provide structural help. From the perspective of organizational psychological, such a process requires that school staff rediscovers their own internal effectiveness through experiencing small but continuous successes, that they set realistic goals and that reaching these clearly defined goals together can potentially release new hopes. Technically, the procedure seems simple, but it requires building problem-solving skills in schools, which must be accompanied and supported from outside as schools usually do not have on their own. The project therefore established so called “Research-Policy-Practice-Partnerships” (Bremm & Manitus 2018) in four schools and four different school districts in Germany. Within those partnerships schools staff, school and system leaders, as well as scholars, try to understand whether and how this logic, which seems simple in itself, and yet is complex in its implementation, can be useful for sustained improvement in in German schools and districts. The project is scientifically accompanied: quantitative questionnaires, qualitative interviews with all participants as well as audios of workshops and partnerships meetings are conducted regularly during the process. In the paper first empirical insights on benefits and challenges for schools and system improvement after working together for six months are presented.

## **Lost in translation – institutional logics and their effects on? The cooperation between school authority and school leaders**

*David Kemethofer and Livia Jesacher-Rößler*

In their school development processes, school principals are confronted both with demands within their schools and with external demands. Different stakeholders are involved and propose their expectations. One of the main external stakeholder within the school system is the school authority. In Austria, school inspectors are responsible for supervision and development of schools at the regional level (Kemethofer & Altrichter 2014). In order to fulfil their responsibilities, school inspectors have to sound out expectations, areas of action and responsibilities in the cooperation with schools. The school authority operates in the institutional environment of the schools and represents certain institutional logics with its demands (Hall 2017; Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury 2012).

Following the question, how the institutional environment influences quality development processes in schools (Muslic 2017), the presented paper uses neo-Institutional theories. The understanding of the role of the school authorities and the scope for action that schools as organizations or school principals have in development processes is of central importance. In particular, translation processes like bricolage, diffusion or enactment take place when school inspectors pass on edicts (Scott 2008; 2014). These different types translations are influenced by personal attitudes and the individual view of change processes of school inspectors as well as their own institutional ideas.

In the qualitative study presented, school inspectors were interviewed by means of expert interviews to reconstruct the processes of translations. They were asked to describe their task profile and how they interpret pedagogical topics and

implement them among regional structures. As a result of the conducted study different prototypes of school inspectors could be found (see Brüsemeister & Newiadomsky 2008). Further, the results suggest that the cooperation between school inspectors and school leaders is strongly influenced by the role of the inspectors. If inspectors see themselves as facilitators and encourage schools to assume ownership for reforms, school leaders will be able to make better use of their scope for autonomy. If they act as inspectors who specify or implement the instructions as specified, the professional competences of the leaders are less required, which can result in an environmental perception that is perceived as limited.

**Cooperation at a Regional Level – School Supervisory  
Authority and School Principals in the Thicket of  
Institutional Environments**

*Joel Malin and Donald Hackmann*

## **Leadership for College and Career Readiness: Presenting a Theoretical Framework**

*Donald G. Hackmann and Joel R. Malin*

**Purpose.** The purpose of this paper is to present a conceptual framework illustrating leadership for college and career readiness, which is intended to provide key components for school leaders in their supervisory roles as they facilitate the design and implementation of quality CCR programming.

**Perspectives.** Throughout the past few decades, education reformers and researchers have investigated how school principals and superintendents engage in leadership and supervisory practices that influence student learning (Leithwood & Louis, 2011). Large-scale studies of leadership effects confirm that “the direct and indirect effects of school leadership on student learning are small but significant” (Leithwood & Louis 2011, p. 2), representing approximately one quarter of the variation explained by school variables. Clearly, leadership matters to student learning, but of equal importance is the quality of students’ academic preparation.

On a related note, the adequacy of K-12 students’ preparation for college and careers also has been the subject of intense scrutiny in recent decades. The economic strength and global competitiveness of the United States relies considerably upon its workforce, with the U.S. labor market demanding skilled employees to fill the nation’s estimated two million job vacancies (Carnevale, Jayasundera & Gulish 2016). Consequently, recent federal and state policy reforms frequently focus upon enhancing high school students’ preparation for college and careers, and sometimes also emphasize equitable access. As an example, the 2015 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Every Student Succeeds Act, contains numerous provisions for states to address college and career readiness (CCR) within schools and

school districts. Yet, despite an expanding research base examining CCR efforts through federal and state legislation and local school efforts in implementing CCR policies (Coalition for Career Development 2019; Venezia & Lewis 2015; Visher, Altuna & Safran 2013), the critical role of school leaders in guiding such reforms has not been fully addressed (Authors 2017a, 2017b). As superintendents and principals work with educators, business/industry partners, higher education institutions, and civic agencies to strengthen students' college and career exploration and preparation within school districts, is it essential that their supervisory and leadership practices be guided by an in-depth understanding of CCR and the effective implementation of programming that prepares students for college and careers.

**Methods.** Throughout the past five years, we have been engaged in qualitative research exploring how school leaders have been effective in leading the formation of school structures and supports that promote high school students' preparation for college and careers. Our research has addressed the design and implementation of CCR reforms, including career academies and career pathway models (Authors 2016, 2017a, 2017b, 2018a, 2018b, in press), and school leaders' roles as supervisors and leaders of such reforms. This paper draws upon and integrates findings from the aforementioned studies, while also citing relevant literature to provide supportive examples, as we present a conceptual framework of leadership for college and career readiness.

**Data sources.** To develop this conceptual framework, we rely upon extant data (sources include individual and focus group interviews, observations of leaders in action, document analysis) obtained as part of our case study research conducted in the last five years.

**Results.** Results consist of a framework that is comprised of five main components (and various subcomponents). The components relate to: creating a CCR culture, engaging

effectively in cross-sector collaboration, organizational structures and processes, developing formal and informal leadership and capacity, and engaging in data use for excellence and equity.

**Scientific and scholarly significance.** This conceptual framework will guide researchers and policy officials who wish to better understand leadership and supervisory practices within the context of developing and promoting students' college and career readiness, and practitioners who are developing CCR reforms or acting in associated leadership capacities.



## **The Relationship between School Principals and School Supervisory Authorities in the context of reform processes – a Dutch perspective**

*Annemarie Neeleman, Pascal Scholtius and Henrietta Steuten*

The Dutch Constitution guarantees school autonomy in accordance with the principle of “freedom of education.” Since 1917, schools have been free to choose and follow their own pedagogical visions (Waslander 2010). The Dutch government provides funding for both privately and publicly run schools, provided that they meet certain quality and financial requirements. Compared to education systems in other Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) member countries, schools in the Netherlands operate in a highly autonomous policy context (OECD 2012). Within a framework of learning objectives, standardized examinations, and block grants established by the national government, the governance of Dutch schools is highly decentralized (Neeleman 2019a). Since there is no national curriculum, schools are largely free to decide what to teach and how to teach it. School autonomy is balanced by a set of centralized quality standards, attainment targets, and a national examination system developed by the government (Neeleman 2019b).

The Inspectorate of Education, under the responsibility of the Minister of Education, monitors both the quality of education and compliance with statutory and financial rules and regulations (Wolf de, Verkroost & Franssen 2017). Self-defined quality factors pertain to the objectives and ambitions a school or a governing body sets itself, above and beyond the basic quality level. A school which fails to meet the statutory requirements is providing education of inadequate quality, or has inadequate financial management. This can result in sanctions being imposed on it (Dutch Inspectorate of Education

2017). This is what happened to Comenius College, a secondary school for general education in a suburb town near Rotterdam. Between 2006 and 2018, one section of Comenius College failed to meet various quality indicators concerning educational outcomes and processes and quality assurance. In August 2018, a new principal and management team were appointed to design and lead a change process towards stable and sustainable improvement. Now, 1.5 years later, all quality requirements of the Dutch inspectorate are met and the school is, moreover, energetically implementing innovative educational reforms.

### Table 3

## **Educational (In-)Equity – Comparative Perspectives on Cultures of Schooling in Germany and the USA**

*Chair: Rick Mintrop*

Educational (in-)equity has been discussed and pushed forward on an international level (e.g., OECD 2012; UNESCO 2017). At the same time, approaches and programs to improve educational equity are designed and implemented in the specific context of individual education systems and individual schools. The objective of the roundtable session is to provide a space in which school practices in the context of (in-)equity can be discussed with a view of cultures of schooling.

Aspects of culture affect the practice of teachers and other practitioners in education. This applies to the individual culture of each school as well as to the macro-culture of the school system as societal subsystem (Schein 2004). The macro-culture reflects institutional traditions, past and present negotiation processes, and current challenges that schooling is confronted with. As a result, the macro-culture is specific to the institutional context, and it varies from one education system to the next.

Helsper (2008) argues that cultures of schooling are the result of educators engaging in and dealing with overarching policies and structural problems in the context of historically as well as socio-culturally charged situations of schooling. As a result, educators are faced with specific hierarchies of meaning that define which school practices are desirable or at least tolerable, and which practices are marginalized or even unwanted. Accordingly, educators are situated within specific local and macro-cultures of schooling that affect the perspectives they have towards (in-)equity, inclusion and exclusion, and performance.

The culture of schooling in Germany and the USA can be seen as contrastive in several dimensions. This is true, for instance, with regard to the role of managerialism and performativity in schools (e.g., Mintrop 2015; Mintrop & Klein 2017), to practices of exclusion and inclusion (e.g., Powell 2009; Sturm 2018), and to practices of addressing the needs of marginalized students.

The paper session combines presentations of three research projects that address education practices in the context of educational (in-)equity in Germany and the USA from different angles and with regard to different relevant actors. The objective is to understand how teachers approach dimensions of (in-)equity in their practice, and to describe organizational strategies of dealing with adverse practices and beliefs.

The first presentation focuses on perceptions of race and immigration and how these are (not) addressed in the classroom. The second presentation focuses on constructing and addressing achievement differences and how this leads to inclusion and exclusion or forms of marginalization of (groups of) students. The third presentation addresses organizational approaches to deal with (in-)equity in schools serving disadvantaged communities and discusses how cultures of schooling affect the strategies taken. The discussant will summarize the presentations from yet another system's perspective. After that, there will be room for all participants to discuss the presentations and their implications for educational research and practice.

## **Negotiating racism in the classroom – comparative analyses in German and US Schools**

*Merle Hummrich and Dorothee Schwendowius*

Although US and German school systems claim to provide equal chances for all students (Baker 2014), studies underline that inequalities relating to social, racial and cultural distinctions persist (e.g., Diehm et al. 2013, Lynn & Dixson 2013). However, comparative qualitative research on how differences are constructed and reproduced in schools is scarce.

In our study, we compare schools' concepts of diversity and their practices of constructing and handling (ethnic) belonging in both countries. The study design is a qualitative multi-level-analyses (Bray & Thomas 1995), including analyses of documents (legal texts of schooling, school programs, homepages), interviews with teachers and principals and ethnographic writings of classroom observations. The data material is analyzed with qualitative methods, which aim to identify the interconnectedness of social levels (Hummrich & Terstegen 2018). In our talk, will present two case studies of classroom interaction, one located in a Pennsylvanian school, one in Schleswig-Holstein.

The objective of our contribution is to analyze how racism comes into play in the classroom and how it is negotiated interactively. By choosing this focus, we assume that interactions on race, racism and privilege in schools are relevant in the context of researching educational inequity because they shape individual and collective learning processes about societal power structures. Moreover, they impact power relations in the classroom and students' experiences of difference and belonging.

The cases exemplify different professional practices of referring to racism, which point to distinct cultures of handling diversity

and (racist) discrimination in individual schools; moreover, they can be related to different societal discourses on racism and distinct traditions of antidiscrimination. In Germany and the U.S.: Whereas in the US, there is a tradition of antidiscrimination which frames institutionalized measures and professional activities, the lack of this in Germany results in individualized ways of teachers 'coping with' diversity and discriminatory practices. Yet, in both examples it becomes obvious that the pedagogical setting is deeply shaped by power relations between teacher and students, which limit the possibilities of learning about racism.

## Constructing Differences in Inclusive Teaching – Comparing Germany and the USA

*Tanja Sturm and Benjamin Wagener*

The aim of inclusive education is to “eliminate social exclusion and to arrange school in a more equitable way.” (Ainscow & Sandill 2010, p. 402). Rich countries provide education for all students, while forms of social exclusion are mainly caused by other frames; e.g. antagonisms between standardization and differentiation (Nilsen 2010). Such conflicts make it necessary to accept that exclusion processes are also part of the scope of teaching (Hedegaard Hansen 2012). The central interest of the paper is to discuss, how teachers working in the United States and in Germany construct and address (achievement) differences between students in their teaching practice and how their practice supports inclusion and exclusion in the classrooms.

We work with the theoretical concept that frames cultures of professional teaching based on the sociology of knowledge (Mannheim 1980), developed along the idea of professional practice by Bohnsack (2019).

30 groups of teachers from schools in different social areas (e.g. urban, country side), who work in different school tracks (e.g. high/low achieving) and teach children of different age (primary/secondary schools), were interviewed in Germany between 2009 and 2014. In 2016, three groups of US-American teachers, who work in a primary school in a suburban area, were interviewed with an exploratory interest. The interviews were analyzed with the Documentary Method (Bohnsack et al. 2010).

One result is that differences in academic achievement among students are relevant to teachers in both countries. Despite these similarities, the research shows that German teachers refer to the achievement of students and compare

them to one another in a hierarchical way. Their culture of teaching goes along with a lack of learning opportunities offered to specific groups of students (Sturm 2012, 2013), while the US-American teachers adapt their teaching on the basis of differences.

The paper helps to understand how teaching cultures are related to the structure of the school system. Germany's multi-tracking school system provides a much more tensional field for teachers' professional practice, which is the conflict between grading in order to legitimate students allocation to educational tracks and the idea of adapted teaching. Contrary to the interviews with the US-American teachers, the German teachers' professional habitus is irritated by students who do not meet the expectations.



# Leadership for Educational Equity in Schools Serving Disadvantaged Communities in Germany and the USA

*Esther Dominique Klein and Hanna Bronnert-Härle*

Schools serving disadvantaged communities (SSDCs) are often characterized by deficit thinking (Valencia 1997) and as a result a lack of responsibility and dysfunctional relationships between teachers and students (Nelson & Guerra 2014) that hinder improvement (Racherbäumer 2017). Several studies show that to help their students succeed, SSDCs must change this culture (e.g., Gu & Johansson 2013). The objective is to analyze how leadership can affect teachers' beliefs about their students in a more management-oriented (USA) and a more professionalism-oriented (Germany) educational context.

Hemmings (2012) argues that schools with a biography of unsuccessfulness must not only restructure, but also re-envision, reculture, and remoralize. Leaders must find ways to change attitudes and beliefs of teachers and help them experience self-efficacy. We draw on the model of Transformational Leadership (Bass & Avolio 1994). Transformational leaders aim at affecting the visions, goals, and beliefs of their staff through idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individualized support.

In a multiple case study design, we conducted a teacher survey to assess leadership. We then conducted semi-standardized interviews with principals, teacher leaders, and district personnel, in which we asked the participants to reflect on school improvement retrospectively, and unstandardized observations of the principals.

In the USA, we collected quantitative data from teachers in four schools serving disadvantaged communities. We conducted in-depth studies in three of these schools. In Germany, we

collected quantitative data from sixteen schools. Qualitative data from four of these schools will be collected in 2019.

The quantitative results from the USA showed that principals in successful schools were more actively engaged with the students, more visible in the school, and more supportive of a positive learning climate in the classrooms. The qualitative data showed that they used elements of TL to help their teachers experience self-efficacy, create a positive atmosphere, and convince them that their students deserved to be successful. For instance, the principals used indicators of success to keep up motivation, appealed to the emotional relationship between teachers and students, created a detailed system of individual support, and helped the teachers develop alternative views of their students through data. The data from Germany are currently being analyzed and the results will be reported at the meeting.

## Table 4

### Defining Refugees and Refugee Education

*Chair: Alexander W. Wiseman*

Refugee identity is less static than official or legal definitions of refugees and migrants. The experiences of refugee seekers suggest that their identity is fluid and dependent upon context. Changes in refugee populations in the 21st century are expected due to an increase of the intensity of climate change and natural disasters, a rise in terrorism, an increase in IDPs, and an escalation of severe socioeconomic deprivation. The label of ‘refugee’ is often applied to those who are forced migrants to make benefits or resources available to them in their receiving country, but these labels are often stigmatizing. On the other hand, being labeled a refugee or asylum-seeker allows some forced migrants to be less vulnerable and more stable in their role and community. The use of these terms also acknowledges that mass refugee crises in the 21st century are significantly different from refugee and other forced migration in the 20th century and earlier.

This confusion and frequent conflict over how to define refugees and refugee education among political, development, and educational organizations suggests that a more inclusive definition of refugee, asylum-seeking and migrant youth, which echoes the need for flexibility and contextualization that refugee voices have raised, is needed. Papers presented in this roundtable embrace both the political definition as well as the more figurative definition of refugees and asylum-seeking youth, which may change depending on where “refugees” are located (e.g., refugee camps, in transit, or in destination communities), but more important is a focus among these papers on how the conditions and characteristics of refugee youth align across different educational services, opportunities, institutions, and events. The perspectives and voices present in the process of re-defining refugees and refugee education pays

particular attention to how migrants/refugees perceive themselves (status, abilities, integration into society etc.) as well as to how they are defined individually, collectively, and within educational contexts from outside of the refugee community itself (Selbst- und Fremdwahrnehmung).

## **Moving beyond methodological nationalism to develop a transnational perspective on the educational pathways of displaced and dispossessed migrant youth**

*William Perez*

In this paper we propose a model of transborder educational access using the concepts of “Precarious Legal Status,” (Goldring & Landolt 2013) “Membership in the Breach,” (Coutin 2007) and “Transnational Alienage” (McGuire & Coutin 2013) to examine educational access among Mexican-born and U.S.-born Mexican-American students who grow up in the U.S. and those who are deported or forced to return to Mexico. To illustrate the model’s utility in research, policy, and practice, we describe how institutional exclusion in both the U.S. and Mexican educational systems reflects the perceptions of these students as “Transnational Aliens” on both U.S. and Mexican society. We recommend future studies on displaced and dispossessed migrant youth adopt a transnational perspective that considers the traumatic impact of contemporary mobility regimes structures (e.g., detention centers, refugee camps, deportations, raids).

## **Refugee youths' educational and social participation: An ethnographic inquiry**

*Dilek Kayaalp*

This study explores the circumstances of Kurdish refugee youth in Canada. Using a critical ethnographic approach, I interviewed twenty young people, aged 15-30, to examine their transnational identities and lived experiences in the Canadian context. The research draws particularly from theories of diaspora studies (Hall 2002), and theories of contemporary racisms and inequalities (Hall 2002). The interview data indicate that the statelessness and statuslessness of refugee youth stem from the practices of hegemony, assimilation, and racism by their home and host state. The study also suggests the importance of questioning the state's hegemony and the domination of the western construction of citizenship to provide alternative forms of social and educational participation that can transform the youths' status from refugees to actors and citizens.

## **Pensando en Rosa y los Otros Alumnos Transnacionales de Varios Perfiles que Encontráramos en Mexico (Thinking About Rosa and Various Other Transnational Students We Have Encountered in Mexico)**

*Edmund T. Hamann*

Since 2003 (and an interview with Rosa) we have been thinking about students in Mexican schools who were previously in the US. The circumstances of their move/return to Mexico varied and allow us to consider when, how, and how much the literature on refugees and refugee education pertains to the various situations of the 800,000+ transnational students currently in Mexican schools. While none lacked Mexican citizenship rights and, as such, were officially 'welcome' in Mexican schools, in many instances returns were forced, sudden, and unanticipated and Mexican schools lacked the linguistic, cultural, and psychological resources to support their new charges.

## **New American Refugees: A case study of how a community of Nepali-speaking Bhutanese families experience school and educational policy in the Northeast**

*Cynthia Reyes, Hemant Ghising and Shana J. Haines*

Refugee youth and their families experience another phase of challenges after they resettle in the U.S. Their transition from a life of statelessness to that of citizen in a developed country is a complex and intense experience, yet life for some improves economically especially after years of living in poverty in a refugee camp. Most refugee parents who resettle in the U.S. experience more hope for a better education for their children. The following yearlong qualitative exploratory study examines opportunities and challenges that a group of Bhutanese refugee students and their families experience in one Northeast state once they migrate to the U.S. The findings focus on the middle grades and secondary school experiences of three students. We describe students' and parents' understandings of linguistic and academic achievement, communication challenges, and assumptions and expectations they have of schools. In addition, the study highlights the complexity of the term refugee, or, in this case, New American refugee, in light of U.S. school and education policy within the Northeast context.



## **Temporalities of Refugee Identity and Education**

*Amberley Middleton*

This paper explores the ways in which both the political and figurative aspects of refugee identity changes, not only with context but with time. For example, refugees may experience multiple legal statuses, ranging from 'unauthorized' migrant to recognized refugee to eventual citizen. The way refugee youth self-identify may also change over time. However, experiencing forced migration has long term implications for the educational needs and trajectories of (former) refugee children and youth. Thus, the concept of 'refugee education' should include students who have experienced forced migration at any point in their lives, not only in the present or recent past.

## **Gender differences in vocational interests: A comparison between native born, migrant and refugee adolescents**

*Florian G. Hartmann, Jutta von Maurice and Dominik Weigand*

According to Holland's (1997) theory of occupational choice vocational interests can best be described using six broad interest dimensions: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional (RIASEC). Results of previous studies indicate that there are strong gender differences especially regarding the Social and the Realistic dimension.

In Germany, the RIASEC model is used as a theoretical background for career counseling of adolescents with and without migrant background. So far, little is known whether the model can also serve as a basis for the vocational guidance of adolescents who have a refugee background and recently came to Germany. Therefore, the current study analyzes how far the RIASEC dimensions are useful to describe the vocational interests of adolescent refugees in Germany (n = 859; data from the study „Refugees in the German Educational System“; adolescent cohort) and investigates whether the gender differences in the sample are comparable to those in German native born and migrant samples (n = 7976 for native born adolescents and n= 3593 for adolescents with migration background; data from the study “National Educational Panel Study”; 9<sup>th</sup> graders cohort).

The German native born and migrant samples show the typical gender differences. In addition, results indicate that the gender differences in the refugee cohort are comparable though less pronounced.

## Table 5

### Training Teachers to Educate Refugee and Humanitarian Migrant Youth

*Chair: Lisa Damaschke-Deitrick*

A critical question and unresolved problem in education is the lack of research on the unique academic and non-academic needs of refugee and humanitarian migrant youth and the teacher training and professional development to support these needs in classrooms. In addition to past traumas and well-documented language challenges, these youth often face unstable home environments with limited sociocultural stability, as well as interrupted and diverse prior educational backgrounds. These factors create psychological and social well-being risks which can exacerbate the already high dropout rates for adolescent refugee and humanitarian migrant youth. While the importance of teachers in supporting immigrant children is well-understood, little research exists examining the role and influence of teachers on humanitarian migrants in secondary schools and education systems. Research is needed which differentiates the educational needs of humanitarian migrants, specifically those fleeing refugee-like situations, and language minority students. Particularly since humanitarian migrants are increasingly resettling in rural and suburban communities which have very little exposure and experience with such populations.

Accordingly, research identifies a gap between: (a) teacher training and professional development and (b) the diverse challenges and unique needs of humanitarian migrants like refugee and asylum-seeking students. Evidence shows that humanitarian migrant youth have unique educational needs related to trauma, identity, and language issues. These three needs are reflected in the multidisciplinary work on trauma-informed teaching, translanguaging, and civic and cultural identity, respectively. This roundtable will focus on approaches

to raising awareness of humanitarian migrant student needs in schools and building the capacity of educators and schools to work with these unique populations. This cross-disciplinary roundtable will highlight resources, knowledge, and skills shown to better equip teachers to address the academic needs of humanitarian migrant youth as well as how to collaborate with social, psychological, and community organizations outside the formal education system to better address the non-academic needs of these students at the secondary school level and higher.

## **Exemplary Practices of New Zealand Teachers Preparing Refugee Youth for Resettlement: The First Six Weeks**

*Jody McBrien*

In New Zealand, refugees begin their resettlement with a 6-week orientation at the Mangere Refugee Resettlement Centre in Auckland. The education centre provides daily instruction for preschool, primary, secondary, and adult education. Children's education includes English language learning and teaching the routines/curriculum of a typical NZ school. Adult learning is divided between English instruction and cultural learning. Youth attend a mixture of secondary and adult classes. My presentation will describe this process and ways in which this unique opportunity prepares youth to integrate into their new society. It is based on my 6-week Fulbright Specialist work at Mangere in August-September 2019.

## Teachers coping with cultural diversity: Case studies on assessment practices, challenges and experiences in Austrian secondary schools

*Herbert Altrichter, Katharina Soukup-Altrichter, Barbara Herzog-Punzenberger and Magdalena Fellner*

Global mobility and economic and political crises in some parts of the world have fuelled migration and brought new constellations of ‘cultural diversity’ to European classrooms (OECD, 2019). This produces new challenges for teaching, but also for assessment in which cultural biases may have far-reaching consequences for the students’ further careers in education, occupation, and life. After exploring the concept and research strand of Culturally Responsive Assessment and explaining the diversity status quo in Austrian schools and teacher education, we use qualitative interview data from 41 teachers and school leaders in 5 lower secondary schools in Austria to more thoroughly understand the reasoning and assessment practices of teachers in the face of increasing cultural diversity. Findings suggest that ‘proficiency in the language of instruction’ is the main dimension by which diversity in classrooms is perceived. While there is much less reference to ‘cultural differences’ in our case studies, we found many teachers in case schools trying to adapt their assessment procedures and grading in order to help students from diverse backgrounds to show their competencies and experience success.

However, these responses were in many cases individualistic rather than organised by school or regional policies on Culturally Responsive Assessment and were also strongly influenced and at times, limited by the government-

mandated assessment regimes that exist in each country. The paper closes with a series of recommendations for the further development of a practicable and just practice of culturally responsive assessment in schools.

## **Change of curricula, teacher educators and support measures – how initial teacher education in Europe should be able to cope with (humanitarian) migrant students**

*Barbara Herzog-Punzenberger*

The discourse about the unique educational needs of humanitarian migrant students has caught ground in traditional countries of immigration where the educational needs of language minority and other migrant students seem to be answered already in teacher training. This is not the case in most European countries despite the fact that percentages of students with migration background in some EU-countries are exactly the same as in the US for example 23% in Austria and 22% in Germany (PISA 2018). In the presentation of conclusions and recommendations of the EU-study on initial teacher education for cultural and linguistic diversity (Dumcius et al. 2017) will be summarized and highlighted with insights from case-studies.



## Training Teachers to Educate Refugee and Humanitarian Migrant Youth

*Jihae Cha, Min Choi*

A critical question and unresolved problem in education is the lack of research on the unique academic and non-academic needs of refugee and humanitarian migrant youth and the teacher training and professional development to support these needs in classrooms. In addition to past traumas and well-documented language challenges, these youth often face unstable home environments with limited sociocultural stability, as well as interrupted and diverse prior educational backgrounds. These factors create psychological and social well-being risks which can exacerbate the already high dropout rates for adolescent refugee and humanitarian migrant youth. While the importance of teachers in supporting immigrant children is well-understood, little research exists examining the role and influence of teachers on humanitarian migrants in secondary schools and education systems. Research is needed which differentiates the educational needs of humanitarian migrants, specifically those fleeing refugee-like situations, and language minority students. Particularly since humanitarian migrants are increasingly resettling in rural and suburban communities which have very little exposure and experience with such populations.

Accordingly, research identifies a gap between: (a) teacher training and professional development and (b) the diverse challenges and unique needs of humanitarian migrants like refugee and asylum-seeking students. Evidence shows that humanitarian migrant youth have unique educational needs related to trauma, identity, and language issues. These three needs are reflected in the multidisciplinary work on trauma-informed teaching, translanguaging, and civic and cultural identity, respectively. This roundtable will focus on approaches to raising awareness of humanitarian migrant student needs in

schools and building the capacity of educators and schools to work with these unique populations. This cross-disciplinary roundtable will highlight resources, knowledge, and skills shown to better equip teachers to address the academic needs of humanitarian migrant youth as well as how to collaborate with social, psychological, and community organizations outside the formal education system to better address the non-academic needs of these students at the secondary school level and higher.

## **Isolating or Inclusive? Educating refugee youth in the United States**

*Jill Koyama*

This case study centers on one Arizona school district's attempt to create an "International School," for the district's 1100 refugee students. The district had experienced an influx of refugees that did not neatly fit into the racial, ethnic, and linguistic categories familiar to those in the district and community, who mostly worked with Spanish speaking students. Ultimately, the teachers, community organizers, and others who worked closely with the refugees opposed the proposal, arguing against such segregation. Instead, they worked with a couple of researchers, including me, to create curricular modules to support their education of refugee youth and other newcomers.

## **Educating Newcomer Immigrant & Refugee Youth in U.S. Schools**

*Monisha Bajaj*

Newly arrived immigrant and refugee youth—many of whom are fleeing extreme violence—are under-theorized in the research. They “face steeper odds” than other immigrants or children of immigrants (Hopkins et al. 2013, p. 286), and specifically are more likely to (1) live in poverty, (2) endure stress related to family separation and trauma related to migration, (3) face language barriers, and (4) drop out of high school (Louie, 2005; Suarez-Orozco et al. 2009, 2010). Despite high dropout rates for newcomers, when they persist in school, their academic attainment often exceeds that of their native-born peers with immigrant origin (Portes & Rumbault, 2001). Existing research has uncovered how the approaches of newcomer schools can be critical and transnational (Bajaj & Bartlett 2017), additive (Bartlett & Garcia 2011), socially just and culturally sustaining (Lee & Walsh 2017; Jaffe-Walter & Lee, 2018), and socio-politically relevant (Bajaj et al. 2017a). These factors can positively impact the trajectory of immigrant and refugee youth, including their academic achievement, school persistence/graduation rates, and socio-emotional well-being. We will present data from a study that examines three educational settings serving newcomer immigrant and refugee high school age students in an ongoing qualitative research study that includes the following schools in the San Francisco Bay Area (1) a mid-size newcomer high school, (2) a newcomer program within a large comprehensive high school, and (3) a newcomer program within a continuation high school for students most at risk of dropping out.

## **Radical Acceptance: A framework for preparing teachers to support students with refugee and asylum seeker backgrounds**

*Maura Sellers*

This presentation discusses the probability that not all teachers are destined to become teachers of select groups of students such as those suffering from displacement, trauma and acute loss. However, for those individuals who do elect to engage with these cohorts, a four -part preparation pathway is proposed, with the express purpose of ensuring that teachers have the knowledge, skills and capacities to work productively with these students in their school contexts. This teacher preparation pathway includes the importance of self -reflection and reflexivity, understanding and identifying factors which are associated with ‘othering’ at the systemic, institutional and individual levels, sustained engagement in recent research and pedagogical strategies that support the learning of students which multiple degrees of difference and the provision of opportunities to undertake professional; experiences in school settings where leaders are already modelling the actions, attitudes and aptitudes of radical acceptance to develop school cultures of radical empathy.

## Table 6

### Individuality and Responsibility: Challenges for Young People

*Chair: Stefanie Greubel*

An important goal of Western education with reference to the age of Enlightenment is to help students develop their individuality and autonomy. At the same time, a common intention underlies many educational processes: to provide experiences for children and young people that enable them to develop appropriate understandings and abilities that allow for ‘mature participation’ in the socio-cultural and economic communities of their societies, and in the world community in general. Mature participation implies that young people take on the responsibility to develop a strong sense of freedom, individuality, and autonomy with respect to their life-paths while simultaneously shaping and deepening their connectedness with others through active participation in real life including virtual communities.

Nowadays, in many societies younger generations such as the so-called “generation Z” appear to experience tension when they face the challenge of balancing individual freedom with the needs and wishes of the greater world community they are part of and connected to (Biesta 2011). Faced with the task of having to find their way in life and develop a sense of coherence (Antonovsky 1979; Scharmer 2016) while at the same time confronting growing uncertainty in the realms of social, ecological, economic and technological life (Rosa 2019), more and more young people seem to act on an urge to voice their concerns or even become politically involved. More than previous generations, they appear to experience the strong necessity to turn their ideals on personal, social and global levels into action (e.g. Shell Deutschland 2019).

A question arises in what way and to what extent current educational approaches provide young people with the experiences, skills and understandings that will afford them to develop much needed capacities and skills to cope with these challenges and to enable them to align their ideals with their actions in the world.

In this round table session, we explore this question by focussing on practices and experiences developed in Waldorf education, a global, well-established holistic educational approach.

## **Fridays for Future: Determinants for Engagement on behalf of Sustainability**

*Janne Fengler, Stefanie Greubel and Jost Schieren*

According to a number of studies (e.g. Shell Deutschland, 2015), the so-called “generation Z” (by definition born after 1997) in Germany is more interested in politics in general and sustainability in particular than earlier generations. Also, they are more committed and engaged to take responsibility and exercise their influence. The Fridays-for-future-Movement is interpreted as a related phenomenon. This constitutes a research desideratum with respect to the homogeneity vs. heterogeneity of the generation Z.

The project focuses on the following three research questions:

1. What knowledge do adolescents of the generation Z have regarding issues related to sustainability?
2. Are there correlations between the attitudes adolescents of the generation Z have regarding issues related to sustainability and their behaviour in terms of sustainability?
3. Which influencing factors with regards to sustainability knowledge, attitude and behaviour can be identified in adolescents of the generation Z?

As little research has been conducted so far to clarify the desideratum outlined (Sommer et al, 2019), an explorative study was conceptualized. Data collection (document analysis, written surveys, guided expert interviews) is realized with the relevant stakeholders (pupils, educators and parents) associated to institutions with different educational paradigms, concepts and values (Waldorf education vs. other educational providers). Results will generate differentiated insights about educational efforts as a contribution to manifest behavioural variables of



pupils in terms of individuality, responsibility and engagement for human communion of the generation Z.

## **Intentions and practices of Waldorf teachers in main lessons: creating educational practice that prepare pupils for being in the world in a ‘grown-up’ way**

*Aziza Mayo*

This paper discusses findings from a small-scale qualitative participatory research project with secondary school Waldorf teachers in the Netherlands. They explored their educational intentions and teaching practices in the morning main lesson, using the concepts of qualification, socialization and subjectification as proposed by Biesta (2006). These concepts play an important role in the way the function and the quality of educational are discussed and evaluated in the Netherlands (Biesta, 2010).

The research project was developed as part of the annual professional development meeting for Waldorf high school teachers (pupils age 12-18) in the Netherlands. It intended to create an inspiring process in which teachers and researchers collaboratively engaged in a qualitative research process to clarify and (re)evaluate their intentions and teaching practices in the morning main lessons. By creating this experience with ‘instruments’ to deepen teacher’s understanding of their intentions and practices, we aimed to foster the sense of agency of teachers with respect to design and development of their teaching practices. The paper describes the process and outcomes of the collaborative exploration and analyses. It addresses the intentions and practices of teachers in light of the challenge of creating educational practice to provide young people with the experiences, skills and understandings that will afford them to develop much needed capacities and skills to cope with challenges of these times and to enable them to align their ideals with their actions in the world. The findings are discussed in relation to the concepts of qualification, socialization and subjectification and as such, provides a set of

descriptions of the intentions and practices that offer useful examples for the debate on quality of education.

## Social Emotional Learning Examined Through the Lens of One Urban Public Waldorf School

*Ida Obermann*

A growing body of research has identified the need in the United States public education system for educational environments to provide growth of agency and future-directedness in students to thrive academically and socially. It is further shown that this need mounts starkly when it regards traditionally marginalized student groups (e.g. Duckworth 2016; Hammond 2016). Trust in school has emerged as a central factor from these data. (Bryk & Schneider 2002; Kochanek 2005). A separate and related strand of study demonstrates the value-add for underserved student groups if they learn in highly integrated environments where children and adults from different ethnic and social backgrounds learn together (Darling-Hammond 2018, Feb; Stanci 2018, March). This dual body of findings sets forth a research task to examine when and under which conditions such vulnerable student groups show disproportionate levels of academic performance and disproportionate levels of evidence for agency, self-confidence, and future direction.

The project presented here uses the case study approach (Bromley 1986; Edwards 1998) to examine this very question. It spotlights the US's first urban public Waldorf school, a multi-lingual, multi-cultural K-8 public Waldorf school in Oakland, CA, Community School for Creative Education. In this mixed-methods study, Oberman exams three years of data collected through the state-wide correlated CORE Social Emotional Survey Instrument. The CORE Districts is a consortium of nine school districts in California, Fresno, Garden Grove, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Oakland, Sacramento, San Francisco, and Santa Ana Unified School Districts. The widely regarded Core Districts Social Emotional Learning Survey measures four social-

emotional competencies: growth mindset, self-efficacy, self-management, and social awareness. The survey instrument is designed to be a central component of the CORE districts' school quality improvement system. The main constructs measured are intrapersonal and interpersonal competencies. Using a Five-point Likert-type scale there are four subscores: self-management; growth- mindset; self-efficacy; and social awareness. In this study these survey data are joined with follow-up interviews and observation data to identify and examine areas of disproportionately high performance. The project generates nuanced insights into where the students in the study sample outperform students in like- and higher wealth peer groups, followed by analysis of conditions prevailing in this urban public Waldorf case. The author closes with reflection on practices and programs in this Waldorf setting, preliminary conclusions, and areas for future research.

## Care Ethics in Teacher Preparation through Action Research

*Colette Rabin*

Care ethics is an approach to moral philosophy that considers the ways in which relationships can serve as a locus of moral learning. In application in elementary school classrooms it provides an alternative to authoritarian approaches, which may teach mere obedient compliance rather than autonomous care. I undertook a small-scale integrative review of thirty-two graduate students' Master's projects that drew on the theoretical framework of care ethics (Noddings 2002; 2012). Preliminary findings reveal that care ethics contributes to teacher candidates' developing a relationship-based approach that can afford their students the chance to learn to contribute to their community from a place of autonomy.

## CV's

**Herbert Altrichter** is currently Full Professor of Education and Educational Psychology and Director of Linz School of Education at Johannes Kepler University, Linz, Austria. His research interests include educational governance studies (school development and system reform), evaluation, teacher education and qualitative research methodology. A native from Vienna, Austria, he earned his PhD in Education from the University of Vienna, and acquired international experiences in Cambridge, UK and at Deakin University (Australia). From 1994-1999 Herbert Altrichter was Austrian Delegate to the Governing Board of the Centre for Research and Innovation in Education (CERI, OECD, Paris). He was the founding president of the Austrian Educational Research Association (ÖFEB) and is now Treasurer of the European Educational Research Association (EERA) (2013-2021). He founded and edits learned journals (Journal für Schulentwicklung, Journal für Lehrerinnen- und Lehrerbildung, Zeitschrift für Bildungsforschung) and was trained as organizational consultant.

**Monisha Bajaj** is Professor of International and Multicultural Education at the University of San Francisco. Dr. Bajaj is the editor and author of six books, as well as numerous articles on education for peace and human rights, as well as immigration and education. Dr. Bajaj has developed curriculum—particularly related to peace education, human rights, anti-bullying efforts and sustainability—for non-profit organizations and intergovernmental organizations, such as UNICEF and UNESCO. In 2015, she received the Ella Baker/Septima Clark Human Rights Award (2015) from Division B of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). She is currently working on a book project titled "Educating Immigrant and Refugee Youth: 25 Strategies for Holistic Success" (with Gaby Martinez, in contract with Teachers College Press).

**Nina Bremm** is Full Professor of School improvement at the University of Teacher Education, Zürich, Switzerland. After her studies in sociology at the University of Münster and the Max-Planck-Institute for Human Development in Berlin, she worked as a Research Assistant at the University of Hamburg where she took her doctoral degree in education in 2014. She specializes on Education under the effects of social inequality and migration. Her research focuses on issues of system, school- and teaching improvement under the circumstances of social deprivation in segregated areas. Nina Bremm has paid particular attention to sociological theory explaining the persistence of social inequalities in modern societies as well as theory of social justice. She works with qualitative and quantitative empirical methods and is also interested in the practical work with school and system leaders and teachers during school development processes. Her articles and book chapters deal with school improvement in disadvantaged communities, learning networks, system improvement and sustained educational change, questions of social justice and inclusion as well as teaches attitudes and beliefs towards marginalized students.

**Hanna Bronnert-Härle** is a research associate in the educational research working group, educational system, and school development research unit at the Institute for Educational Science at the University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany.

**Jihae 'Jay' Cha** is a doctoral candidate in the International and Comparative Education Program at Teachers College, Columbia University. Jihae's research interests examine the intersection of education quality, sense of belonging, gender, and psychosocial well-being, and the ways in which they influence students' academic motivation, persistence, and transition in conflict-affected contexts, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa. Her dissertation research explores the schooling experiences of refugee children in Kakuma Refugee Camp in Kenya, and the



different factors that contribute to their school persistence and dropout amidst displacement.

**Lisa Damaschke-Deitrick** is a Professor of Comparative and International Education at Lehigh University, Pennsylvania. She holds a Doctorate in Social Sciences from the University of Tübingen, Germany, a Master in International Relations from the Free University Amsterdam, The Netherlands, and a Bachelor from the University of Bielefeld, Germany. In her research, she focuses on how education is used as a solution or cure-all for societal issues. Her research areas include educational policies for poverty prevention primarily in education systems in Europe and other welfare states with the focus on early-school leavers. She also conducts research on educational policies and practices designed to facilitate refugee youth's participation in their new host countries.

**Magdalena Fellner** is head of the University and Science Management and Education Management courses at the Donau-Universität Krems, Germany. She is also responsible for the Coordination of the "University Research Austria" network. She is also a research assistant for research and development projects in the field of education management and university development.

**Janne Fengler** is vice dean at the Faculty of Human Sciences and Social Sciences for the Department of Education at Alanus University of Arts and Social Sciences in Alfter near Bonn, Germany. She holds a professorship in Educational Psychology and Childhood Education. Her fields of research and teaching include professionalization of early childhood education, methods of social work and victimology. Professor Fengler is editor of numerous books and special editions of scientific journals. Furthermore, she edits a periodical as well as a scholarly / peer-reviewed journal as editor and editor in chief in the topic areas of action-oriented education, professional

development and human resource management. In her latest monograph, Professor Fengler developed a model of effective assessment and decision making in social work (ALOHA-Model). Professor Fengler is member of different scientific advisory boards and evaluation panel groups and gives lectures at international scientific conferences dedicated to the subject areas of Educational Sciences, Psychology, Social Work as well as Victimology on a regular basis.

**Hemant Ghising** received his doctorate from the Educational Leadership & Policy Program at the University of Vermont. As a longtime educator in a refugee camp his research work was highly motivated by his own lived experiences as refugee for 18 years. He is passionate about telling the stories of refugees and immigrants, refugees transitioning to resettled countries, poverty, equity in education, family and school relationship and learning from the responses of his readers, which he believes would further enhance his writings. He wrote his dissertation on “Bhutanese Refugee Students: Their Perceptions of High School & Challenges of Accessing a Four-Year College Degree in the U.S.” and continues to work on the community-engaged research study with refugee families with Reyes and Haines at UVM.

**Stefanie Greubel** holds a Professorship for Early Childhood Education at the Alanus University of Arts and Education in Alfter near Bonn. Before joining Alanus, she worked at the German Institute for Adult education, Leibniz Centre for Lifelong Learning (DIE) and the University of Bonn, Germany. Her main research interests are education policies and circumstances of Early Childhood Education as well as transitional processes in family and childhood biographies. She mainly teaches in the field of early Childhood Education and empirical research methods. Besides her lectures in University she regularly gives classes in Pedagogical Training centers and supports parents

education in ECET centers. Her last publication is focussed on childrens position in society.

**Donald Hackmann** is the Frances S. and Arthur L. Wallace Professor and Director of the School of Education. He earned his Doctor of Education degree in Educational Administration from the University of Missouri at Columbia. Prior to entering the professorate, he served as a middle level teacher, high school assistant principal, and middle level principal in the state of Missouri. His research encompasses P-12 educational leadership and strategies that promote equity and access.

**Shana Haines** is an associate professor in the Department of Education at the University of Vermont, where she conducts research on family-professional partnerships, teacher education, and inclusive school reform. She received her Ph.D. in Special Education at the University of Kansas. With colleague Cynthia Reyes and Hemant Ghising (and many students), Shana has been involved in community-engaged research seeking to understand the nuances affecting the partnerships between refugee families and their children's teachers. This research led to the development and small pilot study of an intervention called Relationships Among Families and Teachers (RAFT) aimed at augmenting these relationships through a child-centered structured conversation. Shana is currently a Fulbright Scholar in São Miguel, Portugal.

**Joann Halpern** is the director of the Hasso Plattner Institute, New York and an adjunct professor in the Department of Applied Statistics, Social Science and Humanities at New York University. She was the founding director of the German Center for Research and Innovation (GCRI), which was created as a cornerstone of the German government's initiative to internationalize science and research. In addition to teaching and administrative assignments at universities in the United States and Germany, Dr. Halpern co-founded Knowledge

Transfer Beyond Boundaries, an NGO with projects in Cameroon, Nigeria, Yemen, and Antigua. She received her B.A. from Dartmouth College, her M.A. from Harvard University, and her Ph.D. from New York University. She is a recipient of the Harvard University Award for Distinction in Teaching as well as scholarships and fellowships from the Fulbright Association, German Academic Exchange Service, Robert Bosch Foundation, and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Dr. Halpern serves on the advisory boards of the German Center for Research and Innovation, Technical University of Dortmund, German Accelerator, Charité Entrepreneurship Summit, University Alliance Ruhr, and the External Advisory Board of the Tandon Institute for Invention, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship.

**Edmund 'Ted' Hamann** is a Professor in the Department of Teaching, Learning, & Teacher Education at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. An anthropologist of education with expertise in the US and Mexico, for more than 20 years he has studied school system responses to demographic change, particularly to the arrival of transnationally mobile children and families. In 2018 with Mexican colleagues Víctor Zúñiga and Juan Sánchez García he was recognized with the AERA Div. G Henry T. Trueba Award for Research Leading to the Transformation of Social Contexts of Education Award. In 2019, he was a Fulbright García-Robles US Scholar in Tijuana Mexico and in 2020 he was selected as an AERA Fellow.

**Florian G. Hartmann** is a research assistant at the Department for Education of the Bundeswehr University Munich in Germany. He studied pedagogy, psychology and statistics at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München (2004–2010). After his graduation he joined the Bundeswehr University Munich and received his PhD degree in 2016 with a thesis on the similarity of vocational interests within the family. He has been teaching statistics and methods for the social sciences at the Bundeswehr

University Munich, at the Bielefeld University, at the Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt and at the FOM University of Applied Sciences. His research is about vocational interests, educational mobility, and methods for the social sciences.

**Barbara Herzog-Punzenberger** is professor of education at the University of Innsbruck and was leading research programs on migration, multilingualism and inter-/transcultural learning in different contexts. She studied cultural anthropology at the University of Vienna, received a postgraduate degree in political science at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Vienna and a PhD in sociology at the University of Education in Freiburg, Germany. Much of her work is country-comparative research on equity and children from migrant parents in different educational systems. Another focus is on initial teacher education and diversity, especially linguistic and cultural diversity. She has been involved in work for the European Commission, the OECD and the UNESCO.

**Juanita Hicks** is a Researcher at American Institutes for Research (AIR). Her primary responsibilities include contributing to general research of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and specifically towards the exploration of process data from computer-based and large-scale assessments, as part of the AIR Process Data Team within the NCES/AIR Center for Process Data. She is involved in several outreach initiatives focused on increasing the awareness and knowledge of process data from large-scale assessments. She also has extensive experience in educational research and educational measurement as it pertains to K-12 education during her time working as a research analyst for a school district.

**Merle Hummrich** holds the professorship for educational science with a focus on school and youth at the Goethe University Frankfurt am Main, Germany.

**Livia Jesacher-Rössler** is a researcher at the University of Innsbruck at the Institute for Teacher Education and School Research. Her main skills are in educational innovation and change with a particular focus on educational leadership, school improvement and region school development. She also works for the National Center for Learning Schools, where her main interests lie in school research and educational system reforms. Furthermore, she is coordinator of the German-speaking Innovative Learning Environment Network and deputy network coordinator for school research and school development in the Austrian Society for Education.

**Sieglinde Jornitz** works as senior researcher and part of the international team at German Educational Research Institute (DIPF). Together with Marcelo Parreira do Amaral she acts as editor-in-chief for a new handbook on the Education Systems of the Americas and will be part of a larger German funded project on digitization and school. Currently she is involved in a smaller project on professionalization issues of teachers that continues the work on analyzing school lessons to contribute to a theory of teaching as part of an education theory. Being a member of the international team at DIPF, Sieglinde organises various network events for bringing together German and international partners in the field of education. Beside of these activities, she is also an expert in the field of qualitative picture analysis.

**Nina Jude** works as coordinator at the Unit for Teaching and Schooling, at the department of Education Quality and Evaluation, at the DIPF | Leibniz Institute for research and Information in Education, Frankfurt am Main, Germany.

**Dilek Kayaalp** is an assistant professor at the University of North Florida (UNF). Dilek conducted her postdoctoral research at Simon Fraser University, Canada. She completed her PhD in the Department of Educational Studies at the University of British

Columbia, Canada. Since 2015 Dilek has been working on a cross-cultural comparative research project which investigates Middle Eastern refugee youths' cultural and educational participations in the US and Canada. She is the recipient of numerous awards, including the Commission on Diversity & Inclusion Research Award, UNF.

**David Kemethofer** studied Sociology and received his Ph.D. in Pedagogy at the Johannes Kepler University in Linz, Austria. Since November 2017, he is Professor at the University of Teacher Education Upper Austria working at the Institute of further education and school development. Before he was employed as a researcher at the Federal Institute for Educational Research, Innovation and Development of the Austrian school System in Salzburg, Austria. Dr. Kemethofer supports principals as part of a professionalization programme with their action research projects. He also gave lessons at the Universities of Innsbruck, Linz and Salzburg. Additionally he is network coordinator for school research and school development in the Austrian Society for Education and acts as co-convenor in the educational leadership network of the European Educational Research Association. His main academic fields and research interests are educational leadership and the implementation of school reforms. He published on school inspections, performance standards, and school leadership.

**Esther-Dominique Klein** did the teacher education program to teach English and social studies in upper track secondary schools. As a PhD student, she was research employee at the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz and the University of Duisburg-Essen. She finished her PhD in 2012 with a thesis on statewide exit exams as a tool for governance and school improvement. Dominique has been postdoc at the University of Duisburg-Essen ever since. In 2015 and 2016, she spent 12 months at the University of California, Berkeley, as a postdoc fellow funded by the German Research Foundation. There, she

has started a comparative research study that contrasts the role principals and leadership play for the success of schools serving disadvantaged communities.

**Jill Koyama**, a sociocultural anthropologist, is Associate Professor in Educational Policy Studies and Practice and Program Coordinator of Educational Leadership and Policy at the University of Arizona (UA). She also serves as the Director of UA's Institute for LGBT Studies. In her research, she applies critical ethnography to the study of policy and politics associated with civil and human rights and the persistent segregation and marginalization of racially, culturally, ethnically, linguistic minority children, including refugees.

**Felicitas Macgilchrist** is Head of the 'Media Transformations' department at the Georg Eckert Institute of International Textbook Studies, Braunschweig, and Professor of Media Research at the University of Goettingen's Institute of Educational Science. Current research draws on cultural theory, ethnography, discourse studies and critical data studies to explore how people try to change schooling through 'new' technology. Recent publications include a social science fiction about possible futures with education and technology, and further articles taking a generatively critical approach to digital media and schooling.

**Joel Malin** is an Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership at Miami University. He received his Ph.D. in educational policy, organization and leadership from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in May 2015. His research interests include research use and engagement, cross-sector collaboration, and leadership and policy (e.g., surrounding ambitious high school college and career readiness reforms). Joel's scholarship has appeared in several top journals, including Educational Administration Quarterly, the Journal of Educational Administration, and Education Policy Analysis Archives. In the



research use area, Joel has been especially focused on: 1) understanding the nature of educators' research use and engagement; 2) understanding the nature and influence of educational intermediaries/brokers that seek to support the use of research and professional ideas in practice; and 3) considering how to leverage existing networks to enhance research engagement.

**Jutta von Maurice** studied psychology at the University of Trier. She received her diploma in 1993 with a thesis on the effects of chance events and interests on decision-making behavior in college freshmen. She received her doctorate from the University of Trier in 2004 with a thesis on intergenerational interest relations from the perspective of person-environment fit theory. In 2009 Jutta von Maurice was appointed as Executive Director of Research of the National Educational Panel Study (NEPS) and has since been responsible for coordinating research activities of NEPS. As of January 2014, she became Executive Director of Research at the Leibniz Institute for Educational Trajectories (LIfBi) at the University of Bamberg. Since 2016 she is also the principle investigator of the panel study "ReGES - Refugees in the German Educational System" which investigates the conditions leading to a successful integration of refugees into the German educational system. Her research interests are in the fields of vocational psychology, developmental psychology, and quantitative research methods.

**Aziza Mayo** is a professor of education and the director of the research program Values and Value of Waldorf Education, at the University of Applied Sciences Leiden, the Netherlands. In this program, she closely collaborates with Waldorf educational practitioners and with teacher trainers to build knowledge and understanding of purposes and practices in contemporary Waldorf education. Previously, she worked at research universities in the Netherlands and the UK, studying the roles of parents and schools in children's educational experiences.

**Jody McBrien** is a Professor at the University of South Florida. She has conducted research and worked with war-affected civilians and resettled refugees since 2002 in North America, Europe, Africa, Asia, and Australasia. Her newest publication is an edited book, *Educational Policies and Practices of English-Speaking Refugee Resettlement Countries* (Sense/Brill, 2019). She recently returned from New Zealand where she evaluated the educational centre at the Mangere Refugee Resettlement Centre as a Fulbright Specialist.

**Rick Mintrop** is Associate Professor and Director of the Doctoral Program in Leadership for Educational Equity at the Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley. His research focus lies on how educational policies form institutional structures that in turn shape teaching and learning in schools. He examines the issue of school accountability, particularly in low performing schools and is interested in the tension between student achievement and citizenship, accountability and democratization. His work has recently resulted in the book “Schools on Probation: How Accountability Works (and Doesn’t Work), at Teachers College Press.” Heinrich “Rick” Mintrop has been awarded a Carnegie Corporation scholarship to study school accountability systems comparatively in the United States and Germany. He also has firsthand experience in the field as he worked as a teacher in both the United States and Germany before he entered into his academic career.

**Barbara Muslic** is the leader of the project “Data-based professional development in schools” (funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research BMBF) at the Freie Universität Berlin. She is a Post Doc with main research interests in school leadership and school improvement research, (school) organization research and qualitative methodology.

**Annemarie Neeleman** works as a senior policy advisor and researcher for CVO Rotterdam, a large school board that governs 40 secondary schools in greater Rotterdam, the Netherlands. Among other responsibilities, she operates as an intermediary between the Dutch Education Inspectorate and the schools. In June 2018, she successfully defended her thesis “School Autonomy in Practice. School Intervention Decision-Making by Dutch Secondary School Leaders” at Maastricht University. Annemarie is editor-in-chief of the professional journal *SchoolManagement* and member of the advisory board of the professional register for secondary school leaders.

**Ida Oberman** is Dutch-born and German-educated; she received her BA from Swarthmore College and her PhD from Stanford. She taught high school in New York for a decade, and subsequently served as Education Program Officer at the Hewlett Foundation and as Director of the California Best Practice Study at Pivot Learning Partners in San Francisco. She was co-founder of West Side Community School a Waldorf-inspired K-8 school on the boarder of Harlem New York in 1994 and in 2010 founded the first public intercultural Waldorf school, Community School for Creative Education, a TK – 8 charter school, in East Oakland now the most diverse public school in the country serving 250 children and focused on social justice. She is co-chair emerita of the American Education Research Association (AERA)’s Special Interest Group (SIG) on Holistic Education and founder of the AERA Philanthropy and Education SIG. Publications include *The Waldorf Movement in Education 1919-2008* (2008) and *Policies and Practices in Teacher Learning* (co-ed) (1995).

**William Perez** is a professor in the School of Education at Loyola Marymount University. He received his Ph.D. in Child and Adolescent Development and Educational Psychology from Stanford University. His research focuses on the social and psychological processes associated with academic success and

higher education access among immigrant, undocumented, indigenous, and deported students in the U.S. and Mexico. He has received awards for his scholarly work from the American Educational Research Association, the Association for the Study of Higher Education, the American Educational Studies Association, and the Fulbright Scholars program. The impact of his scholarship has been recognized by Education Week's annual ranking of the top university-based scholars in the U.S. who are doing the most to influence educational policy and practice.

**Colette Rabin** is a Associate Professor at the San José University California and teaches sociology of education, philosophy of education, research methods, classroom management, health and student teaching courses. Prior to teaching graduate school, she taught grades kindergarten through middle school for twelve years. Her research interests are in care ethics, social justice, co-teaching, sustainability, and social and emotional learning. Recent publications include, "Co-Teaching: Collaborative and Caring Teacher Preparation," in *Journal of Teacher Education*, "Social Studies from a Care Ethics Perspective in an Elementary Classroom in Social Studies Research and Practice," and "Don't Throw the Rocks: Cultivating Care with a Pedagogy called Rocks-in-the-Basket" in *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*.

**Cynthia Reyes** is an associate professor in the Department of Education at the University of Vermont, where she also coordinates the Education for Cultural and Linguistic Diversity (ECLD) Minor. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Illinois at Chicago where she was engaged in a family literacy study and conducted an ethnographic case study with English learners. She has been involved in research projects related to digital literacy with English learners and pre-service teachers. With colleagues Shana Haines and Hemant Ghising (& others), she is recently involved in a longitudinal community-engaged

study partnering with refugee families and has a particular interest on family literacy and cultural brokering in schools. Reyes and Haines are co-authors on an upcoming book that intends to examine IRB methods and processes for working with vulnerable populations.

**Fusun Sahin** is a researcher at AIR. Dr. Sahin has been contributing to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) work in assessment operations, research, and reporting teams. She contributes to the NAEP project with her expertise in process data (i.e., log data that include record of examinees' interactions within the digitally based assessments), where she investigates data quality, different ways to benefit from process data for operational decisions, and various research projects on response time and response behaviors of examinees. In her current role, Dr. Sahin also involves in research on the digitally based NAEP assessment especially for using process data to inform operational decisions such as design of the items, features, and system tools. She also examines the content and structure of the process data files and evaluates their usefulness for informing about valuable student actions. In addition, she leads various research activities using process data. She presented research in various conferences on topics including examinees' testing behaviors and modeling response time.

**Jost Schieren** holds a Professorship in School Pedagogy with a focus on Waldorfeducation at Alanus University of Arts and Social Sciences in Alfter (Germany). He is dean of the Educational Department. His fields of research and teaching are Pedagogical Anthropology and Epistemology. He published a couple of books about Waldorfeducation in relation to educational sciences and teaches at Waldorfteachertrainingcenters in Sweden, Norway, France, Poland, Austria, the US and India.

**Pascal Scholtius** is principle at Comenius College Rotterdam, a college for higher general secondary education and pre-university education. Within two school years, Pascal has successfully restored the results of his school by making hospitality the key-word, by his transparency on human resource management and sharing his views on education with every colleague, trusting all colleagues in achieving their goals. Pascal is renowned for his vigor in strategic management, using the results of his thorough research to solve educational challenges.

**Dorothee Schwendowius** is Professor for International and Intercultural Education Research at the Otto von Guericke University Magdeburg, Germany.

**Maura Sellars** PhD currently works as a lecturer at the University of Newcastle, New South Wales. She has thirty years classroom experience in primary settings in the UK and Australia and focusses on inclusive practices for students. Her particular interests are the development of a sense of 'belonging' in education, the psychological and cognitive impact of this on student wellbeing and academic success and the enhancement of radical empathy in schools. She is currently involved in research projects involving schools and communities with refugee and asylum seeker students. She has a number of publications, the latest of which is a 2020 book entitled 'Educating Students with Refugee and Asylum Seeker Experiences: A Commitment to Humanity' published by Barbara Budrich.

**Katharina Soukup-Altrichter** is Vice-Rector for Teaching and Research at the University of Teacher Education Upper Austria, Linz, Austria. After having been trained as a primary school teacher and having worked in primary schools she earned her PhD in Education from University of Vienna and worked as trainer in teacher professional development and as consultant

organizational development. Since 2009 she is Professor of Education at the University of Teacher Education Upper Austria. Her research interests and publications are in teacher education and school improvement.

**Henrietta Steuten** is, vice-principle at Comenius College Rotterdam, a college for higher general secondary education and pre-university education. For the last ten years Henrietta, has been involved in projects of restoring the results of schools to meet the standards of the education inspection. She has experience with upgrading the quality of lessons by focusing on effective teaching in the complete range of secondary education in the Netherlands, working on effective organisations of schools, communication models, and innovative teaching.

**Tanja Sturm** is Professor for Educational Science with a focus on Inklusion and Exclusion in education, upbringing and socialization at the Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg.

**Benjamin Wagener** is a Doctorate at the Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Germany. His research interests include inclusion and exclusion in school and teaching, practical organizational and professional research, and reconstructive methods of social research, especially documentary method and videography.

**Dominik Weigand** is postdoctoral research scientist at the Leibniz-Institute for Educational Trajectories (LifBi). Since 2018 he works in the project team of the panel study „ReGES – Refugees in the German Educational System“ as a sub-project manager and item developer for psychological measures. He studied Sociology, Psychology and Philosophy and received his doctorate in political science with his thesis "Objective Tests: Empirical Study on Integration and Contrast of Direct and Indirect Measurement Methods", where he deals with the phenomenon of reactivity that occurs in various scientific

disciplines and also in everyday life. His research interests are psychological measures, methods of empirical social research and cultural adequacy of measurement.

**Annika Wilmers** is an academic staff member at “International Cooperation in Education - ice”, an office that provides advice and support to empirical educational institutions and individual educational researchers for establishing and improving international research initiatives. She is an experienced science manager and has worked for various higher education and research institutions. Since working for ice at DIPF, she has concentrated on linking German educational research with international research communities. Most recently, she has been engaged in projects that aimed at fostering research exchange between North American and German scholars as well as working for OECD and EU projects, particularly in the field of evidence-informed education policy and practice. She holds a B.A. and M.A. in Modern History, Medieval History and German Literature (Université de Provence and University of Tübingen), and a PhD in Modern History (University of Tübingen).

**Alexander W. Wiseman, Ph.D.**, is Professor of Educational Leadership & Policy in the College of Education at Texas Tech University. Dr. Wiseman holds a dual-degree Ph.D. in Comparative & International Education and Educational Theory & Policy from Pennsylvania State University, a M.A. in International Comparative Education from Stanford University, a M.A. in Education from The University of Tulsa, and a B.A. in Letters from the University of Oklahoma. Dr. Wiseman conducts comparative educational research on educational policy and practice using large-scale education datasets on math and science education, information and communication technology (ICT), teacher preparation, professional development and curriculum as well as school principal’s instructional leadership activity, and is the author of many research-to-practice articles



and books. He serves as Senior Editor of the online journal *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education*, Series Editor for the International Perspectives on Education and Society volume series (Emerald Publishing), and Editor of the *Annual Review of Comparative and International Education* (Emerald Publishing).

**Jeanette Ziehm** is Head Coordinator of the IDeA Center at the DIPF | Leibniz Institute for Research and Information in Education, Frankfurt am Main, Germany.