Playing Together: A Call for Multiple Stakeholders to Reduce Exclusionary and Harsh Discipline for Young BICOC with Disabilities

Saili S. Kulkarni
San José State University

Sunyoung Kim
University of Illinois at Chicago

Tunette Powell
University of California, Los Angeles

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.pace.edu/perspectives

Playing Together: A Call for Multiple Stakeholders to Reduce Exclusionary and Harsh Discipline for Young BICOC with Disabilities

Saili S. Kulkarni, Sunyoung Kim, & Tunette Powell

Abstract

Punitive disciplinary actions deny Black, Indigenous,[2] Children of Color (BICOC) with disabilities from access to meaningful instruction and increase their risks for truancy, dropping out, and incarceration. At the intersection of race, disability, and discipline, this paper is a call to action for research and practices that bring together stakeholders and co-constructed, local solutions to exclusionary disciplinary practices affecting BICOC with disabilities. Specifically, we assert that efforts to reduce disproportionately racist responses to the challenging behaviors of young BICOC with disabilities (birth through age 8) cannot be solved with a single intervention strategy or simplistic approaches. Instead, we highlight the critical shortage of research that centers the knowledge and experiences of BIPOC communities, families and early childhood populations. We provide implications for practices that specifically highlight anti-racist and anti-ableist framings in schools.

Keywords: *early childhood, exclusionary discipline, disability, race*

---

1. We note that Sprague et al. (2013) is the only piece that we have found specifically highlighting Indigenous children's exclusionary discipline.

In 2019, Kaia Rolle was placed in handcuffs, arrested and charged with a battery misdemeanor after a tantrum at a charter school in Orlando, Florida (Pressley et al., 2020). She was 6-years old. In an interview, Kaia's mother noted that Kaia suffered from sleep apnea and had a difficult time concentrating in class—factors her mother believed contributed to Kaia's irritability that day.

It took a national outcry before charges against Kaia were dropped. Her story of how race and ability intersected to place a first grader in handcuffs illustrates the context for how Black, Indigenous Children of Color (BICOC) are disproportionately the targets of exclusionary disciplinary practices, even in early childhood (defined as ages 3- to 8-years old). Further, her story illustrates the critical need to address exclusionary and harsh disciplinary practices early.

Kaia Rolle.

Say her name.

As a nation, as we grapple and confront our country's history of police brutality, specifically against Black and Indigenous People of Color (BIPOC), it is important for us to remember that police brutality is merely one of the ways in which racism manifests itself. Schools are also sites and battlefields of violence for BICOC. National preschool data similarly shows that BICOC are suspended three times as often as White children (Gilliam & Shahar, 2006; Losen & Gillespie, 2012; Sprague et al., 2013). Similar patterns exist for children with identified disabilities between the ages of 3 to 5. These students make up 12% of the early childhood population, but nearly 75% of suspensions or expulsions (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). Data from the U.S. Census Bureau of 2016 National Survey of Children's Health also shows disparities in suspensions and expulsions across disability identification with the greatest disparities across children with behavioral problems and attention deficit hyperactive disorder, though disparities exist across developmental disabilities, speech disorders, and anxiety (Novoa & Malik, 2018).

Annamma et al. (2019a) notes how school discipline connects to "criminalization because of a national commitment to a carceral state" and deems BICOC bodies with disabilities as disposable (p. 213).

An et al. (2019) also found that teacher-student relationships for students with disabilities were generally more negative than for those without disabilities. Such punitive disciplinary actions deny BICOC with disabilities access to academic instruction and robs them of foundational instruction time (Losen, 2018). Harsh and exclusionary discipline can also increase the risks for truancy, dropping out, and incarceration (Losen & Gillespie, 2012).

Powell (2020) notes how data on young BICOC tend to be siloed and fail to address the trauma experienced by children and families who are the victims of punitive disciplinary practices. In addition to the limited scholarship that has examined exclusionary discipline practices for BICOC with disabilities (Gilliam & Shahar, 2006), there has been little attention to meaningfully eradicating this disparity, nor has there been much research that centers the voices of those who have been directly impacted by discipline disparities such as the families and communities that support BICOC. Tunette Powell, author and mother of two preschoolers who were suspended, has also explicitly shared her stories of the suspension of her own Black sons, and the realization that they were being suspended for behaviors similar to White peers who were simply reprimanded or given a warning (Glass, 2014).

At the intersection of race, disability, and discipline, this paper is a call to action for research and practice to bring stakeholders and co-constructed, local solutions to exclusionary and harsh disciplinary practices affecting BICOC with disabilities. Specifically, we assert that efforts to reduce disproportionately racist responses to challenging behaviors in BICOC with disabilities cannot be effective with single interventions or simplistic approaches. As Gregory and colleagues explained (2010), the shared goal of educational equity cannot be realized until we disrupt the racial disparities in school discipline practices.

Therefore, the purpose of this manuscript is to highlight the importance of approaches centering the knowledge and experiences of BICOC with disabilities, their families, and their communities and

call attention to this critical erasure within the existing early childhood special education and discipline literature. We begin this paper by describing how we can frame exclusionary discipline disparities for BICOC with disabilities using a DisCrit lens (Annamma et al., 2013), sharing what little literature exists on the experiences of BICOC with disabilities and/or their families, and providing comprehensive recommendations that work to (re) center the voices of this community for research and practice.

Disability Studies and Critical Race Theory

In drawing upon the intersections of racism and ableism in schools, we utilize Disability Studies Critical Race Theory (DisCrit; Annamma et al., 2013) to understand how exclusionary and harsh disciplinary practices for BICOC with disabilities occur in schools and to reframe approaches to eliminating these pervasive issues. DisCrit's seven tenets specifically serve to highlight how racism and ableism are interdependent in invisible ways to uphold notions of normalcy (Connor et al., 2015, p. 19). DisCrit provides a framework for identifying exclusionary disciplinary practices and how to begin a deeper conversation of how schools can move toward eradicating these negative outcomes for BICOC with disabilities.

A theoretical understanding of the ways in which racism and ableism operate is necessary to understand how students of color with disabilities are positioned and subsequently excluded in schools and how their voices and voices of their communities are silenced in school settings and research. As DisCrit (Annamma et al., 2013) reminds us, there are psychological impacts of being labeled with a disability. Further, "ability is often distributed and withheld along racial lines" (Beneke and Cheatham, 2020, p. 2). Even at a young age, children are already being socially positioned as smart/good and not smart/bad and sorted by who is considered "normal" in the classroom (Broderick & Leonardo, 2016). This positioning of BICOC with identified or perceived disabilities have added consequences for students' self-esteem and self-perception.

Students can receive harsh and exclusionary disciplinary consequences for being perceived as a threat to teachers and other students in addition to a host of other behaviors such as non-compliance and fighting (Morris, 2012). As Annamma and Morrison (2018) remind us, "it is multiply-marginalized Students of Color that are the most targeted in dysfunctional classroom ecologies" (p. 116). Dysfunctional classroom ecologies include hyper-surveillance, harsh and exclusionary disciplinary practices, and incarceration. Winn and Behizadeh (2011) contended that youth in schools deemed under-performing tend to focus more on discipline policies as opposed to academic rigor. It is precisely these schools that would benefit the most if educational institutions viewed education as a human right.

The interdependence of racism and ableism along with other interlocking forms of oppression (gender, sexuality, socioeconomic status, to name a few) has been established in the education literature (Connor et al., 2015). Broderick and Leonardo (2016) discussed how the ability line between "normal" and "abnormal" is often centered in white, able-bodied framings of school. Particularly for Black children, who represent about 20% of the U.S. preschool population and about 50% of those suspended one or more times (Samuels, 2004), racism and ableism create negative and costly experiences in schools. Less research has shown, however, how young children at these intersectional spaces receive the same kinds of harsh disciplinary actions and are exposed to the same kinds of structural violence within schools as secondary school youth.

A study by Gilliam and colleagues from the Yale Child Study Center, which received broad media attention in 2016, focused specifically on implicit teacher bias in preschool settings. The study found that teachers hold biased views based on race, gender, and physical size. In particular, the study found biases were greater in teachers from different racial groups than their students and that harsh disciplinary measures such as punishment were used with Black boys who were larger in physical size. This emphasizes DisCrit's first tenet about "upholding notions of normalcy" (Connor et al., 2015,

p. 19) and which children across racial lines, ability, and physical bodies are deemed normal. The study also had implications for those who were deemed of problematic behavior (Stegelin, 2018). The physical bodies of Black children have been used as another tool of subjugation, another way in which racism and ableism overlap (Annamma et. al., 2013).

Voices of BIPOC Families and Children with Disabilities

Very few studies exist that directly center the voices and experiences of BICOC with disabilities and their families. We also note that while there has been considerable attention and national data illustrating the intersections of race and disability with exclusionary discipline, that little is focused on early childhood, though the issue exists (Children's Equity Project [CEP], & Bipartisan Policy Center [BPC] 2020). Even separately, little research exists on the disciplinary experiences of families of children with disabilities or BIPOC families (CEP & BPC, 2020).

Pearson et al. (2020), for example, describes the experiences of Black families of children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). Although the study was not specifically addressing exclusionary behavior, the authors bring up some of the complexities of negotiating behaviorist approaches to ASD for their Black children. Six of 11 Black parents from the study noted dissatisfaction with the services their child received from professionals (Pearson et al., 2020). Among dissatisfied parents, one explained the tension of the token economy systems and how the children were treated "like animals" forced to enact mundane behavioral tasks (Pearson et al., 2020, p. 308). While not specifically highlighting exclusionary discipline procedures, the study suggests that there can often be a lack of dignity for BICOC students with disabilities and a hyper focus on control versus cooperation.

Kenly and Klein (2020) examined the experiences of Black preschoolers and their families in a Midwestern suburb. Using a large

mixed-methods study, the authors found that over 13% of Black kindergarteners were referred to special education as compared with 9% of students who identified as multiracial and 6% of white students. They also found large differences in approaches to education by type of preschool. Professionals at private preschools shared a desire to develop children's socioemotional learning and social skills, while public preschools and daycare centers focused more on academic and behavioral mandates (Kenly & Klein, 2020). The study suggests that exclusionary disciplinary actions are more likely to occur in schools with more rigid behavioral approaches, though this tends complicated by the fact that fewer BICOC with disabilities attend private preschools.

In a quantitative study by Jacobson et al. (2019), the authors also made known the fact that very few exclusionary discipline studies that indicate racial disparities are conducted for students in younger grades (elementary school). Using the Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study, which included around 5000 students from 1998 to 2000, the authors found racial disparities for children under nine (Y9) across Black students in both boys and girls based on the risk of being identified for exclusionary disciplinary practices. While the original sample included interviews with family members (mostly mothers), this data was not provided in the study.

These studies, although advancing our understanding of exclusionary discipline to include younger populations (Jacobson et al., 2019); and including the voices of BIPOC families (Pearson et al., 2020) and describing differences in disciplinary actions across setting (Kenly & Klein, 2020) have yet to fully capture the voices of BIPOC families of children with disabilities and their experiences with exclusionary discipline in early childhood settings. We next provide some additional context for exclusionary disciplinary practices and then provide recommendations for further study and practices to center the voices of BICOC with disabilities and their families, moving specifically toward anti-racist and anti-ableist framings.

Providing a Context for Exclusionary and Harsh Discipline Practices

As shared above, our nation's history of racism, ableism, and violence against BIPOC has been well-documented. Though these experiences are often talked about as a thing of the past, the reproduction of this violence manifests itself every day in society, especially in P-12 classrooms and schools. Rather than serving as great equalizers, exclusionary discipline is one of the ways in which schools reproduce violence through racism and ableism. For example, in the United States, no state outright prohibited the practice of harsh and exclusionary discipline (CEP & BPC, 2020). The failure to do so has resulted in our nation's youngest children being funneled from school to prison by way of the following: (a) in-school suspension, (b) out-of-school suspension, (c) expulsion, (d) corporal punishment, (e) restraint and seclusion, (f) school-related arrests, and (g) referrals to law enforcement (CEP & BPC, 2020; Nowicki et al., 2018).

In early childhood, the most common forms of exclusionary discipline are suspension and expulsion (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). Over the 2015–2016 school year, states reported 1.27 million cases of young children being disciplined through exclusionary practices in public schools (CEP & BPC, 2020). Suspension and expulsion not only remove a child from the classroom, they also reduce the likelihood of a child receiving a high-quality early childhood education, which has been linked to benefits such as less grade repetition and special education placement, higher rates of high school graduation, and improved social behavior (Camilli et al., 2010). Furthermore, suspension and expulsion have had an adverse effect on young children. The U.S. Department of Education and Health & Human Services (2014) states:

> Suspension and expulsion can influence a number of adverse outcomes across development, health, and education. Young students who are expelled or suspended are as much as 10 times more likely to drop out of high

> school, experience academic failure and grade retention, hold negative school attitudes, and face incarceration than those who are not. While much of this research has focused on expulsion and suspension in elementary, middle, and high school settings, there is evidence that expulsion or suspension early in a child's education is associated with expulsion or suspension in later school grades (p. 3).

Overall, school-related arrests and referrals to law enforcement are understudied among the population of young children with disabilities; yet news sources and qualitative school accounts are filled with examples of how frequently these forms of exclusionary discipline are employed. In another example from Georgia, in 2012, a 6-year-old-Black girl (Salecia Johnson; Say Her Name) was handcuffed and taken to jail from her kindergarten classroom, also for throwing a tantrum (Jefferson, 2012). To date, however, there is no evidence that any of these forms of harsh and exclusionary discipline practices improve behavior. In fact, as is illustrated above, these forms of discipline are harmful and have lasting effects for both BICOC and students with disabilities.

In response to the increased numbers of young students entering the "school-to-prison nexus" (Meiners, 2007, p. 6) due to these policies, many states have been working to ban early exclusionary practice in early childhood educational settings (CEP & BPC, 2020). Meiners (2007) first described the "school-prison nexus" as capturing the historic and intersectional intersections of education and prison (p. 6). Annamma (2017) further explains how the process begins with multiply marginalized youth in schools. We emphasize this point to say that these processes can begin as early as when students first enter the school system: in early childhood education. However, this type of discipline is recommended to respond to students' challenging behaviors and it is still in place "as the last resort" (CEP & BPC, 2020, p. 51). Adams and Meiners (2014) described how the specific identification of unwanted bodies in schools (BICOC with disabilities) are then made less visible by exclusion.

Table 1.
Recommendations to Reduce Harsh and Exclusionary Disciplinary Approaches for Young BICOC with Disabilities

Level	Recommendations
Federal	• Redirect federal IDEA funds to districts with problematic disciplinary data • Policy follow-through to maintain accurate data on disciplinary actions • Universal screening
State	• Use data to identify districts with problematic racial and disability-related disparities with discipline • Investment in high-quality teaching workforce • Goal and data tracking across districts • Coordination of state prekindergarten settings with early intervention • Statewide plan for disciplinary guidelines followed consistently across district and classrooms
District	• Anti-bias trainings for teachers • Eliminate segregated settings for emergent bilinguals and students with disabilities • District wide addition of resources to support behavioral and mental health • Family-school partnership efforts • Identify disciplinary practices that lead to lost instructional time • District wide resources for restorative justice practices
School	• Anti-bias trainings for teachers • Schoolwide PBIS • Trainings to use zero-tolerance and exclusionary measures as a last resort • Administration of schoolwide climate surveys • School based SEL trainings and supports • Use harsh or exclusionary discipline as a last resort and only with documented prior approval • Identify schoolwide practices that lead to lost instructional time • Schoolwide commitments to restorative classroom practices • Teacher trainings in restorative behavioral supports and social control
Research	• Increased qualitative research on the impacts of harsh/exclusionary discipline on students of color with disabilities, their families and communities • Data on lived experiences of young BICOC with disabilities • Longitudinal data on impacts of discipline • Impacts of discipline on families and communities • Impacts of restraint and seclusion for students of color with disabilities • Teachers rationales for utilizing harsh or exclusionary discipline • (Stakeholders/multidisciplinary approaches such as Learning Labs (LLs) • Disaggregated data for early childhood (especially K-12 data)

Recommendations

Preschool should serve as a lever with which to include all students with and without disabilities in healthy, safe, restorative environments. To begin with, removing the barriers of segregation and exclusion and moving toward including students with disabilities with typically developing peers as young children has several benefits: the development of tolerance, understanding, and embracing of disability as difference (Baglieri & Lalvani, 2019), as well as improved social and academic development. Unfortunately, far too many students of color with disabilities in preschools continue to be educated separately (CEP & BPC, 2020). Providing opportunities for inclusive, restorative justice practices (Kulkarni, in press, a), in which *all* children learn together, would additionally create healthy, safe, and meaningful school environments. Kulkarni (in press, a) found that elementary school teachers of color committed to restorative justice practices use these practices not only as a response to behavior deemed challenging but expand restorative justice as a lens with which to approach teaching overall. An approach that seeks to understand children's communicated behaviors and centers on healing from harm to build strong classroom community are all key aspects of applying a restorative lens.

Building on the importance of a restorative justice lens to disciplinary approaches, we provide recommendations from the existing literature (Table 1) and expand these suggestions to specifically address anti-racist and anti-ableist practices (Table 2). Table 1 looks at key policy and practice recommendations across levels of implementation (federal, state, local and research). Table 2 looks at the importance of key stakeholders and their roles individually and collectively in implementing anti-ableist and anti-racist practices.

There are recommendations that have been offered by the literature on reducing exclusionary practices for BICOC and children with disabilities. We first outline some of these existing recommendations to reduce and eliminate exclusionary disciplinary practices for BICOC in schools. We then expand the existing research with further suggestions and considerations that draw from the DisCrit framework to explicitly

engage anti-racist and anti-ableist practices. Finally, we follow up by providing research recommendations in our discussion and conclusion.

Policy-level recommendations to improve disciplinary practices in schools were provided by Children's Equity Project (CEP) and Bipartisan Policy Center (BPC) (2020). At the district and school level, the most important consideration is to ensure that schools ban harsh disciplinary practices with young children, invest in reviewing disciplinary data, and focus on anti-bias training and positive discipline (CEP & BPC, 2020). The policy paper also recommends reducing segregated environments for students identified as students with disabilities and those who are emergent bilinguals. Generating structurally inclusive environments is, indeed, a first step to reducing exclusionary and harsh disciplinary practices for young BICOC with disabilities.

Table 2
Anti-Racist/Anti-Ableist Practices for Stakeholders to Reduce Discipline Disparities for BICOC

Stakeholders	Anti-Racisit/Anti-Ableist Practices
Teachers/ Educators	Early childhood educators need to participate in on-going and self-reflective opportunities centering on how racism and ableism operate interdependently in school systems. This shifts/ moves beyond anti-bias training to engage teaching young children about difference. We adapt recommendations by Cole & Verwayne (2018) below for young BICOC with disabilities and disciplinary approaches as well as our earlier recommendations of a DisCrit-informed curriculum for teacher education (see Kulkarni, in press, b). • Work with colleagues to generate a collective anti-racist curriculum • Communicate regularly with families about perspectives on discipline • Anticipate misconceptions that professionals, stakeholders, and children may have about race and behavior • Participate in trainings and professional development that seek to engage historical understanding of how disability and race intersect to inform discipline (Annamma et al., 2013) Baglieri and Lalvani (2020) also provide ideas for anti-ableist practices that teachers can include when working with children in schools. • Adding to thematic units on families, communities, and current events addressing disability as difference • Defining "normal" and "abnormal" and "disability" vs. "ability" to promote acceptability of behavioral differences

Table 2 cont.

Service Providers	Preparation in many of these service provider occupations has continued to center whiteness and hire very few practitioners of color (Mahendra, 2019). Drawing from Mahendra's (2019) article for speech and language pathologists, we adopt the following suggestions for service providers. • Identify and recognize patterns of disciplinary inequities for multiply marginalized children • Critically self-reflect about discipline as it affects multiply marginalized children. • Connections with multiply marginalized families that center community cultural wealth (Yosso, 2005) rather than Eurocentric ways of knowing these communities
School Leaders	Directors of early childhood centers and preschools and/or school principals are critical to setting tone for disciplinary policies in schools. Anti-racist and anti-ableist practices for leaders are adopted for young BICOC with disabilities from Miller (2020). • Leadership affects culture and culture affects leadership (Miller, 2019a). Leaders must be able to read their institutions and underlying beliefs about discipline in order to affect change. • Leaders must reframe the issues of racism and ableism to help school professionals understand both historical and current contexts (Annamma et al., 2019). • In addition to highlighting the problem or issues concerning discipline disparities, school leaders can "cascade the knowledge of what's required and how this could be approached to others (teachers, parents, students, community members, school boards)" (Miller, 2020, p. 6). This inclusive and collective approach can lead families, teachers, and others to 'own the issue' (Miller 2019b).
Collective Engagement	Collective engagement across stakeholders is rooted in undoing power differentials (Bal et al., 2016; Zygmunt et al., 2018) across race and ability. All stakeholders have an opportunity to come together to learn from BICOC with disabilities and their families in a space where families. BICOC with disabilities (though media such as visuals, journey maps, and oral reporting, are engaged to share their experiences with exclusionary discipline. Families bring their community cultural wealth (Moll et al., 1992) to these conversations and share their visions of what discipline can look like in schools. School discipline is re-envisioned through these collective conversations with stakeholders. • Collective conversations can be structured using Learning Labs (see Bal et al., 2016) • Collective conversations should establish an ethic of authentic and critical caring that establishes and sustains community-engaged partnerships (Zygmunt et al., 2018) • Changes are built on the foundation of asset-based, culturally sustaining approaches to discipline (Paris & Alim, 2017).

Losen (2018) also provides several policy-level and district-level recommendations to reduce exclusionary disciplinary practices The policy brief explains that states should identify districts with problematic data on racial and disability-related disparities, learn the root causes of these disparities, and then redirect the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) funding towards these schools and districts (Losen, 2018). The report also suggests school-wide training for staff using school climate surveys and evaluating data regularly to discern effectiveness in remedying these issues (Losen, 2018). Finally, the report suggests that there needs to be more research on the qualitative effects of exclusionary practices and lost instructional time on students of color with disabilities.

Stegelin (2018) also provides a series of general policy recommendations from the school and district level, including an investment in a high-quality workforce of teachers, partnerships with families, universal screening, goal and data tracking, and specialized support for teachers and administrators. The report also recommends that further research is needed on case studies or longitudinal effects of children who have been suspended, their families and community perspectives, as well as teacher variables and reasons that lead to exclusionary disciplinary practices for young children. Unfortunately, as we have outlined earlier, few of these kinds of longitudinal or case studies of experiences exist for BICOC with disabilities.

Further suggestions from both the Department of Education and Department of Health and Human Services indicate that it is critical that preschool educators are provided with additional supports in the form of consultants such as mental health professionals, behavior specialists, counselors, and special education teachers (DOED and HHS Policy Statement, supra note 25, at 7[2]). Table 1 summarizes the major recommendations from research and policy briefs related to

2. U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, 2013-14 *Civil Rights Data Collection: A First Look* (Washington D.C.: October 2016), and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Education: Policy Statement on Expulsion and Suspension Policies in Early Childhood Settings (November, 2016).

exclusionary and/or harsh disciplinary measures for BICOC with disabilities and their families. In Table 1, we also add several recommendations for further research as indicated by several of the studies and briefs, as well as our own assessment of the existing literature.

Educational research has also taken up the issue of school-wide discipline at the secondary level (Skiba et al., 2002), as well as recommendations for different approaches that move away from zero-tolerance discipline (Skiba et al., 2002). Efforts to improve school-wide positive behavioral supports (PBIS) have led to the use of multidisciplinary or team-based approaches. As Calais and Green (in press) contend, PBIS is not without its own racial biases; however, we welcome a teams-based approach to build restorative practices that dispense with harsh and exclusionary discipline. Green and colleagues (2018), for example, suggest the use of an equity team to "create and maintain systems that have an explicit commitment to equity" (p. 242). The equity-team approach, similar to a multidisciplinary team, would be composed of different stakeholders (family members, administrators, social workers, counselors, and teachers) and include the demographic makeup of the school community. Such a team would be responsible for maintenance of school wide disciplinary practices and evaluation of effectiveness through regular meetings.

Children and youth bring complex sets of abilities and experiences that highlight the culturally situated nature of education. For example, Black students are punished more severely for less serious, more subjective reasons such as disrespect as noted above (Skiba et al., 2002). Bal and colleagues (2016) developed Learning Labs (LLs) through the Culturally Responsive Positive Behavior Supports (CRPBIS) research group at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Originally, the intent of LLs was to facilitate an inclusive problem-solving process and develop culturally responsive behavioral support systems with practitioners, families, students, and community members (Bal et al., 2016). Bal et al. (2016) found that implementing LLs had a positive impact on the perspectives and disciplinary practices of stakeholders at a high school in the Midwest. The structure for LLs

follows a six-step process: (a) questioning, (b) analysis of issue, (c) modeling, (d) examining, (e) planning, and (f) reflection (see Bal et al., 2016). Ultimately, the team-based approach to reducing harsh and exclusionary disciplinary approaches has been mostly effective in reducing inequities across racial groups. Using approaches such as LLs also creates opportunities for sustainable reduction in harsh and exclusionary discipline practices for young children with disabilities. Continued review and reflection of data and approaches can lead to sustainable changes in schools and districts.

Centering the Experiences of BICOC and Families Using DisCrit

What we see as missing from the above recommendations from scholars is the explicit attention to the ways that racism and ableism seek to continue these systems of inequities for multiple marginalized children. Scholars who have specifically centered the experiences of youth of color with disabilities illuminate the richness and possibilities of this work to inform teaching practice and policy. Again, while this work has not explicitly engaged BICOC with disabilities or their families, we highlight several important contributions that have specifically centered the experiences of BIPOC students with disabilities. David Connor's (2008) book *Urban Narratives* centered youth of color with learning disabilities as they navigated high school in New York. Subini Annamma's P*edagogy of Patholization* provided insights into how young girls subjected to violence and harsh disciplinary practices navigated segregated carceral spaces. More recently, Amanda Miller (2020) looked at the experiences of disabled girls of color from ages 11 to 21 and their literacy practices in schools. These existing pieces provide an important starting point to build literature that (re) centers the voices of BICOC with disabilities and their families. Specifically, future studies could learn from the process of building long term relationships and trust with participants, valuing the knowledge and assets provided by BIPOC communities, and redistributing power differentials between participants and researchers. Further, we see the need for community-centered engagement of multiple stake-

holders (Zygmunt et al., 2018), particularly centering and privileging the voices of families of young BICOC and the BICOC themselves who continue to be the targets of exclusionary discipline. Additionally, we see DisCrit and culturally sustaining pedagogies, which draw from the centering of youth voices and decision-making, as central to this process (see Table 2).

Additionally, patterns across all of these pieces focus on young adults as they navigate discipline and difference. There are often challenges in learning directly from the voices of very young BICOC children and indirect accounts of experiences usually rely on families or community members to gain perspectives. Generating opportunities for BICOC with disabilities and their families to share their lived experiences of disciplinary exclusion, however, is critical to the advancement of our understanding of the impacts of discipline. Powell (2020) noted the importance of learning about Black families' trauma regarding disciplinary experiences for young Black children. We further this idea to suggest that we need to also hear the stories of BICOC with disabilities, their families and communities.

Using DisCrit as a framework for understanding the experiences of young BICOC with disabilities, stakeholders can specifically engage in anti-racist and anti-ableist practices by reflecting on the structures, systems and practices that perpetuate these inequities. As Annamma and Morrison (2018) remind us, DisCrit informed pedagogies must include both the historical and current systems in schools that perpetuate racism and ableism. For teachers and school professionals, this can mean inviting in family and community members to the classroom, only to treat them as helpers or outsiders rather than knowledgeable. Teachers can have relationships with students only to provide worksheets instead of deeply meaningful assignments (Annamma & Morrison, 2018).

Stakeholders can learn about the communities which serve BIPOC families, not just as they exist currently, but also the historical context. Deep understanding of redlining, white flight, and spatial segregation as it connects back to BIPOC families, communities and

children, for example, provides a lens with which to understand community beliefs and practices. Stakeholders can specifically learn about how the system of schooling in the United States was set up to separate and segregate BICOC with disabilities. Knowing and understanding how schools separate and segregate according to differences allows for the possibilities of re-envisioning schools as anti-racist and anti-ableist spaces.

For teachers, a DisCrit-informed curriculum seeks to counter the persistent invisibility of the voices of BICOC with disabilities and their families beyond addressing cultural and linguistic diversity as other in a special education context. This would require challenging and dismantling existing curriculum while leveraging resources such as ethnic studies to re-center disability and race in the classroom. "Giving people the language and resources through which to advocate for educational justice can be transformative for people with disabilities and their families (Elder & Migliarini, 2020, p. 1859). Specifically, a DisCrit-informed curriculum offers that teachers must understand how schools are designed in hegemonic ways, but can be reimagined to center multiply-marginalized youth voices (see Table 2).

While the data on exclusionary and harsh disciplinary practices has outlined several trends such as the increased harsh punishments for students of color including Black and Indigenous children (CEP & BPC, 2020; Sprague et al., 2013) as well as the exclusionary practices for students of color and students with disabilities (Gilliam et al., 2016) and provided policy recommends to reduce or improve outcomes across the federal, state, and school level (CEP & BPC, 2020), little is still known about the impacts of exclusionary and harsh practices on the families, children, and communities in which these practices occur. Further, much of the literature related to early childhood encompasses children from birth to age 8 (Beckley, 2011), yet few studies disaggregate discipline data on K-12 students. In our call to action, therefore, we specifically outline the need for (a) new methodological approaches, (b) additional research on why

disparities exist using first-person accounts; and (c) continuing to address these issues through the perspectives of those directly affected: students and families.

New Methodological Approaches

In particular, there is a strong need to qualitatively address the issue of exclusionary and harsh discipline practices for BICOC with disabilities. Very few studies have attempted to understand how early childhood teachers, families, and students of color with disabilities communities cope with the impacts or ramifications of disciplinary practices. While several of these incidents have resulted in litigation or reports to the U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights, few describe the pain and aftermath of court cases, the lingering impacts on families of color and the direct connections of such practices in creating a school to prison nexus (Annamma et al., 2013), nor the direct parallels between students of color or students with disabilities around restraint and seclusion practices both within or outside of school contexts. The use of qualitative data would illuminate some of these existing disparities and needs. Suggested approaches could include school observational data with direct feedback and discussion of classroom contexts, interviews and focus groups of families' experiences to support healing from trauma to begin to restore faith in the school system, and document analysis of discipline reports to understand underlying rationales for disciplinary practices such as referrals, suspensions, and expulsions.

Further, Annamma's (2016) piece on journey mapping of girls of color who were part of the carceral state has potentialities for young BICOC with disabilities. Learning directly from the stories of youth and their experiences in schools incorporates a much-needed perspective using the accessible medium of pictures. As Annamma (2016) also notes, educational journey mapping can provide much needed context for the social and socio-spatial processes that children experience in schools. We see educational journey maps as one of many possibilities at advancing our knowledge of the exclusionary discipline experiences of BICOC with disabilities.

Understanding Why Disparities Exist

Rationales are similarly tied to methodological needs for more qualitative, in-depth data on disciplinary practices. More research is needed to understand how teachers' disciplinary choices are constructed both at the individual level and systematically. As noted by Vavrus and Cole (2002), teachers' lack of classroom control drives many of the decisions to move quickly toward zero-tolerance disciplinary measures. Fenning and Rose also argue that "making already punitive and draconian discipline policies more equitably applied to all students" is detrimental to all students (p. 539). Indeed, numerous studies highlight disproportionate disciplinary practices for students of color (Skiba et al., 2002; Skiba & Peterson, 1999; Skiba & Rausch, 2006), yet few take the approach that harsh and exclusionary discipline practices are never appropriate for students, most especially young children. This leads to a need to further question how normalized zero-tolerance discipline policies have become in schools. In many articles and policy papers, for example, these practices have been referred to as "traditional" (Fronius et al., 2016) rather than averse. Future studies need to critically examine the challenges surrounding behavior management, discipline, and the idealization of "classroom control" for young children.

Conclusion

The aforementioned issues drive our argument and call to action for future research and practices that critically move beyond zero-tolerance disciplinary measures. We call for the examination of disciplinary policies as a whole, especially in light of overwhelming disproportionality while also arguing against all forms of discipline as control and punishment. As Annamma and Winn (2019b) explain, statistical information about rates of multiple marginalized children (in this case BICOC with disabilities) "highlights how racism and ableism are intersections of marginalization and oppression that limit opportunities and make the lives of those at these intersections less stable" (p. 321). We need to continue to examine and understand the impacts of

exclusionary practices for young BICOC. Beneke and Cheatham (2020) urge us that racism and ableism circulate interdependently in early childhood settings and define our conceptions of what is considered normal or acceptable behavior for children. We know, however, that behavior is culturally situated (Rogoff, 2003) and our call to action builds upon the foundational work of scholars who examine constructions of disability and race and how they serve to uphold normalcy in schools (Annamma et al., 2013; Baglieri et al., 2011; Broderick & Leonardo, 2016). Wright and Ford (2016) remind us that as early as preschool, teachers have already begun to stigmatize young Black boys, which has lasting implications for the way children see themselves.

While the data has overwhelmingly shown the disproportionate disciplinary experiences of BICOC with disabilities, now more than ever, it is critical that stakeholders, equity teams or multidisciplinary Learning Labs (Bal et al., 2016) come together to (re)mediate our understanding of discipline in schools. We note that the way forward involves both an individual and a collective stakeholder responsibility. For example, Table 2 provides individual stakeholder guidance to enact anti-racist and anit-ableist practices in schools.

Collectively, as shown in the last section of Table 2, stakeholders are encouraged to authentically center the knowledge and community cultural wealth (Moll et al., 1992) that BICOC with disabilities and their families bring to this work. These efforts, as Zygmunt et al. (2018) and Bal et al. (2016) have both outlined in their work, must eradicate existing power relations, where teachers and service providers are often positioned as experts. Instead, a collective stakeholder approach uses an asset-based approach that is culturally sustaining (Paris & Alim, 2017). Culturally sustaining pedagogies extend asset pedagogies, yet as Waitoller and King-Thorius (2016) note, the practices, and underlying ideologies still push for assimilation into dominant culture and normalization of ability. It is precisely why we are mindful of the equal importance of racial and disability analysis in understanding exclusionary disciplinary approaches in early childhood education. Additionally, a collective approach allows us to address

collective healing as racial and disability trauma, by way of exclusionary and harsh discipline, is both individual and collective (Powell, 2020).

Families and BICOC with disabilities can, and should be, positioned as the experts of their lives and invited to share their visions for reimagining discipline in schools. Partnering with BICOC with disabilities and their families as educational stakeholders moves beyond the missionary ideas of savior or fixing children's internal behavioral deficits. As Thorius et al. (2019) state, "we must, and can, do better" for young BICOC with disabilities (p. 158). Doing better for BICOC with disabilities, such as Kaia Rolle, and BICOC, such as Salecia Johnson, means that we must reimagine how educational stakeholders "play together" and learn from their stories, say their names, and move toward equitable, anti-racist, and anti-ableist practices in early childhood.

Authors' Note

References (*indicates references used in Tables)

Abamu, J., & Manning, R. (2019, June 5). Desperation and broken trust: When schools restrain students or lock them in rooms. *NPR Morning Edition*. https://www.npr.org/2019/06/05/726519409/desperation-and-broken-trust-when-schools-restrain-students-or-lock-them-in-room

Adams, D., & Meiners, E. (2014). CHAPTER NINE: Who Wants to Be Special? Pathologization and the Preparation of Bodies for Prison. *Counterpoints, 453*, 145-164. https://www.jstor.org/stable/42982336?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

Annamma, S. (2016). Disrupting the carceral state through education journey mapping. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 29*(9), 1210-1230. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2016.1214297

Annamma, S. A. (2017). *The pedagogy of pathologization: Dis/abled girls of color in the school-prison nexus*. Routledge.

*Annamma, S. A., Connor, D., & Ferri, B. (2013). Dis/ability critical race studies (DisCrit): Theorizing at the intersections of race and dis/ability. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 16*(1), 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2012.730511

Annamma, S., & Morrison, D. (2018). DisCrit classroom ecology: Using praxis to dismantle dysfunctional education ecologies. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 73*, 70-80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.03.008

*Annamma, S. A., Anyon, Y., Joseph, N. M., Farrar, J., Greer, E., Downing, B., & Simmons, J. (2019). Black Girls and School Discipline: The Complexities of Being Overrepresented and Understudied. *Urban Education, 54*(2), 211–242. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085916646610

Annamma, S. A., & Winn, M. (2019). Transforming our mission: Animating teacher education through intersectional justice. *Theory Into Practice, 58*(4), 318–327. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1626618

Baglieri, S., Valle, J. W., Connor, D. J., Gallagher, D. J. (2011). Disability studies in education: The need for a plurality of perspectives on disability. *Remedial and Special Education, 32*(4), 267-278. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932510362200

*Baglieri, S., & Lalvani, P. (2019). *Undoing Ableism: Teaching about Disability in K-12 Classrooms.* Routledge.

*Bal, A., Schrader, E. M., Afacan, K., & Mawene, D. (2016). Using learning labs for culturally responsive positive behavioral interventions and supports. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 52*(2), 122–128. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451216636057

Beckley, P. (2011). *Learning in early childhood: A whole child approach from birth to 8.* Sage.

Beneke, M. R., & Cheatham, G. A. (2020). Teacher Candidates Talking (but Not Talking) About Dis/ability and Race in Preschool. *Journal of Literacy Research, 52*(3), 245-268. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1086296X20939561

Broderick, A. A., & Leonardo, Z. (2016). What a good boy. In D. J. Connor, B. A. Ferri, & S. A. Annamma (Eds.), *DisCrit: Dis/ability studies and critical race theory in education* (pp. 55–67). Teachers College Press.

Butler, J. (2009). Unsafe in the schoolhouse: Abuse of children with disabilities. Council of Parent Attorneys & Advocates. Retrieved from http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.copaa.org/resource/collection/662B1866-952D-41FA-B7F3-D3CF68639918/UnsafeCOPAAMay_27_2009.pdf

Calais, J., & Green, M. (in press). The Racial Pandemic: Positive Behavior Intervention Support as an Asymptomatic Carrier of Racism. *Perspectives in Early Childhood Psychology and Education.*

Camilli, G., Vargas, S., Ryan, S., & Barnett, W. S. (2010). Meta-analysis of the effects of early education interventions on cognitive and social development. *Teachers College Record.*

Casella, R. (2003). Zero Tolerance Policy in Schools: Rationale, Consequences, and Alternatives. *Teachers College Record.* https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9620.00271

Children's Equity Project, & Bipartisan Policy Center. (2020). Start with equity: From the early years to the early grades. Children's Equity Project and the Bipartisan Policy Center [Report]. https://childandfamilysuccess.asu.edu/cep/start-with-equity

*Cole, K., & Verwayne, D. (2018). Becoming upended: Teaching and learning about race and racism with young children and their families. *Young Children, 73*(2), 1-16.

Connor, D., Ferri, B., & Annamma, S. A. (2015). *DisCrit: Disability studies and critical race theory in education.* Teachers College Press.

Cyphert , A. B. (2014). Addressing racial disparities in preschool suspension and expulsion rates. *Tennessee Law Review, 82*, 893-936.

Elder, B., & Migliarini, V. (2020). Decolonizing inclusive education: a collection of practical inclusive CDS- and DisCrit-informed teaching practices implemented in the global South. *Disability and the Global South, 7*(1), 1852-1872. https://disabilityglobalsouth.fil es.wordpress.com/2020/05/07_01_04.pdf

Fenning, P., & Rose, J. (2007). Overrepresentation of African American students in exclusionary discipline: The role of school policy. *Urban Education, 42*(6), 536-559. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085907305039

Fine, M., & Ruglis, J. (2009). Circuits and consequences of dispossession. The racialized realignment of the public sphere for US youth. *Transforming Anthropology, 17*(1), 20-33. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-7466.2009.01037.x

Fronius, T., Persson, H., Guckenburg, S., Hurley, N., & Petrosino, A. (2016). Restorative justice in US schools: A research review. *WestEd.*

Gage, N. A., Pico, D. L., & Evanovich, L. (2020). National Trends and School-Level Predictors of Restraint and Seclusion for Students with Disabilities. *Exceptionality*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1080/09362835.2020.1727327

Gagnon, D. J., Mattingly, M. J., & Connelly, V. J. (2017). The restraint and seclusion of students with a disability: Examining trends in US School districts and their policy implications. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 28*(2), 66–76. https://doi.org/10.1177/ 1044207317710697

Gilliam, W. S. (2005). *Pre kindergarteners left behind: Expulsion rates in state prekindergarten systems.* New York, NY: Foundation for Child Development.

Gilliam, W. S., Maupin, A. N., Reyes, C. R., Accavitti, M., & Shic, F. (2016). Do early educators' implicit biases regarding sex and race relate to behavior expectations and recommendations of preschool expulsions and suspensions. *Yale University Child Study Center 9*(28), 2016.

Gilliam, W., & Shahar, G. (2006). Preschool and child care expulsion and suspension: Rates and predictors in one state. *Infants & Young Children. 19*(3), 228–245.

Glass, I. (Host & Producer). (2014, October 17). *Is this working*? (Episode 538) [Audio broadcast]. This American Life. https://www.thisamericanlife.org/538/is-this-working

Green, A.L., Cohen, D. R., & Stormont, M. (2018). Addressing and preventing disproportionality in exclusionary discipline practices for students of color with disabilities. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 54*(4), 241-245. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451218782437

Gregory, A., Skiba, R. J., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin. *Educational Researcher, 39*(1), 59-68. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09357621

Hatt, B. (2012). Smartness as cultural practice in schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 49*(3), 438–460. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831211415661

Jacobsen, W. C., Pace, G. T., & Ramirez, N. G. (2019). Punishment and inequality at an early age: Exclusionary discipline in elementary school. *Social Forces, 97*(3), 973-998. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soy072

Jefferson, A. I. (2012, April 20). Salecia Johnson's parents want answers. *The Root.* https:www.theroot.com/views/salecia-johnsons-parentsstill-want-answers

Katsiyannis, A., Gage, N. A., Rapa, L. J., & MacSuga-Gage, A. S. (2020). Exploring the Disproportionate Use of Restraint and Seclusion Among Students with Disabilities, Boys, and Students of Color. *Advances in Neurodevelopmental Disorders, 4*(3), 271-278.

Kenly, A., & Klein, A. (2020). Early Childhood Experiences of Black Children in a Diverse Midwestern Suburb. *Journal of African American Studies, 24*(1), 129-148. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12111-020-09461-y

Kulkarni (in review, a). Teachers of color implementing restorative justice practices in elementary classrooms: A DisCrit analysis. *Equity and Excellence in Education.*

*Kulkarni, S. (in press, b). Shifting special education teacher beliefs about dis/ability and race: Counter stories of goodness and smartness. *Journal of Curriculum Inquiry.*

Losen, D. J. (2018). Disabling punishment: The need for remedies to the disparate loss of instruction experienced by Black students with disabilities. *The Center for Civil Rights Remedies at the National Civil Rights Project.*

Losen, D. J., & Gillespie, J. (2012). Opportunities suspended: The disparate impact of disciplinary exclusion from school. Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles. http://escholarship.org/uc/item/3g36n0c3

*Mahendra, N. (2019). Integrating lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer issues into the multicultural curriculum in speech-language pathology: Instructional strategies and learner perceptions. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups, 4*(2), 384-394.

Meiners, E. R. (2007). *Right to be hostile: Schools: prisons, and the making of public enemies.* Routledge.

Miller, A. L. (2020). Disabled girls of color excavate exclusionary literacy practices and generate promising sociospatial-textual solutions. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education.* https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2020.1828649

*Miller, P. (2020). Anti-racist school leadership: Making 'race'count in leadership preparation and development. *Professional Development in Education, 47*(1), 7-21. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2020.1787207

*Miller, P. (2019). Race discrimination, the politics of knowledge, and cultural inequality in England. In R. Papa (Ed.), *Handbook on Promoting Social Justice in Education* (First edition, pp. 1913-1934). Springer London. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-14625-2

*Miller, P. (2019b). Race and ethnicity in educational leadership. In T. Bush, L. Bell, and D. Middlewood, Eds. *Principles of Educational Leadership & Management* (3rd edition). https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/principles-of-educational-leadership-management/book258794

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*, 132-141.

Morris, M. (2016). *Pushout: The criminalization of Black girls in schools.* The New Press.

Norwicki, J. M. (2018). K-12 Education: Discipline disparities for Black students, boys, and students with disabilities. Report to Congressional Requesters. GAO-18-258. *US Government Accountability Office.*

Novoa, C., & Malik, R. (2018, January 17). Suspensions are not support: The disciplining of preschoolers with disabilities. *Center for America Progress.* Retrieved from https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/early-childhood/reports/2018/01/17/ 445041/suspensions-not-support/

*Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world.* Teachers College Press.

Pearson, J. N., Meadan, H., Malone, K. M., & Martin, B. M. (2020). Parent and Professional Experiences Supporting African-American Children with Autism. *Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities, 7*(2), 305-315.

Powell, T. M. (2020). *The scars of suspension: Testimonies as narratives of school-induced collective trauma* (Doctoral dissertation, UCLA).

Pressley, A., Annamma, S. A., & Thompson, V. (2020, September 17). Black girls with disabilities are disproportionately criminalized. *Teen Vogue.* https://www.teenvogue.com/ story/black-girls-disabilities-criminalized

Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development.* Oxford University Press.

Simonsen, B., Freeman, J., Goodman, S., Mitchell, B., Swain-Bradway, J., Flannery, B., Sugai, G., George, H., & Putman, B. (2015). Supporting and responding to behavior:

Evidence-based classroom strategies for teachers. OSEP technical assistance brief. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299483345_Supporting_ and_responding_to_behavior_Evidence-based_classroom_strategies_for_teachers

Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Peterson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *The Urban Review, 34*(4), 317–342.

Skiba, R., & Peterson, R. (1999). The dark side of zero tolerance: Can punishment lead to safe schools?. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(5), 372–382.

Skiba, R. J., & Rausch, M. K. (2006). Zero tolerance, suspension, and expulsion: Questions of equity and effectiveness.

Sprague, J. R., Vincent, C. G., & Tobin, T. J. (2013). Preventing disciplinary exclusions of students from American Indian/Alaska Native backgrounds. *Family Court Review, 51*(3), 452–459. https://doi.org/10.1111/fcre.12042

Stegelin, D. A. (December 2018). Preschool suspension and expulsion: Defining the issues. *Institute for Child Success.*

Thorius, K. A. K., Moore, T. S., & Coomer, M. N. (2019). We can do better: Critically reframing special education research and practice at the intersections of disability and cultural and linguistic diversity for young children. In F. E. Obiakor & J. P. Bakken (Eds.), *Special Education for Young Learners with Disabilities.* Emerald Publishing Limited.

U.S. Department of Education and Health & Human Services. (2014). *Policy statement on expulsion and suspension policies in early childhood settings.* https://www2.ed.gov/ policy/gen/guid/school-discipline/policy-statement-ece-expulsions-suspensions.pdf

U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights. (2014, March). *Civil Rights Data Collection Data Snapshot: School discipline* (Issue Brief No. 1).

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2016). National Survey of Children's Health. Retrieved from https://mchb.hrsa.gov/data/national-surveys

U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights. (2016). 2013-2014 *Civil Rights Data Collection: A First Look* (New release for 2016). Retrieved from ocrdata.ed.gov

Vavrus, F., & Cole, K. (2002). "I didn't do nothing": The discursive construction of suspension. *Urban Review, 34*(2), 87–111.

Waitoller, F. R., & King Thorius, K. A. (2016). Cross-pollinating culturally sustaining pedagogy and universal design for learning: Toward an inclusive pedagogy that accounts for dis/ability. *Harvard Educational Review, 86*(3), 366-389. https://doi. org/10.17763/1943-5045-86.3.366

Winn, M. T., & Behizadeh, N. (2011). The right to be literate: Literacy, education, and the school-to-prison pipeline. *Review of Research in Education, 35*(1), 147–173. https:// doi.org/10.3102/0091732X10387395

Wright, B. L., & Ford, D. Y. (2016). "This little light of mine": Creating early childhood education classroom experiences for African American boys preK-3. *Journal of African American Males in Education, 7*(1), 5–19.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race ethnicity and education, 8*(1), 69-91. https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006

*Zygmunt, E., Cipollone, K., Clark, P., & Tancock, S. (2018). Community-engaged teacher preparation. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education.*