

TRANSFORMING THE INSTITUTION, OR INSTITUTIONALIZING THE TRANSFORMATION?: ANTI-RACISM AND EQUITY IN EDUCATION IN TORONTO

PAUL R. CARR *Consultant*

ABSTRACT. This paper reports on the manner in which a large, diverse, urban school board (Toronto, Ontario) has responded to racial diversity and anti-racist education, and, in a larger sense, equity, from 1970 to 1995. The paper elucidates the factors which characterize the resistance to equity-based institutional change. A qualitative, applied research approach, based on an anti-racist education framework, is used to examine the institutional culture of the board. The research methodology involved interviews and questionnaires with key decision-makers, principals, and teachers. Three key findings are highlighted: 1) the evolutionary nature of attempts to deal with equity issues; 2) the systemic nature of discrimination; and 3) the inability to clearly define anti-racist education and equity, thus impeding the creation of a coherent vision for the implementation of responsive policy initiatives. The discussion focuses on the elements required to facilitate transformational change in the institutional culture of the board, emphasizing the concept of accountability.

RÉSUMÉ. Cet article rend compte de la façon dont une grande commission scolaire urbaine très diversifiée (Toronto, Ontario) a réagi à la diversité raciale et à l'éducation antiracisme, et dans un sens plus large, à l'équité entre 1970 et 1995. L'article explique les facteurs qui caractérisent la résistance au changement institutionnel fondé sur l'équité. L'auteur utilise une méthode de recherche appliquée et qualitative fondée sur un cadre d'éducation antiracisme pour analyser la culture institutionnelle de la commission scolaire. Cette méthodologie comporte des interviews et des questionnaires avec les grands décideurs, les principaux et les enseignants. Trois grandes constatations s'en dégagent: 1) la nature évolutive des tentatives visant à régler les problèmes d'équité; 2) la nature structurelle de la discrimination; et 3) l'incapacité de définir clairement l'éducation antiracisme et l'équité, ce qui empêche d'avoir une vision cohérente pour prendre des initiatives stratégiques réceptives. L'analyse porte sur les éléments qu'il faut avoir pour faciliter le changement dans la culture institutionnelle de la commission, en soulignant la notion de responsabilisation.

The issue of equity – in terms of accessibility, inclusion, representation, and outcomes – as it relates to education has become increasingly relevant over the past two decades. Understanding the social construction of identity (Omi & Winant, 1993; Figueroa, 1994) and the heterogeneity of social groups (Breton, Isajiw, Kalbach, & Reitz, 1990; James, 1992) is a key element to improving the education system. While a significant amount of theoretical and applied work has been undertaken on the significance of social class, ethnicity, and gender in education, fewer detailed and comprehensive studies, especially in the Canadian context, have been completed on how educational institutions have sought to transform themselves to become more responsive to racial diversity.

This paper reports on a qualitative study examining the manner in which a large, diverse, urban school board (the Toronto Board of Education [TBE]) has responded to racial diversity and anti-racist education, and, in a larger sense, equity, from 1970 to 1995. The TBE has an extremely diverse student body (Table 1), with approximately 45% of students coming from racial minority backgrounds, although only about 12% of the teachers are racial minorities (Table 2). It should be noted that the Toronto Board has always been diverse, in terms of social class, ethnicity, religion, and language, but these data were not gathered as much or with the same determination in the 1970s and earlier. Although the racial variable has become increasingly important over the past three decades, there is little reference to the existence of racial minorities in the Toronto Board before the 1970s, but there have always been aboriginal students, and also others who were not White.

It is recognized, from the outset, that many issues, concepts, and terms used today may not be fully transferable to the 1970s. However, issues of difference, identity, and inequitable power relations have been articulated throughout this period, albeit in different forms. Whereas gender and ethnicity may have been more highly prioritized variables in the 1970s, and race in the early 1990s, there have been various disparate efforts to deal with issues of divergent interests and needs. One reason for dealing with this period is to gauge how issues have changed or evolved over time. It is necessary to caution here that some respondents may remember their experiences from the earlier period not as they really were, but as they have interpreted them in the light of their acquired knowledge since that time. For instance, systemic racism was not readily discussed or understood in the 1970s as it is today, but issues related to social class or gender inequity may have been

Transforming the Institution

TABLE 1. Socio-demographic Characteristics – TBE Secondary Students, 1991-1992*

		PERCENT (%)	POPULATION ESTIMATE ••	
Overall Population		100	27,000	
Race	White	54	14,500	
	Asian	30	8,000	
	Black	9	2,000	
	Aboriginal	1	300	
	Other	6	1,600	
Language / Culture	White	English only	21.6	5,800
		Portuguese	9.4	2,500
		Jewish	4.9	1,300
		Greek	4.4	1,200
		Italian	3.1	800
		Polish	1.6	400
	Asian	Chinese	11.5	3,100
		From Indochina**	10.4	2,800
		Tamil	1.9	500
		Indian	1.8	500
		Korean	1.6	400
	Black	Canadian-born	3.4	900
		Caribbean	3.1	800
		African-born	2.4	600
	Aboriginal	Canadian-born	0.7	200
Other	Hispanic	3.3	900	
	Iranian	1	300	
Place of Birth	Canada	57	15,300	
	Outside Canada	43	11,600	
Year of Arrival (foreign-born only)	Before 1987	43	11,600	
	Since 1987	57	15,300	
Parental Presence at Home	Both parents	63	16,900	
	Mother only	18	4,800	
	Father only	3	800	
	Not with parents	16	4,300	
Parents' Occupation	Professional	24	6,500	
	Semi-professional/technical	25	6,700	
	Skilled/semi-skilled	32	8,600	
	Unskilled	6	1,600	
	Non-remunerative	13	3,500	

* Source: Yau, M, Cheng, M, & Ziegler, S. (1993 p. iii) This table is reproduced as it appears in the original version. While some of the categories and descriptors are problematic and require clarification, it should be noted that the Toronto Board has been a leader in attempting to provide such socio-demographic information. The collection and analysis of these data has faced many obstacles.

** The population estimates are based on student registration records for November 1991, and are rounded to the nearest hundredth. Students from the four adult schools in the Toronto Board were not included.

TABLE 2. Representation of racial minorities in the Toronto Board of Education

YEAR	FINDINGS
1982 TBE Report*	604 (8%) racial minorities out of 8,404 people working in the Board; only 3 Black principals and none from other racial minority groups working in the Board at the elementary and secondary levels
1987 TBE Report*	2 (6%) principals, 6 (11%) vice-principals, and 214 (9.2%) teachers at the secondary level
1992 TBE Report*	Two key findings: a) 11% of the elementary teacher applicants and 26% at the secondary panel were racial minorities in the period 1989-1990; b) the overall success rate of White applicants was around twice that as for racial minority ones
1994-1995**	Based on data and analysis provided by the Board's Employment Equity Office, the Race Relations Advisor, and Research Services, it was estimated that 12% of teachers in the Board were, at this time, racial minorities

* Source: See Carr and Klassen (1996:131-132).

** Source: Based on doctoral research. See Carr (1996).

more accessible. It should be noted that the research was conducted during the 1994-96 period, and that most respondents were more clearly anchored in activities taking place currently as opposed to the earlier periods.

The study aims to elucidate the factors which characterize the resistance to equity-based institutional change. Since there has been little research focusing on the impact and effect of racial minorities on institutional cultures of education systems, the case study approach was chosen to examine specific issues and barriers. Race, equity, and institutional change involve an analysis of inequitable power relations, making the qualitative approach most appropriate to understand effectively the lived experiences of those not only in positions of power, but also those who have traditionally been disconnected and marginalized from the decision-making process.

As related in the section "Evolution of the Conceptualization and Understanding of Equity", the TBE came under increasing pressure in the late 1970s by racial minority groups and other equity-seeking groups to rectify issues pertaining to the shortage of racial minority teachers and role models, the disproportionate drop-out rate, especially for blacks, the Euro-centric curriculum, and an institutional culture perceived to be less than responsive to the needs of racial minorities. Many reports

have documented the disparaging results over the past twenty years in relation to efforts to improve the educational outcomes and experience of racial minorities (TBE, 1979; Yau, Cheng, & Ziegler, 1993; Carr, 1996). In order to contextualize the problematic of equity-based institutional transformation, it should be noted that the TBE has been viewed as a leader in the field, open to examination and criticism, and has served as a laboratory for social intervention in many regards. The mere fact that study such as this one took place attests to a certain openness and commitment on the part of the Board, especially in light of the difficulty in conducting similar studies in other jurisdictions.

For the purposes of this study, the "institutional culture" of the TBE is defined as: the myriad formal and, especially, informal practices, policies, programs, and events which shape the day-to-day and long-term management and vision of the Board, from decision-making processes to the educational activities in the classroom. A key concern in the study relates to why, and how, the informal processes have seemingly undermined the formal structures and operational functions. For example, why have progressive policies dealing with equity, when they have, indeed, been conceived, not been fully implemented?

In addition to this introductory (first) section, the paper contains four main sections. The second section elaborates on the research focus of the institutional culture and transformational change, highlighting the theoretical and applied literature guiding the study. The third section presents the methodological and conceptual issues in relation to the qualitative approach, which underpins the study. The fourth section presents key findings, and their policy and education implications. The final section is a discussion of the salient issues.

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The main tenets of anti-racist education, as defined in this paper, emanated from Great Britain in the early 1980s, and came to Toronto in the mid-1980s (Thomas, 1984). While inevitably linked to the North American context, including the Civil Rights movement in the US in the 1960s, the anti-racist education movement in Toronto viewed the education arena as a privileged forum for addressing social issues. The Toronto Board has traditionally been perceived to be at the fore in dealing with diversity and equity issues, given its largely diverse population as well as diverse local political movements. The dissatisfaction with multiculturalism policies led community activists and others to adopt an approach more focused on systemic barriers, inequitable

power relations and combating racism and other inequities (Lee, 1985; Cheng, Brown, & Lines, 1994). Dei (1994)¹ has outlined the need to assess critically how educational institutions create and perpetuate barriers to the full inclusion of all groups. Moreover, Dei (1996a, 1996b) has emphasized that anti-racist education should be viewed as a "political project", one which makes explicit the hidden curriculum as well as the need for an across-the-board critical pedagogy.

The Ontario government attempted to develop an acceptable policy response to diversity for over a decade. In 1987, it stressed that "anti-racist education does not negate the value of multicultural education [but]... acknowledges the existence of racism, and forthrightly seeks its eradication within schools and in society at large" (Ontario Provincial Advisory Committee on Race Relations, 1987, p. 39). In 1993, it developed a formal policy on anti-racism and ethnocultural equity in education aimed at extending multicultural education and at validating diverse, individual experiences in order to "develop a positive self-image" (Ontario Ministry of Education and Training [OMET], 1993, pp. 2-3). This policy mandated school boards to produce formal policies and action-plans through community consultation, which was intended to include marginalized groups not normally involved in the decision-making process (OMET, 1993)².

Discussing race is problematic, in that, on the one hand, there is an almost universal rejection of the scientific racism of eighteenth-century European scientists in favor of an acceptance of the notion of race as a social construction (Omi & Winant, 1993), and, on the other, there is the need, in a society where racism exists, to use the racial variable to document trends, outcomes, and behaviours. There is constantly the danger of ghettoizing and stereotyping some individuals in the hopes of attaining a better understanding of a particular group, or of inequities in society. It is problematic to distill an individual's identity down to one variable (i.e., racial origin), when there may be any number of variables which influence, shape, and define one's being (i.e., gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, place or origin, educational experience, disability, language, religion, ideology, social class). Lee (1985), James (1992) and Fyfe and Figueroa (1993) have emphasized the heterogeneous nature of all groups. It is difficult to determine the racial origin of some people, if skin colour is deemed to be the primary determinant, since this may vary within the same family, especially in mixed-race situations (Moodley, 1985). Racial origin may serve to be of little

importance in some societies in which there is only one prominent racial group. Fyfe (1993) summarizes some of the critiques of anti-racist education as being based on the fact that race is not a scientific concept, and "its constant use runs the risk of legitimizing its very misapplication by racists" (p.41).

To contextualize the meaning of race, it is useful to revisit the concept of White privilege and power (Sleeter, 1993; McIntosh, 1990). Henry (1993) critiques the normative White, Christian values which predominate in North American education, arguing that no research is value-free. Cochran-Smith (1995) presents the case for rejecting the notion of "color-blindness" held by a majority of teachers in favour of making diversity an explicit part of the curriculum. The process of racial identification involves many phases (Tatum, 1992), necessitates a personal transformation, and, ideally, should be facilitated by both constructive theoretical and applied experiences (Sleeter, 1992). Rymer and Alladin (1996) argue that there are two principal phases to realizing anti-racist education, with the first involving personal awareness and understanding, and the second relating to action in society. It is clear that racial minority teachers play a central role to the implementation of anti-racist education (Carr & Klassen, 1997).

There are disproportionate numbers of some groups dropping out, and underachieving academically (Royal Commission on Learning, 1995; Dei, 1996a). The racial variable helps us to understand and document inequities and shortcomings in the education system. In the TBE, for example, Blacks have a drop-out rate three times that of Whites; students of Portuguese origin experience similar academic outcomes as Blacks, thus illuminating the social class and ethnic variables; and First Nations students also have experienced disparaging results in education (Ontario Royal Commission on Learning, 1995; Yau, Cheng & Ziegler, 1995). Is there a causal linkage between racial or ethnic origin and educational achievement? At the very least, these data indicate a need to understand how education systems respond to divergent student outcomes. Who defines the problem, who studies it, and who makes policy decisions around the potential resolution of differential outcomes is pivotal to the understanding of how responsive the education system is at present, and is capable of being. The study of how educational institutions transform themselves and lay the groundwork for transformational change needs to be more explicitly linked to the study of inequities in education (Fullan, 1993).

METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE STUDY

A qualitative, applied approach, underpinned by the work of Glesne and Peshkin (1992) and Merriam (1988), was used to examine the institutional culture of the TBE vis-à-vis equity and anti-racism. This approach sought to provide a forum to better understand how inequitable power relations are perpetuated, and how educational institutions respond to the needs and interests of marginalized groups. The research methodology involved two components: 1) one-on-one interviews with 22 key decision-makers, six principals, and 22 racial minority teachers; and 2) primarily open-ended information gathered through three surveys (one for principals, one a random sample survey for teachers, and the other being a targeted survey for racial minority teachers only), which included some five principals, 60 White teachers, and 35 racial minority teachers, all working in the secondary panel.

One-on-one interviews

The participants comprising the key decision-makers and contributors to anti-racist education form an extremely diverse³ and prominent group in the area of equity in education. The 22 interviews, which took place between October 1994 and February 1995, lasted between 45 minutes and two hours, with the median being one hour. All interviews, with the exception of one, were tape-recorded. At some point in the interviews, all participants were guided into responding to five key questions: 1) the conceptualization of race, racism, and anti-racist education in the TBE; 2) the process of the development of anti-racist education initiatives in the Board; 3) the process of the implementation of anti-racist education initiatives; 4) the role of racial minority teachers in the TBE; and 5) the intersecting forms of identity or difference which form the backdrop to anti-racist education.

The second sample, composed of principals, was key because of the role the principal plays in the implementation of anti-racist education. With the assistance of the Race Relations Advisor, who identified the principals most likely to participate in the study, six TBE secondary principals were contacted between November 1994 and February 1995.⁴ The principals identified were the ones most likely to be interested in talking about this particular research project. Without exception, the interviews, which were all taped, lasted close to, if not longer than, two hours. As the interviews progressed, the emphasis was placed on the organizational structure of the schools, the role of the departments and their influence, the range of strategies used to ensure community par-

ticipation in the schools, the evaluation strategies of the staff, the intricate nature of principals' networks, labour relations, and the specific tensions and constraints related to managing a school.

Survey questionnaires

The process of meeting TBE secondary teachers informally and formally was one of the most challenging components of the research. A variety of methods was used to contact teachers. First, through a series of informal contacts, the "snowball approach" was used, with those being contacted often suggesting others who may have been interested. Second, the support of the teachers' union was solicited in order to ensure an appropriate sample, and also to provide feedback on the relevance of the survey. Third, the researcher worked closely with the TBE's Employment Equity Office to acquire a sample of TBE racial minority teachers. As mentioned above, three surveys were used for this study (a targeted survey to the 25 secondary principals who were not interviewed, to which five responded; a random sample to a large number of secondary full-time teachers; and, finally, a focused survey to racial minority teachers who had self-identified as racial minorities but who had not already been contacted to participate).

A random sample of 352 full-time TBE secondary teachers was first selected in consultation with the teachers' federation, which provided the list of names of permanent teachers working in the 1994-95 school year. There were 70 responses to this survey – 60 from White teachers, and ten from racial minority teachers. The questionnaire contained 28 questions, which sought to solicit feedback on how teachers assess the Board's involvement in anti-racist education. They also aimed to gauge how teachers felt their colleagues contributed to the implementation of anti-racist education. Some of the questions were quite similar to those used in the two previous phases.

With the assistance of the TBE's Employment Equity Coordinator it was found that of the remaining 130 TBE secondary teachers who had previously self-identified as racial minorities in a 1990 Board survey, and who received the targeted sample request letter, some 40 indicated an interest in participating in the study, 29 by questionnaire, and 11 by way of an interview. The majority (25) were returned completed. The total number of teachers who formally participated in the study was 117 (57 interviews or questionnaires – racial minority teachers; 60 questionnaires – White teachers).

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

This section of the paper reviews the most salient findings of the research, and highlights three key trends: 1) the evolutionary nature of attempts to deal with equity issues; 2) the systemic nature of discrimination in this large racially diverse educational institution; and 3) the inability to clearly define anti-racist education and equity, which leads to the incapacity to create a cohesive institutional vision for the implementation of responsive policy initiatives.

In order to present the data, participants are given a pseudonym (male or female, depending on the gender), a letter indicating the type of position held listed after the name (K for key contributors and decision-makers, P for principal, and T for teachers), and a letter to indicate if the person is White (W) or a racial minority (R). Finally, the last indicator, which is provided for teachers only, is a number signifying the number of years of experience the individual in question has in the board. The number of years of experience is not provided for Phase 1 and Phase 2 participants in order to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. To illustrate this approach, Albert-T-W-16 would be a White, male teacher with 16 years experience in the TBE.

The evolution of the conceptualization and understanding of equity

Although the word equity did not attain any particular significance until the early 1980s, it is used here to encapsulate the TBE institutional responses to diversity, whether it be focused on issues of social class, ethnicity, gender, or race. In the early 1970s, a group of maverick, left-wing trustees highlighted social class issues, thus constituting the beginning of a broader movement toward transformational change in education. One trustee described the mood as follows:

During the election campaign [early 1970s] I had gotten in touch with a large number of students. . . . mostly Portuguese and Italian, and some Blacks but not very many. I was impressed by their strong student rights feelings and running head long into a formal Anglo-Saxon, middle-class school tradition. The Principal at the time insisted not only on the pro forma things like the recital of God Save The King/Queen, the Lord's Prayer, but had a very regimental [approach], a former military person. It was quite a formal situation at that time. It was ironic at the time the modern languages (department) at the Board only taught Latin and Greek and French. The languages of the community were not acknowledged or recognized in the schools. This led to quite a long struggle. (Jordan-K-W)

A few key individuals involved in steering the Board's direction during the 1970s described the evolution and dynamic of the early period as one that was not pre-occupied with race:

In the early to mid-1970s the emphasis was not placed on race. I don't have a memory of ever really worrying about it in the early 70s. I don't recall having policies or requirements around the whole area of racist activities, but, specifically, [around the] the material that you would involve in the classrooms. (Eugene-P-W)

At that time it [discrimination] was not articulated in relation to race, but in relation to class. And it was sort of the tail-end of the Anglo-Saxon monopoly on the public school system in Toronto. And the issues that were being raised were more around streaming and the vocational schools. The issue for me was that we were spending a lot of time getting kids to adapt to the system, and maybe we should be getting the system to adapt to the kids. (Graham-K-W)

A hallmark for this early period was the disconnected nature of any institutional approach to equity, characterized by myriad committees with limited focus as well as heated debate about how to handle the quickly evolving demographic shifts, especially the growing number of students whose first language was not English.⁵ Although it was clear that substantive demographic change was occurring and altering the racial, religious, cultural, ethnic, and linguistic make-up of the Board, efforts to challenge the traditional hegemonic forces were scattered, albeit numerous.

On the heels of the Sub-committee Report on Race Relations (TBE, 1979), which contained 119 recommendations and was, in general, widely embraced by racial minorities, the 1980s were characterized by a bolder and more sophisticated era. There was a more open discussion of inequity, and "race relations" was the phrase coined to embody the Board's need to reach out to people of "colour", as well as to highlight the need for everyone to understand better how discrimination manifests itself. One key figure during the 1980s described the sensitive and more explicit acknowledgment related to racial diversity as follows:

If you looked at the Board [in the early 1980s], they weren't overtly racist, but they also weren't anti-racist. . . . There wasn't an openness to discuss the problem, it was very much, whenever any kind of a problem happened, "Let's quickly cover it up, and let's get on, you know, with education." In all fairness, the people that were there were the products of their system, and the reason we [those working on equity issues] were hired was to make the system look good. . . . And I was caught between a rock and a hard place, as they say,

because the community, on one hand, was very clear about what was happening to their children and what was going on, and was pushing me, and the administration was saying, "Don't push too hard, the system can only go a little at a time." So the community was pushing for change at a faster rate, and the system was [not moving as fast], and you're stuck in the middle. There's no way you can be a maverick at the Board, because if you get shut off . . . then, you're useless. So you try to find entry points where you can do something. . . . (Ronald-K-R)

A constructive discussion on racism and how to deal effectively with it in the institutional context encountered, however, greater barriers than did other equity-related issues. For example, the Board implemented a vigorous affirmative action policy for women in the early 1980s, and many racial minorities were critical of it, contending that primarily White women benefited from the new hiring and promotions. It was also felt that the new cadre of White women did not significantly alter the institutional culture vis-à-vis racial minorities. The Board was also a leader during this time in the area of responding to ethnic-group demands for the teaching of heritage languages (Carr, 1996).

By the 1990s, a critical mass of teachers and Board staff had received training on equity, and the community played a more active role in influencing education policies. After many hard-fought battles equity is now one of the Board's main (stated) priorities, and knowledge about, and experience in, equity initiatives is considered a key variable related to the hiring of new teachers.⁶ Several participants noted how much better the situation is in the 1990s compared to the earlier period in which overt discrimination was not uncommon.

Nineteen years ago [in the mid-1970s] racism was defined as individual acts of behaviour, i.e., graffiti, name calling, fights. Today of course there is a broader analysis of what racism looks like and how it manifests [itself] in the school system. It is everyone's responsibility to deal with it. There are some pressures put forth to deal with individual group issues, such as the Chinese culture. (David-K-R)

Most teachers, Whites as well as racial minorities, indicated that there had been a number of noticeable changes. The teachers were very concrete as to the impact in the classroom and the staff-room, confirming that many improvements had been made:

1970-1980 - ignored; 1980-1989 issues of equity were addressed by textbook reviews and workshops; consultants provided a good re-

Transforming the Institution

source for those who were interested; 1990 - codification. (Malcolm-T-W-25)

I took part in an inquiry concerning allegations of racism against a principal with whom I had worked and it appeared that all allegations were taken seriously and a fair inquiry took place. (George-T-R-13)

The onset of these important changes in the operations, mind-set, and philosophy of the Board sparked myriad tensions between different groups. Advocates of equity-based change have argued that it is now necessary to move past the targeting of individual, specific racial incidents, and to diagnose and address more vigorously the issue of systemic discrimination. One long-term Board official concluded that:

It's [the Board's approach to anti-racist education] in a state of flux and it runs the gamut from warmed-over multiculturalism. . . to what I call second-generation multiculturalism, to people generally trying to grapple with anti-racist education, . . . to people who are attempting to attack the whole notion of the existence of racism, and what is race as a social construct . . . There are people in secondary schools who are encouraging kids to read. . . critical anti-racist stuff, and write, talk and think and so on, involving them in school clubs that might be race-specific organizations, and doing advocacy for students and so on. And then there is this last group, which is very small, which is looking at the social construction of race issues and beginning to think "what does education look like if it is not based on, hinged on, this social construction of race?" (Frank-K-R)

Despite the obvious positive changes over the years, it remains that the level of transformational change has been extremely incremental in nature.

Equity-based change and systemic barriers

Coupled with the progress and limited transformational change pertaining to the institutional response to equity, systemic discrimination continues to pervade the diverse institutional layers of the Board. One key TBE official characterized the change in the institutional culture as slow and sporadic:

In general I think it [racism] is thriving, it's rampant, it exists, it's hard to deny. In this organization of 15,000 employees, we do have many visible minorities working in our organization, not as many as could be, and their experiences and lack of representation in the other areas of the Board are structural demonstrations of how racism affects our participation in this organization. Policies in place to deal

with racial issues are not practiced. Change is very slow. People are still behaving and experiencing racism as [they did] 15 years ago in large areas of the Board. There are pockets that have made some progress. . . . (Nina-K-R)

Although many teachers were not as well versed with the concept of systemic discrimination as the Phase 1 participants, a number of them underscored the notion that systemic barriers exist even if overt discrimination has largely been eliminated.

Despite the watershed events in the late 1970s around the concerted efforts to recognize the problem, illustrated by the Final Report of the Sub-Committee on Race Relation (TBE, 1979), the symbolic rhetoric of the day was not matched by tangible, measurable outcomes. "Management by crisis" was a phrase used in the Race Relations Program Review (Hitner Starr Associates, 1985), which provided a five-year evaluation of the 1979 report, to describe the TBE, and also mentioned many times by research participants to be the *modus operandi* of the Board. Some key decision-maker participants commented that they felt disillusioned that little had been achieved in the first five years after the release of that report. For example, one senior official noted that:

All the superintendents were called to a meeting at [a hotel in 1985] about a report [the Hitner Starr Report] which had been developed that had to do with the implementation of the race relations recommendations in 1979. This report said there had been no systematic implementation or plans for implementation for any of the recommendations. Consequently, there was a high level of concern that the Board not be embarrassed or be seen that they were not doing what they were supposed to do. Intensive in-servicing began with the superintendents and all the principals. It was laid out over the year giving six different time options. Some people managed to not attend any of the workshops, which was quite distressing to many of us because it said that if they could excuse themselves [principals and superintendents], then there was not one-hundred percent commitment to doing anything. The fact that there was a human rights hearing that ended with the Board being found guilty of unintentional discrimination, that really got people's attention at the time because they had never heard the term. There was a recognition that they had to be quite careful simply because this kind of claim could come back to haunt them. (Bruce-K-R)

Framing the political desire for rapid change and the institutional desire for controlled and measured change, and further exacerbating tensions, several senior Board employees highlighted the gap in expectations between the elected officials and the professional administrative staff.

What happens in the Toronto Board, despite the best will in the world, is that the administration controls everything. . . . Everyone seems to agree with this idea of administrative control. (Cassandra-K-R)

Complementing the dichotomy around trustee – senior administration relations is the issue of White power and privilege, and the general incomprehension or unwillingness at the highest levels to reconcile this power and privilege with effective administrative and management control.

The debate around the 1989 Tenth Anniversary celebration of the creation of the TBE Equal Opportunity Office provides a vivid illustration of how internal lethargy, combined with entrenched power interests, can effectively maintain an inequitable status quo. As described by one key official:

The problem we [the progressive trustees] ran into was, because the system had developed so much, the logical place to look (regarding hirings for senior positions) was internally, and there did not seem to be, from among the people that were there, not that they were not qualified, but on a comparative basis, even those of us on the left, when we threw in all of our biases and perspectives, would probably let that ideological view dominate, for there to be some progress on the question of anti-racism. . . . It turned out selections were not made, in part because some of the people did not choose to apply. People who were working for the Board in senior positions as high as the superintendency level were also part of that very open lobby in criticism, and I made a point of saying that only in the Toronto system as it had developed at that point would that kind of behaviour be seen to be O.K. and not squelched. (William-K-W)

A large group of community and educational equity advocates who protested the process and results of the series of senior hirings made during the conference were not comforted by the justifications provided by the Board. It is ironic that there was concern expressed that some of those in power, who were pushing for change, had little or no understanding of their own privileged status related to being White (Carr, 1996).

Some TBE insiders, while critiquing the perceived White values and representation at the top, acknowledged that "behaviour has not changed at the rate the policy has changed." For example, one official stated:

What you've got is a bunch of White people running the show, who've got a theoretical understanding of parts of it, and a sort of commitment to parts of it, a kind of general equity feeling, but they really believe that they don't need to learn anything, and that the

system is doing okay, and if there's a little problem, "here, we'll deal with it". . . . And they go into spasm whenever they get a large community push on it. . . . So with all this cosmetic stuff being done, and there's some real good work being done here and there, but that's the work being done by these individual people, and it's not a system-wide kind of wave of commitment, because the culture is so self-protective. (Chelsea-K-W)

Another example of the systemic nature of discrimination in the institutional culture of the TBE comes to light when looking at the area of training. What kind of training is offered? Who controls the decision-making around content selection for the workshops and courses? Is equity and anti-racist training mandatory? What follow-up is there to ensure that there is some transformational change, and that formal as well as informal actions are modified? One key decision-maker described one process in which he was a participant to facilitate understanding and change amongst principals as being difficult, and highlighted the need for a strategic approach.

It was not easy to do this. The first year I tried to do some training with my group of principals and they blew up, and I thought the thing was going to go down the drain quite frankly. . . . By the end of the second day [of training], they were seething mad, they were madder than hell, you see, because you could resist up to a certain point or you could be polite and figure out that, "Well, O.K., we'll do this and then we'll go back and do what we used to do", but then it became apparent that it wasn't going to go away, and the masks dropped, and they went hairy. . . . And once they had a chance to think about some of the issues, I think that that was a turning point, they got over it. . . . We were then able to complete the training and put it in the context of the school setting. . . . The biggest barrier, it has to be couched in a certain way, because the reaction is, "Are you calling me a racist?, like, why am I here, because you feel that I'm a racist, and that's because you've got me in this session to talk about racism, and I'm fed up because I'm not a racist." (Serge-K-R)

The capacity for some people to openly reject training or overtures related to equity can infiltrate and influence the entire institutional culture (Muhkerjee & Cooper, 1987). What risk do White principals and teachers take, compared to racial minorities, in challenging the rationale and implementation of equity policies?

Some principals voiced the concern that there are professional risks to their involvement in some ethnocultural student activities. The apparent responsibility on the shoulders of principals of having to mediate potentially conflictual situations amongst students and staff under-

Transforming the Institution

scores the need for strong institutional support, especially in relation to training:

Last year I stopped them [lunch-hour presentations pertaining to the diverse student population] because two years ago I tried an Afro-Caribbean group; I had an Ethiopian [group] and primarily Jamaican-Trinidadian [group] putting on a show; there was such an intense battle between those two groups, their cultures are very different. One is matriarchal, the other is patriarchal. One has an exuberance of life, the other is a very rigid society, primarily Muslim with their set of codes. They could not agree, one thought the other's dance was vulgar. We have had to split them. (Jerome-P-W)

How administrators and teachers become involved in student activities, and how they use them to break down barriers, is critical to what takes place in the classroom. Specific attention should be paid to the elimination of stereotypes, to which some of these activities may easily fall prey. Despite the strong views, pro and con, in relation to students' efforts to organize, there is no set of rules or standards for principals to follow.

Thus, the existence and recognition of systemic barriers underscores the relevance of race and how racial diversity is dealt with. Directly linked to this discussion of systemic barriers is the following section, which examines the divergent views of anti-racist education as well as the potential impact related to the lack of consensus around its meaning.

Defining and working with anti-racist education

There appears to be an unwritten agreement amongst many parties in the Board, like elsewhere in society, about the necessity and importance of anti-racist education. Thus, there is a schism between the required action and the demonstrated understanding of, and commitment to, anti-racist education.

Amongst White teachers, the range of views stretches from bewilderment, anxiety, and anger at placing anti-racist education on the Board's priority list to ambivalence, muted support, and full-fledged involvement. Many White teachers stated that anti-racist education is not an area of personal concern, concluding that "I don't know enough about it. It is not one of my priority topics in personal professional development" (Hannah-T-W-5), and "Academic teachers dealing with technical – math and science – subjects are concerned with achievement only" (Patrick-T-W-30). Other White teachers indicated that a number of (White) teachers may trivialize the damage caused by racism, all the while emphasizing that progress has been made:

Never experienced it [referring to racism] – some teachers make comments in staffroom but don't think it would affect their treatment of students in classroom; e.g., My black student is doing well – expressed with surprise. (Felix-T-W-15)

There may be some racist comments from time to time but they are usually among friends and not meant to be derogatory. Most kids at my school get along well with each[other] regardless of race and ethnic background. (Oliver-T-W-20)

On the other hand, racial minority teacher participants were, for the most part, in favour of anti-racist education. Some teachers spoke of the high level of discrimination and the low level of racial minority teacher representation as factors inciting them to believe that anti-racist education should permeate all institutional layers at the Board:

After 3 racial incidents, you will be warned by the TB [Toronto Board]. No teacher was ever affected by racial incidences. One teacher told a Black student to go back to Africa. No action was taken. (Carl-T-R-15)

[Yes, there is a lot of racial discrimination] I say this because I see most positions of responsibility held by Whites; very few Black principals or V-Ps. (Felicity-T-R-17)

There was generally no lack of understanding about the connection between anti-racist education and the school culture amongst racial minority teachers, but some White teachers had difficulty making the linkage:

I think we have a significant multicultural presence and that every effort has been made to make students feel welcome on the surface, but I don't really see a connection between anti-racist "education" and school culture. It implies that there is some attempt to manage the culture – which I don't think is true. (Jocelyn- T-W-17)

As Huberman (1992) points out, "the administrator's world may be completely different than that of the teacher"(p. 28).

Several participants stressed the need to attack persistently the problem, but underscored the importance of knowing which strategies to promote, and how hard to push them. The inability to know which resources to access and, moreover, how to address sensitive issues from an enlightened vantage-point was a theme often emphasized by principals and teachers alike:

... anti-racist education is whatever will raise kids' self-esteem. And in terms of curriculum, that would be making sure that their values

are honoured through recognition of some of their cultural festivals, through making sure that the library materials reflect them, through the classroom programs, and so within that framework the school will set overall goals. . . . In my [area], this is an overall focus, and we have linked research with the program. We are looking at the number of racial incidents, doing focus interviews with teachers, parents and the staff, looking at the gifted program by composition of race, looking at a number of things, the tracking of student awards . . . the focus on awards was leaving out Black students, for example, Black male students particularly. (Spencer-K-R)

As long as there were no penalties to not adhering to the Board's direction of respecting racial and ethnic diversity, a large number of non-committed educators and TBE staff are able to "muddle through". The privilege accorded Whites allows them to voice concern about the necessity or non-necessity of anti-racist education without fear of reprisal or reprimand. It was also found that the prospect of being isolated and ostracized by colleagues usually does not exist to the same degree for Whites as it does for racial minorities in relation to undertaking anti-racist education work.

Principals, in particular, noted that the Board's anti-racism approach was too "top heavy", and that it should be viewed as a long-term process in which people are given the time and resources to adapt. The principals also expressed concern that not enough emphasis is placed on the implementation of anti-racist education:

With the anti-racism, it is very much a top-down perspective. There has been acceptance from some staff, some students and some parents. But it has not been accepted by all of those parties in all of those communities. Anti-racism is a personal, emotional issue of which the reaction from those constituents is based on their own life experience and their own values. I think it is a really hard notion to give to us [or require] one-hundred percent acceptance and compliance. This issue cannot just be a laid-on Board mandate. Clearly it is a process. (Dorothy-P-W)

The problem is change cannot be willed or legislated; rapidity of change is beyond what some of us can cope with, there is [sic] far too many initiatives. We have an enormous change of students every year, therefore, this is a one-year continuum here. . . . The greatest example of racism within the school is among the groups and what they bring with them. For instance, the Punjabis and the Hindus, the Tamils and the others in Sri Lanka. When we do multicultural days the Tamils will want to point out how they have been wronged by the Sinhalese in their own community. Latin parents want to know who their children are seeing in the school. It is within the newcom-

ers, not the established group, that different values are brought in. (Jerome-P-W)

A critical issue for principals is the need to be able to reconcile differences while distinguishing between diverse needs (Carr, 1997). One principal highlighted how problematic it is trying to convey a positive and meaningful message to the students while attempting to manage the process of transformational change.

Or you get the really poor White kids, and they say that, "We got no chances, it's all for the Blacks, and the Indians." I have heard that often. They will come down and say, "Sir, does everything we do around here have to be for this ethnic stuff". That tells you we are doing something. That kid has real feelings. That tells you that that kid feels neglected.

It's all the little things. When I came here, there was virtually no school teams. So what does that mean in terms of anti-racist work. Well, it means that there are 15 or 20 kids on each one of those teams, bumping into each other, sharing a common set of goals and aspirations. And now it's not fashionable to have multicultural celebrations with food. I think that's stupid. It's a good way to bring people together to share food and drink. . . . The kids take pride in doing their folk dances, and you know, it's almost become unfashionable, and I think that that's nuts. It's another way to aid in taking pride in their heritage. (Mark-P-W)

The study found that many teacher respondents did not have a solid grasp of the policy process related to anti-racist education, and their comments indicated that the real implementation, in terms of concrete action, has been lacking. For example, John-T-R-5 felt that the Board's main message around anti-racist education focused on "equal opportunity", stating that there is "lots on paper." Sam-T-R-6 felt that the approach "focused on incidents between teachers and students", and that the TBE "hasn't looked at subtle manifestations of racism." Jean-T-R-13 commented that the "[anti-racism] policies are top-down, coming from the Ministry," but also noted that the "community" has some power.

One of the consequences of the complex organizational configuration of the Board, coupled with its size, is the difficulty in organizing like-minded people committed to equity into networks, both formal and informal, in such a way as to be able to influence the general workings and underpinnings of the Board's operations. Thus, finding and supporting allies becomes a difficult undertaking:

[The institutional culture of the Board prescribes that administrators contain them [activists] as much as you can. They're [some key individuals] extremely good at what they do, but they're limited in their impact because the system only allows them a certain impact. Like, you can't get into a school without the invitation of a principal. So no one of those guys can just walk into a school and say, "there's a problem here and this is what I'd like to do," they could be ousted.

Over the years, the Race Relations Advisors, the first of whom was appointed in 1980 I think, gathered together people who had common interests, and it was that type of networking, through formal and informal meetings over a 10-15 year period that developed a kind of network of allies. . . . I found myself, and I'm not unique in this, often in a school where there were no allies, where I was working alone on this agenda, and had to find external allies. . . . I would say that in the four schools in which I taught, there would have been one only in which I had clearly identifiable allies, and one in which I managed to kind of tangle a few people. (Chelsea-K-W)

The key rallying point for those working, or having some interest, in this area has, undoubtedly, been the Race Relations Committee, which has provided an entry-point for channeling grievances and concerns up through the system. However, the power of this Committee is limited by the fact that it reports to one of two senior committees of the Board whose agendas and priorities may not always support equity issues.

The perception of a disconnection between diverse equity interests can only hamper efforts aimed at overall inclusion. At the same time, the inclusion of diverse equity interests – for example, the alienation and marginalization of young Black males – should not be taken for granted when conceptualizing macro-level strategies. Specific responses are still required within the context of a coherent approach. At a fundamental level, it is clear that there is a need for a broad and comprehensive understanding of equity and anti-racism, as well as a better appreciation of the concept of identity formation, since that latter concept underpins the conceptualization of any attempt to promote and manage diversity.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

The study found that the implementation of equity, and, in particular anti-racist, initiatives has been wrought with a number of inconsistencies, underscoring the entrenched and systemic nature of discrimination in the institutional culture. Despite having developed a cadre of

committed and respected experts adept in the field of equity and organizational change, Board efforts aimed at inculcating a shared and accepted vision of equity have been largely isolated, often disconnected from the larger decision-making processes. In particular, there still appears to be a general lack of consensus around what is the problem, and how to define it. There needs to be a more consolidated and comprehensive discussion around the issue of inequitable power relations as it relates to the inter-connectedness of forms of difference in education.

Rymer and Alladin (1996) point out that at least four factors must be considered when implementing anti-racist education: the controversial nature of serious examinations of discrimination; the roles of teacher and student in such examinations; the critical posture required when evaluating discrimination; the importance of entertaining a discourse of possibility. While serious efforts have been made by the TBE, the degree to which the Board has met these standards is uncertain, at least if one is to consider the sustained system-wide efforts and outcomes of inclusivity and representation as benchmarks for success. Similarly, Berlin and Alladin (1996) have emphasized that there needs to be a solid partnership between the school and community in order to be able to create the proper environment in which issues of diversity can be appropriately discussed and dealt with. Again, here, significant isolated efforts have been made, but at the system-wide level there remains a great deal of marginalization and discontent in relation to the educational goals of many racial minorities. Fullan (1993) argues that “[m]aking a difference must be explicitly recast in broader social and moral terms”, not focused at the “one-to-one and classroom level.” Thus, in order to promote some tangible level of equity-based change, it is important to think systematically, not only at the micro- and individual levels.

The literature on change in education has underscored the problematic nature of defining the culture of an institution or a school as well as the complexity of change (Huberman, 1992). Deal (1993) offers three reasons why change in schools has not worked: “Professionals lack the required skills and are negatively disposed toward change”, “Roles are improperly defined or because adequate levels of interdependence and coordination do not exist”, and “Because they threaten the balance of power, create opposing coalitions, and trigger conflict” (pp. 7-8). Huberman (1992) explains that “Managing change then becomes a matter of containing irrational behaviour”, which “often takes the form of unsettled interpersonal accounts” (p. 7). For successful change to

happen Huberman (1992) advises avoiding the “too-many-moving-parts problem”, and also to be aware that “the more complex the change . . . the greater the chance of internal turbulence”. Deal’s (1993) recipe for laying the groundwork for change includes “revitalizing the culture” in a public school (“recreate the history of a school”, “articulate shared values”, “anoint and celebrate heroes”, “reinvigorate rituals and ceremonies”, “tell good stories”, “work with the informal network of cultural players,” pp. 15-17).

The findings of this study indicate that there has not been a clear vision of equity in education at the Toronto Board, which has had the effect of diluting the significance of those individuals who have shown leadership in this area. Making, perhaps, too many “backroom deals” to achieve a consensus around anti-racism has served to diminish the overall institutional vision. Some values, it could be argued, must predominate above all others in an educational institution, yet the prevailing hidden agenda prevents the articulation of a solidly supported equity agenda. The “traditional” style of leadership has been considered a failure because of its inability to “tap fully human potential and to help teachers become self-managing” (Sergiovanni, 1993, p. 74). Traditional leadership models have also failed to fully consider how to deal more effectively with issues of equity and diversity (Cunningham, 1990; Fullan, 1992). Similarly, Kirst, McLaughlin, and Massell (1990) argue that education must become more child-focused, rather than fixated on the needs of “teachers, texts, families”.

Schlechty (1991, pp. 101-2) places emphasis on the inter-connected nature of planning and implementation, stating that “[t]he act of planning is itself an implementation activity”. He, further, postulates that “[i]f change is to occur, people in the organization must believe that things are going to change” (Schlechty, 1991, p. 102). Fullan (1992) fleshes out more fully the concept of implementation, arguing that “the key issue from an implementation perspective is how the process of change unfolds vis-à-vis what people do (behaviours) and think (beliefs) in relation to a particular innovation.” Fullan (1992) argues that “Effective implementation depends on a combination of factors and themes” (p. 22), including internal and external relationships which may facilitate or block change, the character of individual schools and teachers, and the “characteristics of the nature of the change.” The “marketing” of the change can be as important as the technical mastery of the type of change required (Schlechty, 1991). As Huberman (1992) points out, one must distinguish between implementation and “actual

implementation" (p.10), and that, ultimately, "implementation is a political process, one that involves conflict" and "dozens of bargains being struck along the way" (pp. 16-17).

Fullan (1993) emphasizes the need to work with polar opposites, as exemplified through his "Eight Basic Lessons of the New Paradigm of Change": "1. You Can't Mandate What Matters, 2. Change is a Journey not a Blueprint, 3. Problems are Our Friends, 4. Vision and Strategic Planning Come Later, 5. Individualism and Collectivism Must Have Equal Power, 6. Neither Centralization Nor Decentralization Works, 7. Connection with the Wider Environment is Critical for Success, 8. Every Person is a Change Agent" (p. 21). Fullan (1993, pp. 82-83) cautions avoiding "groupthink" and "balkanization", the former being "the uncritical acceptance and/or suppression of dissent in going along with group decisions", and the latter "occurs when strong loyalties form within a group with a resultant indifference or even hostility to other groups, . . . thereby inhibiting school-wide initiatives".

The issue of implementation is where the criticism is most squarely focused. Even when action-plans have been drawn up and the issues clearly diagnosed, the implementation in the TBE has been lacking. Moreover, there appears to be no adverse consequences for those choosing not to implement an anti-racist or equity-based curriculum or educational-management plan. One concrete recommendation that can be made, here, is that the Board spend more time, effort, and resources on the implementation of anti-racist education, that it have a built-in accountability mechanism, and that it involve extensive input from all parties, including parents, community groups, students, and teachers. A clearer vision of anti-racism must also be developed, and a system-wide debate should take place on the rationale for focused changes to take place.

The sentiment of power and privilege being accorded to Whites within a White administrative and political system was a predominant theme highlighted throughout the research (Sleeter, 1992). Although more senior administrators are now White women, there is still the perception that the decision-making centre is relatively inaccessible to marginalized groups and interests. Many participants contended that a certain, relatively narrow, mind-set permeates the senior levels, even when effective alternative viewpoints are introduced. Thus, representation and inclusion become key considerations. How much different can the leadership be from the mainstream values of the organization? Or, does the senior leadership shape these mainstream values, and, if so,

what are the elements required to ensure that transformational change does, indeed, take place? If the leadership is too far ahead of the proverbial "troops", as one senior official put it, will the ensuing backlash ensure institutional intransigence?

In order to tackle such an entrenched and sophisticated institutional culture, a comprehensive set of inter-connected reforms needs to be implemented within a framework that places a premium on the development of a shared long-term vision, inclusivity and representation as fundamental values of the new organization, in addition to accountability (Carr, 1996:264-273). Suggested reforms must be viewed as part of an integral package, since individually they will not lead to any transformational change. Within the current ideological climate a premium must also be placed on sensitizing employees to the rationale for the changes (i.e., it should be hinged on strong pedagogy and progressive management/leadership principles) as well as being as cost-effective as possible.

Viewing equity from a holistic vantage-point has the advantage of critically addressing difference, marginalization, representation, power relations and change from a range of perspectives, incorporating into, and building on, the general institutional framework as new issues are unearthed. The compartmentalization of equity issues leads to alienation and mistrust. It ensures that the institutional culture will continue to reign over the general structural and political orientation of the organization. The prospect for transformational change is muted when the issues are not clearly defined, and when the resources, both human and financial, are not provided.

NOTES

1. Dei's nine anti-racist education principles (1994:1-2) are: 1) recognizing the social effect of "race" although race lacks a scientific basis; 2) teaching that the full social effects of race intersect with other forms of social oppression intersect (race, class, gender, and sexuality); 3) questioning white (male) power and privilege and the rationality for dominance in society; 4) addressing the marginalization of certain voices in society; 5) recognizing that students do not go to school as "disembodied" individuals, but that their background and their identities are implicated in the schooling and learning processes; 6) acknowledging the pedagogic need to confront the challenge of diversity and difference in Canadian society; 7) acknowledging the role of the educational system in producing and reproducing not only racial but also gender, sex, and class-based inequalities; 8) stressing the school problems of youth cannot be analyzed in isolation from the material and ideological circumstances in which the students find themselves; and 9) questioning explanations of pathological family and home environments as a source of school problems.

2. The ten components of the policy are as follows: 1) Board Policies, Guidelines, and Practices; 2) Leadership; 3) School-Community Partnership; 4) Curriculum; 5) Student Languages; 6) Student Evaluation, Assessment, and Placement; 7) Guidance and Counselling; 8) Racial and Ethnocultural Harassment; 9) Employment Practices; 10) Staff Development (Ontario Ministry of Education and Training, 1993).

3. Fourteen (14) of the participants were racial minorities, with eight (8) being White. The racial origin breakdown of the sample is as follows: 7 Black, 4 South Asian, 2 East Asian and one of Mixed racial origin. The sample included eight (8) women and fourteen (14) men, which is indicative of the gender barrier at the senior levels. It should be noted that a combination of the categories provided by the TBE's Every Secondary Student Survey and the Ontario government's employment equity legislation was used in order to define racial origin, since developing a racial typology which is both appropriate and comprehensible is problematic. I asked participants to define their own racial origin, and then regrouped them accordingly. Under the rubric "Black" a number of references were made, including "African-Canadian", "African", "Jamaican-Canadian", etc. Of the fourteen (14) racial minority members, all of whom had emigrated to Canada, eight (8) came from the Caribbean, three (3) from the Indian sub-continent, one (1) from Asia, one (1) from Africa, and one (1) from Europe.

4. Of the six (6) principals, four (4) were men and two (2) were women. Two (2) of the six (6) were racial minorities, one being Black and the other South Asian, with the remaining four being White. Of the 23 questionnaires sent out in late March 1995, 5 were returned, for a response-rate of 22%. If we include the six principals interviewed, the percentage of principals canvassed would then be 35%.

5. For example, some of the early committees and workgroups dealing with these equity issues included the following: 1970 – Special Committee RE Educating New Canadians; 1972 – Advisory Committee RE Selection of Qualified Women for Positions of Responsibility; 1973 – Work Group on Vocational Schools; 1974 – Advisory Committee on Philosophy and Programs of the New Canadian Population; 1974 – Work group on Multicultural Programs; 1977 – Committee on Multicultural Programs and Racism; 1977 – Sub-Committee on Race Relations; 1977 – Status of Women Committee; 1978 – Committee on Race Relations and Multiculturalism; Race Relations Committee. For a detailed review of the activities undertaken in the Board during this period, see Carr (1996, pp. 80-132).

6. Evidence of this can be found in the level of hiring of racial minority teachers since 1990. When significant resources have gone into the recruitment and preparation of candidates as well as the training of those doing the hiring, the percentage of racial minorities hired has increased markedly. According to the Race Relations Advisor (interview on February 13, 1997), for the years 1992 and 1995, when a strategic approach to hiring racial minorities was implemented, more than twice as many racial minorities were hired than in the years 1990, 1991, 1993 and 1994.

REFERENCES

- Berlin, M., & Alladin, I. (1996). The Kipling Collegiate Institute story: Towards positive race relations in the school. In I. Alladin (Ed.), *Racism in Canadian schools* (pp. 131-145). Toronto: Harcourt and Bruce.
- Breton, R., Isajiw, W., Kalbach, W., & Reitz, J. (1990). *Ethnic identity and equality: Varieties of experience in a Canadian city*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Transforming the Institution

- Carr, P. (1995). Employment equity for racial minorities in the teaching profession. *Multicultural Education Journal*, 13(1), 28-42.
- Carr, P. (1996). Anti-racist education, institutional culture and the search for educational transformation: A case study of the Toronto Board of Education's secondary panel. (An unpublished doctoral thesis at OISE/University of Toronto).
- Carr, P. (1997, Spring). Stuck in the middle: A case study of how principals manage equity-related change in education. *Education Canada*, 32-49.
- Carr, P., & Klassen, T. (1996). The role of racial minority teachers in anti-racist education. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, XXVIII(2), 126-138.
- Carr, P., & Klassen, T. (1997). Different perceptions of race in Education? Racial minority and white teachers. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 22(1), 67-81.
- Cheng, M. (1996). *Anti-racist education project: A summary report on the extent of implementation and changes found in Wards 11/12 schools: 1991-92 to 1994-95*. Toronto: Toronto Board of Education.
- Cheng, M., Brown, R., & Lines, E. (1994). *Anti-racist education: A literature review*. Toronto: Toronto Board of Education.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1995). Color blindness and basket making are not the answers: Confronting the dilemmas of race, culture, and language diversity in teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 493-522.
- Cunningham, L. (1990). Educational leadership and administration: Retrospective and prospective views. In B. Mitchel & L. Cunningham (Eds.), *Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities and schools: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 1-18). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Deal, T. (1993.) The culture of schools. In M. Sashkin & H. Walberg (Eds.), *Educational leadership and school culture* (pp. 3-18). Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.
- Dei, G. (1994). Anti-racist education: Working across differences: Working across differences. *ORBIT*, 25(2), 1-3. Is this title correct?
- Dei, G. (1996a). *Anti-racism education: Theory and practice*. Halifax: Fernwood.
- Dei, G. (1996b). Critical perspectives in antiracism: An introduction. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 33(3), 247-267.
- Figueroa, P. (1991). *Education and the social construction of 'race'*. London: Routledge.
- Fullan, M. (1992). *Successful school improvement*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Fyfe, A. (1993). Multiculturalism or anti-racist education: The irrelevant debate. In A. Fyfe & P. Figueroa (Eds.), *Education for cultural diversity: The challenge for a new era*. London: Routledge.
- Fyfe, A., & Figueroa, P., (Eds.). (1993). *Education for cultural diversity: The challenge for a new era*. London: Routledge.
- Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Henry, A. (1992). "Taking back control": Toward and Afrocentric womanist standpoint on the education of black Children. (An unpublished doctoral dissertation at OISE, University of Toronto).

- Henry, A. (1993). Missing: Black self-representations in Canadian educational research. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 18(3), 206-222.
- Hitner Starr Associates. (1984). *Race relations review*. Toronto: Hitner Starr Associates.
- Huberman, M. (1992). Critical introduction. In M. Fullan (Ed.), *Successful School Improvement* (pp. 1-20). Toronto: OISE Press.
- James, C. (1992). *Seeing ourselves: Exploring race, ethnicity and culture*. Oakville, ON: Sheridan College.
- Kirst, M., McLaughlin, M., & Massell, D. (1990). Rethinking policy for children: Implications for educational administration. In B. Mitchell & L. Cunningham (Eds.), *Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities and schools: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 69-90). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lawrence, S., & T. (1996). Feeling and dealing: Teaching white students about racial privilege. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 12(5), 531-542.
- Lee, E. (1985). *Letters to Marcia: A teacher's guide to anti-racist education*. Toronto: Cross Cultural Communication Centre.
- McIntosh, P. (1990, Winter). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible napsack. *Independent School*, 31-36.
- Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Moodley, K. (1985). Ethnicity and education: Implications of multiculturalism. In K. Moodley (Ed.), *Race relations and multicultural education* (pp. 7-20). Vancouver: Centre for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction, the University of British Columbia.
- Muhkerjee, A., & Cooper, E. (1987, Winter). Race relations training for school administrators and employees: An adult education model. *Currents*, 12-15.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1993) On the theoretical status of the concept of race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race identity and representation in education* (pp. 3-10). New York: Routledge.
- Ontario Ministry of Education and Training. (1993). *Antiracism and ethnocultural equity in school boards: Guidelines for policy development and implementation*. Toronto: Ministry of Education and Training.
- Ontario Provincial Advisory Committee on Race Relations. (1987). *The Development of a Policy on Race and Ethnocultural Equity*. Toronto: Ministry of Education.
- Ontario Royal Commission on Learning. (1995). Equity considerations. Making it happen. In *For the love of learning* (Vol. IV, pp. 86-99). Toronto: Queen's Printer.
- Rymer, J., & Alladin, I. (1996). Strategies for an antiracist education. In I. Alladin (Ed), *Racism in Canadian schools* (pp. 157-172). Toronto: Harcourt and Bruce.
- Schlechty, P. (1991). *Schools for the twenty-first century: Leadership imperatives for educational reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1993). New sources of leadership authority. In M. Sashkin & H. Walberg (Eds.), *Educational leadership and school culture* (pp. 61-74). Berkeley, CA: McCutcheon.
- Sleeter, C. (1992). Resisting racial awareness: How teachers understand the social order from their racial, gender and social class locations. *Educational Foundations*, 6(2), 7-32.
- Sleeter, C. (1993). How white teachers construct race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *"Race", identity and representation in education* (pp. 151-171). New York: Routledge.

Transforming the Institution

Thomas, B. (1984). Principles of anti-racist education. *Currents*, 2(2), 20-14.

Toronto Board of Education (TBE). (1979). *Final report of sub-committee on race relations*. Toronto: Board of Education.

Toronto Board of Education (TBE). (1994). *Interim racial and ethnocultural mistreatment policy*. Toronto: Toronto Board of Education.

Yau, M., Cheng, M., & Ziegler, S. (1993). *The 1991 every secondary student survey, Part III: Program level and student achievement*. Toronto: Toronto Board of Education.

PAUL CARR recently completed his doctorate at OISE/UT, has taught at Ryerson Polytechnic University, and has published articles in the areas of diversity in education, identity formation, and leadership in education. He can be reached by e-mail at paulc@interlog.com.

PAUL CARR a récemment obtenu son doctorat à l'IEPO/UT, il a enseigné au Ryerson Polytechnic University et a publié des articles sur la diversité de l'éducation, l'acquisition d'une identité et le leadership en éducation. On peut le joindre par mél. à paulc@interlog.com.