

## **Overview of the Readings (and Video) on Hope and Healing (April 29, 2021 Session)/Submitted by Jane Quinn and Mariatere Tapias**

In his essay published in the *Harvard Education Review* (Summer 2009), Jeffrey Duncan-Andrade explores the essential nature of hope in educating and nurturing urban youth. He analyzes three kinds of “false hope”—including hokey hope, mythical hope, and hope deferred—positing that all three are commonplace in urban schools and are perpetrators of dishonesty and mistrust. “Critical hope,” in contrast, produces and sustains true hope by providing tangible and relevant benefits to students. Duncan-Andrade views critical hope as comprised of three elements: material hope (including good teaching that connects academic rigor of content areas with the realities of students’ lives) (p. 187); Socratic hope (including the ability to “show the sermon, rather than preach it”) (p. 188); and audacious hope (the ability to empathize with the undeserved suffering of others, to control one’s responses to provocation, and to help students channel their emotions). He speaks from his vantage point both as a veteran teacher and as a researcher of effective pedagogy with urban youth, observing that: “At the end of the day, effective teaching depends most heavily on one thing: deep and caring relationships” (p. 191).

Duncan-Andrade returns to several of these themes in the 2017 video of a presentation he gave at Google—a presentation in which he demonstrated several aspects of good teaching: connecting research to practice; engaging the audience; using humor; and illustrating the concept of Socratic hope (“showing the sermon”) through a very moving closing sequence filmed in his own classroom in an Oakland High School. Studying his ideas about measuring what matters should be a requirement for all policymakers, from local school boards to the U.S. Secretary of Education.

Julio Cammarota describes how healing youth identities through social justice action can enhance the learning and development of urban students. His 2011 article in *Urban Education* outlines the specifics of the Social Justice Youth Development model, which is “conceptualized to facilitate and enhance young people’s awareness of their personal potential, community responsibility, and broader humanity” (p. 829). Drawing on Freire’s concepts of praxis (critical reflection and action), this model “allows young people the opportunity to think critically about their social and economic conditions and engage in actions to address these conditions” (p. 829). Using a case study of one participant, a student named Yolo, Cammarota skillfully illustrates how this intervention fosters deep engagement in compelling and relevant problems as well as provides opportunities for personal transformation. The article concludes with an examination of the implications of this work for broader adoption and implementation.

Like Cammarota, Shawn Ginwright connects hope and healing in his 2011 article in *Liberal Education*. This author calls for a broad definition of youth civic engagement that looks beyond traditional (white) notions of individual voluntarism and community service, focusing instead on social justice actions such as protests, hunger strikes, and civil disobedience. “These forms of civic engagement address issues related to injustice and are directed toward social change” (p. 34), according to Ginwright. He examines the civic dimensions of healing, hope, and care, observing that the healing process fosters hope. “Together, healing and hope inspire youth to understand that community conditions are not permanent, and that the first step in making change is to imagine new possibilities” (p. 37). He analyzes the important role that community organizations can play in rebuilding youth civic life by providing pathways to critical consciousness, action, and well-being.