

Educational Justice and Sustainability for Rural Schools

By Mara Casey Tieken

Rural schools have long been absent from debates about education policy and practice. The 2016 presidential election changed this, at least temporarily, bringing new attention from policymakers, advocates, and media. There is some evidence to suggest that funders are also newly interested in connecting with overlooked rural communities and investing in rural-centered reform.¹

This new attention has generated more discussion about rural America. But not all of this conversation has been constructive. Many dominant national narratives about rural communities are inaccurate and one-dimensional, portraying rural places as demographically, economically, and politically homogeneous. These narratives erase large swaths of rural America and can lead to uninformed policymaking and philanthropy.

In fact, rural communities are diverse and varied. They are also, by many indicators, starkly unequal, and these inequalities have profound consequences for rural schools and the children who attend them. This brief draws upon research on rural communities and schools to inform funders interested in supporting educational justice and sustainability for rural communities. Though rural residents comprise nearly 20 percent of the population, only 7 percent of private philanthropic giving goes to rural communities, and few foundations have any sort of explicitly rural strategy. And because most funders are not located in rural places and do not understand the complexity of rural contexts or schools, rural residents will need to have a central voice in equity-oriented philanthropic efforts.²

Rural residents comprise nearly 20 percent of the population. But only 7 percent of private philanthropic giving goes to rural communities... few foundations have any sort of explicitly rural strategy.



Photo credit: @amyhilbrand via Twenty20

1 For example, see Smart, Allen, "Making investments in rural health: What are the new and old challenges?" 2017. Retrieved from: <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hblog20170628.060871/full/>

2 Smart, Allen, "Building a field of rural philanthropy: The case for creating a rural philanthropic network," 2019. Retrieved from: https://philanthropyworx.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/PhilanWorx_CaseStudy_REV_2_19.pdf

Below, we first describe the current demographic and economic conditions of the rural United States and then detail major factors and inequities shaping rural schools. We conclude with recommendations for grantmakers concerned with educational equity and well-being in rural communities.

The hard-to-define rural U.S. is more racially and ethnically diverse than often assumed

Official definitions of rural vary, making it difficult to issue definitive demographic and economic statistics about rural communities.³ By some counts, the federal government has more than two dozen different classification schemes, and each state has its own definitions, too. Most are tied to factors like population size or distance from an urban core, and, problematically, they usually first define urban or metropolitan areas, relegating rural or nonmetropolitan spaces to a leftover category. Not surprisingly, depending on the definition used, the proportion of the country's population designated as rural fluctuates dramatically; recent estimates span from 17 to 49 percent. According to the Census definition, though, 19 percent of the population—or 60 million residents—lived in a rural area in 2010.⁴

Though rural America is widely assumed to be white, that assumption is inaccurate for many rural places and people. Nationally, 9 percent of the rural population is Hispanic, 8 percent is African American, 2 percent is Native American, about 1 percent is Asian or Asian Pacific Islander, and two percent is multi-racial; the remaining 78 percent is White. But these demographics differ regionally; the Mississippi Delta, for example, has higher proportions of rural African American communities, the Rio Grande valley has many rural Hispanic residents, and rural Native communities are found across the Great Plains and Alaska. These demographic patterns reflect long histories of oppression and exclusion—the removal of tribes from indigenous land, the enslavement of African peoples, European conquest along the southern border—and also more recent trends of segregation and immigration.⁵

Some rural communities are gaining population and racial diversity, while others are losing residents

After a period of population decline throughout much of the 2000s, rural counties are now gaining population. These trends vary, though, too, depending on location. While about a third of rural counties saw new population highs in 2010, another third are currently losing population. Much of the population growth comes from rural in-migration, often in rural counties adjacent to cities or sites of recreational or retirement activity.⁶

This population growth is also making rural America more diverse. From 2000 to 2010, the rural non-white population grew from 8.6 to 10.3 million people—or by 19.8 percent; during this same time, the rural White population was nearly flat. These gains were primarily due to a rapidly expanding rural Hispanic population,

3 Throughout the remainder of this brief, we use the term “rural” as the authors cited have.

4 Cromartie, John, and Shawn Bucholz, “Defining the ‘rural’ in rural America,” 2008. Retrieved from: <https://www.ers.usda.gov/amber-waves/2008/june/defining-the-rural-in-rural-america/>; U.S. Census, 2010.

5 Cromartie, John, “Rural America at a glance,” 2018. Retrieved from: <https://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub-details/?pubid=90555>; Tieken, Mara Casey, “There’s a big part of rural America that everyone’s ignoring,” *Washington Post*, 2017.

6 Cromartie, “Rural America at a glance”; Johnson, Kenneth, and Daniel Lichter, “Rural depopulation: Growth and decline processes over the past century,” *Rural Sociology*, 2019.



which grew during this period by 44 percent, a combination of migration to rural areas and high birth rates. Importantly, this population gain is offsetting population decline among aging and out-migrating rural White residents. However, it is also under threat, due to recent changes in immigration policies, the separation of immigrant families, and ICE raids in rural communities and workplaces.⁷

Rural economies also vary by sector, driving population gain and loss

The rural economy is based upon a wide variety of sectors; however, local rural economies tend to rely on a smaller number of industries than urban economies. This makes individual communities relatively dependent upon the economic health of a few industries. Some rural industries, especially those tied to recreation and retirement, are experiencing widespread growth, leading to population gain in rural places along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and in interior regions like the Smoky Mountains and Ozarks. A recent boom in oil and natural gas production has also led to economic and population growth in some rural regions, especially across the northern Great Plains. But many rural areas are facing significant economic decline, mostly related to automation or instability in traditional rural industries, like agriculture, mining, timber, and fishing. Currently,

⁷ Lichter, Daniel, "Immigration and the new racial diversity in rural America," *Rural Sociology*. 2012; Stuesse, Angela, "The poultry industry recruited them. Now ICE raids are devastating their communities," *Washington Post*, 2019.

only about 1 in 10 rural workers is employed in one of these sectors, and these jobs continue to disappear, causing rural places in the Mississippi Delta, the Midwest, and Appalachia to lose population. Declines in manufacturing have also harmed rural counties across the country, and globalization and economic restructuring have had disproportionate negative effects in rural places, squeezing many rural industries and forcing out many small rural businesses. Rural growth in employment lags behind urban rates and also still trails pre-recession growth rates.⁸

Rural poverty rates are high, and they reflect—and reinforce—rural racial disparities

In 2017, 16.4 percent of nonmetropolitan residents lived in poverty, compared to 12.9 percent of metropolitan residents—a gap that has been persistent over time. This overall rate, though, obscures vast racial disparities: the rural Black poverty rate was 32 percent, the poverty rate for rural Native residents was 31 percent, and the rural Hispanic poverty rate was 24.5 percent—while only 13.5 percent of rural White residents live below the poverty line. However, some rural White locales, like Appalachia, also face high rates of poverty.⁹

Rural poverty is associated with a variety of factors beyond low income, including physical isolation, little public transportation, weak infrastructure (e.g., sewer systems, adequate and affordable housing, broadband access), environmental toxicity and destruction, and limited access to medical care and social services (e.g., job training programs, food pantries). These factors can concentrate the effects of poverty; poor rural communities of color are particularly likely to face both racial and economic segregation. These challenges can also lead to areas of persistent poverty, which is particularly extreme for rural places: more than 85 percent of counties with high poverty (i.e., rates of 20 percent or higher) for at least thirty years are rural counties. Rural children are especially likely to grow up in poverty. In 2010, 64 percent of rural counties had high rates of child poverty, compared to 47 percent of urban, and high child poverty rates are increasing in rural areas. Poverty rates are also much higher for rural children of color than for rural White children.¹⁰

Rural America, then, is much more diverse and varied than is typically assumed. It is patterned by areas of prosperity and deep poverty—patterns that also tend to reinforce racial disparities. These demographics, economic trends, and inequalities are reflected in rural schools.

8 Cromartie, “Rural America at a glance”; Johnson and Lichter, “Rural depopulation”; Laughlin, Lynda, “Beyond the Farm: Rural industry workers in America,” 2016. Retrieved from: https://www.census.gov/newsroom/blogs/random-samplings/2016/12/beyond_the_farm_rur.html; Mather, Mark, and Beth Jarosz, “U.S. energy boom fuels population growth in many rural counties,” 2014. Retrieved from: <https://www.prb.org/us-oil-rich-counties/>

9 Cromartie, “Rural America at a glance”; Lichter, Daniel, Domenico Parisi, and Michael Taquino. “The geography of exclusion: Race, segregation, and concentrated poverty,” *Social Problems*, 2012.

10 Lavelley, Megan, “Out of the loop,” Center for Public Education, 2018; Lichter, Daniel, and Kenneth Johnson, “The changing spatial concentration of America’s rural poor population,” *Rural Sociology*, 2007; Lichter, Parisi, and Taquino, “The geography of exclusion”; Schaefer, Andrew, Marybeth Mattingly, and Kenneth Johnson. “Child poverty higher and more persistent in rural America,” Carsey School of Public Policy, 2016.

Nine million children attend rural schools; about half of whom come from families with low incomes

More than one quarter of U.S. public schools are rural, educating about 9 million students.¹¹ Nearly half of these rural students are eligible for free or reduced price lunch, and about a quarter are students of color. Nearly 4 percent of rural students are English Language Learners (ELL), though this varies widely state by state. This proportion is also increasing, mainly due to growth in the rural Hispanic school population, which expanded by 150 percent from 2000 to 2009. Rural schools and students face profound disparities in resources and outcomes; some of these disparities are relative to urban schools and students, while others emerge across the rural population itself.¹²

Rural schools, especially those serving poor communities and communities of color, face substantial resource inequities

Even though a quarter of schools are designated rural, only 17 percent of state education funds go to rural districts. Rural districts often face particular and costly challenges, including declining enrollments. With lower teacher salaries and fewer amenities, many rural districts also struggle to hire and retain teachers, especially in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields and ELL positions. Transportation is another enormous expense for many rural districts, and states often offer transportation subsidies, though these funds are highly subject to state budget shortfalls. State categorical funding may not be a useful source of funding for rural districts, as small sizes make it difficult to apply for grants or efficiently run programs, and federal Title I formulas, which use a complex “number weighting” system, can also disadvantage low-population rural places. There are a few federal and state programs to assist rural districts: for example, the federal Rural Education Achievement Program offers grants for small, rural districts, and Massachusetts recently passed legislation to provide additional funding for sparsely populated rural districts. Thus, the rural funding context is complex and varies from state to state. It also varies from district to district. A large part of education funds comes from local property taxes, creating large funding gaps between property-wealthy and property-poor locales. Property-poor rural locales, therefore, face particular resource inequities, which only exacerbate the challenges of hiring and retaining talented staff and supporting important academic, extracurricular, and social programs.¹³

These funding inequities mean more limited educational opportunities for many rural students. Rural students, for example, have more limited access to advanced coursework. The average rural school offers half as many advanced math classes as the average urban school, and while more than 90 percent of suburban and urban schools have at least one Advanced Placement course, only 73 percent of rural schools do.¹⁴

11 Showalter, Daniel, Robert Klein, Jerry Johnson, and Sara Hartman. “Why rural matters 2015-16: Understanding the changing landscape,” The Rural School and Community Trust, 2017.

12 Lavelley, “Out of the loop”; Showalter, Klein, Johnson, and Hartman. “Why rural matters.”

13 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, “FY19 rural school aid,” 2018; Player, Daniel, “The supply and demand for rural teachers,” Rural Opportunities Consortium of Idaho, 2015; Showalter et al., “Why rural matters”; Strange, Marty. “Finding fairness for rural students,” *Phi Delta Kappan*, 2014; U.S. Department of Education, “Rural Education Achievement Program,” 2004.

14 Lavelley, “Out of the loop”; Strange, “Finding fairness.”



Photo credit: @amyhilbrand via Twenty20

About 14 percent of rural students attend high-poverty schools—that is, a school where more than three-quarters of students are eligible for subsidized lunch. Rural students of color are particularly likely to face economic segregation: more than 42 percent of rural Native students, 36 percent of rural African American students, and 30 percent of rural Hispanic students attend high poverty schools, compared to only 7 percent of rural White students. High poverty schools tend to have higher teacher turnover, lower teacher salaries, less qualified and experienced teachers, less rigorous coursework, and lower quality facilities and curriculum. This kind of deep, concentrated poverty is also often associated with a greater need for additional resources to support social services, medical services, or more sustained parent outreach—opportunities that cash-strapped rural districts can find hard to fund.¹⁵

In general, rural schools are less racially segregated than urban: rural districts often encompass several small towns, offering opportunities for more diverse districts. However, about 15 percent of rural Black and Hispanic students still attend schools in which nearly all of the students are students of color; in addition, rural Native students face particularly high levels of racial segregation. In the South, private schools remain a key source of rural school segregation. Not only do segregated schools—whether predominantly students of color or mostly white students—fail to provide students with important critical thinking skills and the ability to communicate and develop relationships across lines of race, those with high concentrations of students of color are also associated with higher poverty rates and greater resource disparities.¹⁶

15 Lavelley, “Out of the loop”; Orfield, Gary, and Chungmei Lee. “Historic reversals, accelerating resegregation, and the need for new integration strategies,” *The Civil Rights Project*, 2007.

16 Clotfelter, Charles. “Private schools, segregation, and the Southern states,” *Peabody Journal of Education*, 2004; Logan, John, and Julia Burdick-Will, “School segregation and disparities in urban, suburban, and rural areas,” *The Annals of the American Academy*, 2017; Orfield, Gary, and Erica Frankenberg, “The last have become first: Rural and small town America lead the way on desegregation,” *The Civil Rights Project*, 2008; Orfield, Gary, John Kucsera, and Genevieve Siegel-Hawley, “E pluribus... separation: Deepening double segregation for more students,” *The Civil Rights Project*, 2012.

Policymakers often overlook rural schools

Rural schools are often overlooked in state and federal education policymaking. The recent choice movement offers a good example. Choice reforms assume a context with choices, yet the long distances and small populations of rural places often preclude a robust selection of options. Only 11 percent of charter schools are located in rural areas, compared to 56 percent in cities, and these rural charter schools also do not fare as well academically as their urban counterparts. Virtual charter schools, sometimes touted as a rural alternative, tend to have weaker outcomes, too, and many rural areas do not have the broadband access to support them. Similarly, recent federal accountability policies have included many provisions that proved unworkable for rural places, such as the No Child Left Behind Act's highly qualified teacher provision, which promoted a standard, context-less definition of "quality" and failed to consider multiple-subject teachers, and the School Improvement Grant program's turnaround models, which assumed a large pool of qualified teachers.¹⁷

One of the largest policy challenges facing rural districts is the closing of rural schools. The country has dropped from more than 270,000 schools in 1919 to less than 100,000 in 2010; the vast majority of those closed have been rural schools, often those serving poor communities and communities of color. Rural closures continue today. Financial pressures, declining enrollments, and low academic performance can lead state and district officials to close schools, and a wide variety of federal, state, and local policies currently incentivize or mandate closure. While closure can ultimately boost student achievement if students are sent to a higher performing school, they often end up at a similarly or lower performing school, and, for rural students, closures can mean long and dangerous bus rides, less extracurricular participation, and decreased parent engagement. There is little research examining the effects on surrounding communities, though some survey and interview data suggest it can close businesses and further outmigration.¹⁸

Rural schools show mixed—and racially disparate—outcomes

Despite these resource disparities and policy neglect, by many indicators, rural schools typically perform well. On average, rural scores on the National Assessment for Educational Progress are equal to or better than urban students' scores, and rural students also graduate from high school at higher rates than urban students. These general trends, however, mask disparities in outcomes. There is a persistent test score gap between rural White students and rural Hispanic and African American students, though this gap is smaller than exists in urban and suburban schools. There are also racial gaps in graduation rates. The overall rural graduation rate is about 87 percent, but it is only 77 percent for rural non-White students.¹⁹

Access to post-secondary education is a particular area of concern for rural students. Rural students do not go to college at the same rates as their urban and suburban counterparts. In 2015, for example, only 59 percent of rural students enrolled in a 2- or 4-year institution immediately after high school, while 67 percent of students

17 Eppley, Karen, "Rural schools and the Highly Qualified Teacher Provision of No Child Left Behind: A critical policy analysis," *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 2009; Lavelley, "Out of the loop"; Woodworth, James, et al. "Online charter school study," Center for Research on Education Outcomes, 2015; Rosenberg, Linda, Megan Davis Christianson, Megan Hague Angus, and Emily Rosenthal, "A focused look at rural schools receiving School Improvement Grants," National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, 2014.

18 Howley, Craig, Jerry Johnson, and Jennifer Petrie, "Consolidation of schools and districts: What the research says and what it means," National Education Policy Center, 2011; Tieken, Mara Casey, and Trevor Auldridge-Reveles, "Rethinking the school closure research: School closure as spatial injustice," *Review of Educational Research*, forthcoming.

19 Showalter et al., "Why rural matters."

from suburban schools and 62 percent from urban schools enrolled. Rural students are particularly underrepresented in four-year degree programs and at selective schools. These disparities relate, at least in part, to the lower socioeconomic background and lower parental education of rural students, both of which can present substantial barriers to enrollment. Rural areas are also “education deserts,” with fewer four-year options than more urban areas. And, while students’ educational aspirations are similar across race groups, their academic experiences are different, with African-American, Hispanic, and Native students less prepared for post-secondary education than White students.²⁰

Rural schools play many important roles in rural communities

By preparing youth for the responsibilities of work, leadership, and adulthood, rural schools have profound effects on surrounding communities and their futures. But, as one of the few institutions in many rural places, they also have positive effects on communities in other ways. For example, rural schools are often a community’s largest employer, and their presence can mean more economic activity for other local businesses, like banks, service stations, and grocery stores. They also offer a gathering place for children and adults, and their activities and events bring people together, build trust, and help establish shared concerns and goals. This reduces the risk of social isolation, to which rural spaces are vulnerable. In rural schools, traditions and values are communicated—and sometimes challenged—and schools help create a common identity, marking a group of individuals as a community. Through their elected school boards, rural schools offer a community a measure of political power. And rural schools can be an important force for racial integration and equity. They often pull together several small towns; in segregated contexts, this offers the opportunity for a new, more expansive, more diverse community. As institutions central to the economy, culture, and the politics of a rural place, they can serve as a source of influence and control for a community with little formal power.²¹

Rural schools, therefore, are vital institutions, both for rural children and rural communities. But they are typically overlooked, leading to ill-fitting policies and resource constraints. Also often overlooked is the unprecedented demographic change they now face, as immigration rises and communities of color grow. This expansion is crucial for keeping rural America growing and thriving. But if the racial and socioeconomic inequalities that already divide rural schools go unchecked, they will likely deepen, further dividing rural schools, harming rural children, and threatening rural communities’ economic, physical, social, and political wellbeing.

20 Byun, Soo-yong, Judith Meece, and Matthew Irvin, “Rural-nonrural disparities in postsecondary educational attainment revisited,” *American Educational Research Journal*, 2012; Hillman, Nicholas, “Geography of College Opportunity: The case of education deserts,” *American Educational Research Journal*, 2016; Irvin, Matthew, Soo-yong Byun, Judith Meece, Karla Reed, and Thomas Farmer, “School characteristics and experiences of African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Native American Youth in rural communities: Relation to educational aspirations,” *Peabody Journal of Education*, 2016; Koricich, Andrew, Xi Chen, and Rodney Hughes, “Understanding the effects of rurality and socioeconomic status on college attendance and institutional choice in the United States,” *The Review of Higher Education*, 2018; National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2016.

21 Tieken, Mara Casey. *Why rural schools matter*, University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Use principles of equity in support of rural education.

Fortunately, many rural community organizations and nonprofits are working to address disparities and support rural schools and communities. However, they face many of the same challenges of rural schools. Rural-serving organizations are often disregarded, as funders typically favor organizations serving larger populations, and these organizations can also be misunderstood by funders more familiar with urban contexts or who are making erroneous assumptions about rural populations.

Therefore, we offer the following recommendations to guide funders interested in advancing educational justice for rural children and communities. We conclude with examples of established organizations engaged in this work.

- *Listen to rural residents.* For centuries, rural communities have been subject to the change efforts of urban reformers. These efforts have sometimes furthered the economic and political exploitation of rural places, or they simply don't fit the context. Daunted by the slow pace of change or the (perhaps deserved) mistrust of rural residents, funders may also lose interest. Abandoned efforts only further skepticism and entrench inequities. Funders, therefore, should trust the experts—that is, rural residents themselves—and work with, not on, rural communities to foster change.
- *Put racial and economic equity at the center of the work.* The economic and political well-being of rural communities varies dramatically; White, wealthy rural communities tend to enjoy many more resources and much more power than poor and/or non-White rural communities. Even within particular rural locales, lines of race and class can shape the opportunities afforded to residents. History is replete with White wealthy individuals and groups—rural and urban—exploiting moments of change to maintain their power; school desegregation offers one instructive example, as it also led to white flight and the rise of between-district inequality. Therefore, it is crucial that grantmakers direct resources to the communities and residents that need them most. In addition, when working with organizations serving a wide variety of rural communities, make sure their leadership fully represents all constituents.
- *Support current rural equity efforts.* Grassroots organizations have been developing rural leadership and organizing for racial and socioeconomic justice for generations. Some of the most effective change movements—such as the civil rights movement and the farmworkers movement—were predominantly rural in nature. Their support of rural communities of color, immigrant communities, and tribal communities continues today, carried on by direct successors of these movements and also new organizations. Led by local rural residents, these organizations are best positioned to understand local needs and dynamics and devise innovative, community-supportive responses.

For centuries, rural communities have been subject to the change efforts of urban reformers. These efforts have sometimes furthered the economic and political exploitation of rural places, or they simply don't fit the context.

Some of the most effective change movements—such as the civil rights movement and the farmworkers movement—were predominantly rural in nature. Their support of rural communities of color, immigrant communities, and tribal communities continues today, carried on by direct successors of these movements and also new organizations.

- *Build rural power.* While advocacy and service efforts can sometimes meet important temporary needs, they often do little to change power dynamics and address structural inequalities, leaving rural inequities intact. But when designed in partnership with local collaborators, rural organizing, leadership, and educational programs can build local skills and lead to long-lasting structural change. These power-building efforts, especially when meeting a community-identified need, can dramatically revise the everyday economic, social, and political conditions facing poor rural communities and rural communities of color.

Many traditional indicators of success — events with large turnouts, extensive media coverage, large institutional networks, quick change—do not make sense for a rural context, where populations are smaller, distances are vast, inequalities are entrenched, and media institutions are few.

- *Redefine indicators of success.* Many traditional indicators of success—events with large turnouts, extensive media coverage, large institutional networks, quick change—do not make sense for a rural context, where populations are smaller, distances are vast, inequalities are entrenched, and media institutions are few. Using numbers to measure impact disadvantages rural organizations, leading many grantmakers to pass on or abandon this work. Consider other measures of success, such as depth or magnitude of change as reported by community leaders, the proportion of a community improved or engaged in the work, or testimony from intended beneficiaries. The trajectory for change might also be longer than in urban contexts, especially in locales with deep histories of racial and class oppression. Ensure that funding processes honor and reflect the entrenched nature of rural inequities.
- *Allow for local flexibility.* The context of rural communities, even those close to each other, can vary widely, due to different historic and current economic, social, political, and demographic conditions. Therefore, organizations that work across rural contexts—and the funders that support them—must be responsive to this. Overly rigid programmatic requirements, such as mandating a particular issue focus or a specific reform strategy, or requiring that grantees present at conferences that are costly and time-consuming to even get to can preclude local responsiveness and hamstring reform efforts. Giving leaders the latitude to adapt to local conditions will mitigate unintended consequences and foster the kind of context-specific work that can bring about broader change.

RURAL EDUCATION EQUITY-FOCUSED ORGANIZATIONS

- **Southern Echo:** a leadership development and training organization that builds accountable grassroots leadership in African-American communities in rural Mississippi. Echo takes an intergenerational approach to community organizing, and it supports local organizing groups across the Delta. Equitable education is a key focus.
- **Dolores Huerta Foundation:** an organization that recruits, trains, and empowers Latinx and immigrant parents in rural agricultural California communities to advocate for the rights of their children.
- **Arkansas Public Policy Panel:** supports organizing, coalition building, policy advocacy, and leadership development in Arkansas; K-12 education is a major focus.
- **Dream Imagine Gifts (DIG):** develops STEM opportunities for rural South Carolina youth and communities through education, mentorship, and community engagement. It runs afterschool and summer programs for youth and sponsors an annual STEM festival.
- **Rural Community Alliance:** organizes and empowers rural communities across Arkansas to advocate for educational equity, support economic development, and promote youth voice.
- **Generation Indigenous:** promotes dialogue and programs that organize Native youth and promote indigenous leadership. As the only predominantly rural demographic, Native communities are particularly overlooked by funders.²²
- **Valley Interfaith:** develops leadership to build relational power in the Rio Grande Valley; education funding and immigration reform are focus issues. An affiliate of the West/Southwest IAF, it organizes across racial, denominational, economic, and geographic boundaries.

22 Dewees, Sarah, and Benjamin Marks, "Twice invisible: Understanding rural Native America," 2017, Retrieved from: <https://www.usetinc.org/wp-content/uploads/bvenuti/WWS/2017/May%202017/May%208/Twice%20Invisible%20-%20Research%20Note.pdf>

SOCIAL JUSTICE FUNDER OPPORTUNITY BRIEFS

draw upon research, policy analysis and practitioner experience to identify promising grantmaking opportunities that aspire to create a fairer, more inclusive and more equitable society.

Mara Casey Tieken is an associate professor of education at Bates College in Lewiston, Maine. Her research focuses on racial and educational equity in rural schools and communities; her book *Why rural schools matter* (University of North Carolina Press, 2014) examines how rural schools define and sustain their surrounding communities.

The author would like to thank Lori Bezahler, president of the Hazen Foundation, for her feedback on an earlier draft of this brief. The author takes full responsibility for all views and opinions expressed here.

Brandeis

THE HELLER SCHOOL
FOR SOCIAL POLICY
AND MANAGEMENT
Sillerman Center
for the Advancement
of Philanthropy

The Sillerman Center at Brandeis University informs and advances social justice philanthropy through educational opportunities, publications and creative programming for grantmakers, philanthropy-related organizations and individual donors across the United States. To learn more about us, visit our website and Facebook page.

<http://sillermancenter.brandeis.edu>