District Leaders’ Concerns About Mental Health and Political Polarization in Schools

Selected Findings from the Fourth American School District Panel Survey

Policymakers had hoped that the 2021–2022 school year would be a chance to recover from coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic–related disruptions to schooling (U.S. Department of Education, undated). Instead, media reports of staff shortages, heated or even violent school board meetings, increased student misbehavior, low teacher and student attendance, and enrollment declines suggest increased—rather than decreased—problems during this third pandemic school year (St. George and Strauss, 2021; Kamenetz, 2021; Robertson, 2021; Belsha, 2021a; Hiruko, 2021; Jones, 2021; and Kamenetz, Turner, and Khurana, 2021). Even the unprecedentedly large allocation of federal funding intended to help districts recover from the pandemic has presented districts with its own challenges (Ujifusa, 2021).

To learn about the extent of these challenges, we surveyed 359 district and charter network leaders in the American School District Panel (ASDP) between October 25, 2021, and December 10, 2021. The ASDP is a partnership among the

Key Findings

- As of November 2021, district leaders’ top three concerns out of the 11 we listed were the mental health of students, teachers, and principals, respectively. Leaders’ concerns about student and staff mental health were more prevalent than concerns about student engagement, student discipline, student and teacher attendance, and declined enrollment.

- Roughly two to three times more leaders from urban districts, high-poverty districts, and districts serving mostly students of color expressed “major” concerns about declined enrollment and low student and teacher attendance compared with their counterparts.

- Three-quarters of district leaders said that political polarization about coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) safety or vaccines was interfering with their ability to educate students in 2021–2022. Four of every ten district leaders said the same about political polarization related to critical race theory.
subgroups that are statistically significant at the 5-percent level.

In this report, we summarize district leaders’ top concerns this school year (2021–2022) and the pressures of political polarization in public schools. In a companion report (Schwartz and Dilberti, forthcoming), we examine staff shortages this school year in detail, along with superintendents’ plans to stay in their positions. Additional details about our methods are included at the end of this report.

The Mental Health of Students and Staff Topped District Leaders’ Concerns

In November 2021, we asked district leaders about 11 widely reported problems, including increases in student disciplinary issues, declines in student enrollment, difficulty providing high-quality instruction during quarantines, and mental health, to examine how prevalent these problems are for...
districts nationally. (We asked about staff shortages separately and discuss these issues in a companion report [Schwartz and Diliberti, forthcoming].)

As shown in Figure 1, mental health concerns for both students and staff were at the top of district leaders’ lists of concerns. Ninety percent of district leaders expressed either “moderate” or “major” concern about students’ mental health this school year. And 87 and 84 percent of district leaders, respectively, reported the same levels of concern about teachers and principals. The mental health of students and staff were the only topics for which half or more of district leaders reported “major” concerns.

Although we did not ask district leaders why they are so concerned about students’ mental health this school year, recent research and media reports suggest that increased anxiety, suicide attempts, and emergency room visits among children; large declines in academic achievement; increases in students failing to show up for classes; and increased student disciplinary issues could be reasons for district leaders’ concerns (Dewan, 2021; Lewis and Kuhfeld, 2021; McNeel, 2021; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2021). As for district leaders’ prevalent concerns about staff mental health, reasons could include heightened rates of teacher and principal absences, work performance, degraded school climate, and potential attrition (Gewertz, 2021; Steiner and Woo, 2021).

Majorities of district leaders also expressed a considerable amount of concern about many of the other issues we listed. For example, 71 percent of district leaders reported “moderate” or “major” concern about providing high-quality instruction to quarantined students. Although the district leaders in our survey reported that few students were in quarantine on a typical school day when they took the survey in November 2021 (see Box 1), other research and media reports have pointed out districts’ limited plans to provide high-quality instruction to quarantined students, which comport with district leaders’ high levels of concern (Center on Reinventing Public Education, 2021; Schwartz, 2021).

Meanwhile, 61 percent of district leaders expressed “moderate” or “major” concern about low student engagement in remote learning, and 59 percent said the same about increased student discipline issues. A minority—but still a sizeable portion—of district leaders (45 percent) expressed similar levels of concern about low attendance from students and teachers alike, which we discuss in more detail in the next section.

Finally, 41 percent of district leaders reported “moderate” or “major” concern about enrollment

---

**BOX 1**

**How Many Students Were in COVID-19 Quarantine, as of November 2021?**

District leaders estimated that 6 percent of students, on average, were absent on a typical school day at the time they took the survey because of quarantines related to COVID-19. Three-quarters of district leaders reported that zero or else 1–5 percent of students were in quarantine on a typical day.

NOTES: This figure depicts response data from the following survey question: “Approximately what percentage of your district/CMO’s students were absent due to COVID-19 exposure or diagnosis on a typical day last week? Include students who could not attend in-person school as planned because of an exposure to someone with COVID-19 and students who themselves tested positive for COVID-19” \( (n = 300) \). Respondents were instructed to enter a percentage between 0 and 100. Respondents who said that they did not know are excluded from this figure. Responses were binned (i.e., sorted into categories according to the percentage of students absent because of quarantine) for this figure.
declines for reasons other than redshirting (i.e., families keeping a child who is age-eligible for preschool or kindergarten out of school for an extra year). District leaders’ concerns about enrollment declines comport with other research showing students leaving public schools for private and homeschooling sectors (Musaddiq et al., 2021).

In comparison, only 9 percent of district leaders had “moderate” or “major” concerns about enrollment declines in 2021–2022 specifically because of redshirting. This is a shift from last school year (2020–2021), when district leaders cited redshirting as the top reason for enrollment declines (Schwartz et al., 2021). District leaders’ reports of redshirting last school year are supported by federal data, which show that preschool and kindergarten enrollment in the 2020–2021 school year declined 13 percent below prepandemic levels (Mahnken, 2021). The decrease in district leaders’ concerns about redshirting from last school year to this one is also supported by preliminary enrollment numbers in some school districts, which show that kindergarten enrollments have rebounded (Belsha, 2021b; Bodkin, 2021).

## Low Attendance Among Students and Staff and Declined Enrollment Were More-Prevalent Concerns for Historically Marginalized Districts

In Figure 2, we show the percentage of district leaders in each of nine district subgroups who expressed...
been slightly larger among urban districts (Lafortune and Prunty, 2021). Note, however, that the consistency in these patterns might be driven to some extent by the subset of districts that are classified as urban, high-poverty, and serving mostly students of color (see Box 2).

More generally, these findings largely comport with those from a teacher survey we conducted in spring 2021, in which teachers in higher-poverty schools and those serving mostly students of color—the same types of schools that were most likely to be offering remote instruction for large portions of the 2020–2021 school year—reported more absenteeism and less student engagement, which was reflected in assignment completion and passing grades (Kaufman and Diliberti, 2021). District leaders’ responses to our November 2021 survey suggest that some of these same problems have persisted into this school year, with the caveat that these patterns also might reflect prepandemic differences.

Meanwhile, the orange box in Figure 2 shows that 42 percent of rural district leaders had “major” concerns about students in remote learning not being very engaged, compared with 21 percent of urban and 26 percent of suburban leaders. We hypothesize that, because fewer rural schools offered remote learning

**BOX 2**

**The Degree of Overlap Between Urban Districts, High-Poverty Districts, and Districts Serving Mostly Students of Color**

By definition, each district in our sample belongs to four of the nine district subgroups we examine in this report. Urban districts, high-poverty districts, and districts serving mostly students of color in particular have a high degree of overlap, as shown. For example, almost all urban districts in our sample serve mostly students of color, and many are also high-poverty districts. We therefore expect to see similar patterns for these types of districts because the same district leaders are often represented in two, if not all three, of these district categories.
In comparison, a smaller—but still substantial—43 percent of district leaders agreed or strongly agreed that “political polarization about critical race theory is interfering with our ability to educate students.”

After examining how leaders from different types of districts responded to these questions, we found the following three statistically significant differences (results not shown): First, 79 percent of leaders in majority-white districts agreed that political polarization about COVID-19 safety or vaccines was interfering with their ability to educate students, compared with 63 percent of leaders from majority–students of color districts. Second, fewer urban leaders (61 percent) than suburban and rural leaders (71 and 77 percent, respectively) agreed with the same statement. Third, 75 percent of leaders in low-poverty districts compared with 57 percent in high-poverty ones agreed that parent or community belief in misinformation about COVID-19 was interfering with the district’s ability to educate students.

Taken together, these differences suggest that more leaders in majority-white districts, nonurban districts, and low-poverty districts perceived political polarization about COVID-19 as a sufficiently large problem as to interfere with their schools’ ability to educate students. These patterns align with trends throughout the pandemic, such as lower parental perceptions of risk from COVID-19 in rural areas,
greater vaccine hesitancy among rural teachers and those in majority-white districts, and less support in rural areas and among white parents for COVID-19 safety practices in schools (Schwartz et al., 2021; Schwartz, Diliberti, and Grant, 2021).

**Districts Reported That Their Largest Barrier to Spending Emergency Federal COVID-19 Relief Funds Was a Shortage of Staff to Hire**

Districts have received an unprecedented amount of federal funds to spend over a four-year period to help recover from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and address some of the problems we discussed earlier. We asked district leaders what issues, if any, stood in the way of spending the federal Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief (ESSER) Fund to help students. From a list of 12 possible barriers, 77 percent of district leaders said that they experienced one or more of the barriers to spending their ESSER funds (the 12th, “other,” option is not displayed). Leaders across all nine district types tended to select the same types of barriers, indicating some degree of conformity in their experience using ESSER funds to help students.

The most common barrier by far, which 57 percent of district leaders selected, was a lack of staff to hire (see Figure 4). For every district subgroup, this barrier was about twice as common as the next-most prevalent barrier, which most districts indicated was the time required to procure goods and services. The least common barriers were

**FIGURE 4**

**Percentage of District Leaders Selecting Barriers to Using ESSER Funds to Help Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Locale</th>
<th>Poverty level</th>
<th>Student racial/ethnic composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All districts</td>
<td>Traditional public district</td>
<td>CMO</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortages of staff to hire</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time required to procure goods and services</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient number of school district staff to procure services</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Education Agency (SEA) requirements or approvals</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty about the best way to use the funds</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortages of services to purchase</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization among parents about how schools should operate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA has not allocated the funds to our district</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor contracts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization among school staff about how schools should operate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District board approvals or support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: This figure depicts response data from the following survey question: “What barriers is your district/CMO experiencing in using ESSER funds to help students, if any?” Respondents were instructed to “select all that apply” (n = 357). Numbers in bold indicate that the subgroup percentage of district leaders reporting that something is a barrier to spending ESSER funds is statistically significantly different (p < 0.05) from the balance of district leaders not in that subgroup who said the same.
investments in behavioral and mental health initiatives or counseling and mentoring (Jordan and DiMarco, 2022). Furthermore, in a federal survey of schools in September 2021 (the results of which should be interpreted with caution given low response rates), 86 percent reported encouraging staff to address student well-being, 46 percent said that they created or expanded a program for students’ social and emotional or mental well-being, 59 percent indicated offering professional development to train teachers to help, and 42 percent hired new staff related to SEL or mental health (Institute of Education Sciences, undated-b).

It is too early to say whether these student mental health efforts will be effective during the pandemic. However, prior research shows that SEL has positive effects on students’ social and emotional skills and their behavior; it also has positive effects on teachers’ emotional exhaustion and sense of personal accomplishment (Durlak et al., 2011; Oliveira et al., 2021; Taylor et al., 2017). Likewise, meta-analyses show positive effects of certain types of school-based mental health programs on adolescents, with more-limited, but also positive, evidence for treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms in younger school-age children as well (Feiss et al., 2019; Oliveira et al., 2021; Rolfsnes and Idsoe, 2011).

There is less research about the efficacy of ways in which to alleviate educators’ work stress and sense of burnout. Education research has shown that work stress and burnout can affect not only an individual’s mental ill health, work performance, and attrition—with its own attendant ripple effects—but also classroom climate and students’ well-being (Oliveira et al., 2021). A meta-analysis of interventions to reduce teacher burnout showed the largest effects from mindfulness interventions and larger effects from programs that lasted longer than a month compared with programs that lasted from 1 to 3 weeks (Iancu et al., 2018). A second meta-analysis that focused on SEL interventions found positive effects on teacher burnout, which the authors hypothesize could be because many of the sources of teachers’ stress relate to labor contracts, polarization among staff about how schools should operate, and district board approvals.

As shown in the orange boxes in Figure 4, about one-third of leaders from high-poverty districts indicated that State Education Agency requirements or approvals and insufficient staff in district central offices were barriers to using the funds, which was considerably higher than their counterparts in low-poverty districts. Leaders from majority-students of color districts were also more likely than their counterparts from majority-white districts to note a lack of central office staff to procure services as a barrier to spending ESSER funds.

**Implications**

Taken together, these results suggest that districts are confronting serious challenges in the 2021–2022 school year that might be getting in the way of student learning. Although some challenges, such as student and staff mental health, are nearly universal across districts, other challenges are more localized. Historically marginalized districts are confronting extra challenges this school year, such as getting students back in school and low teacher attendance, while a higher percentage of historically advantaged districts are encountering political polarization about COVID-19.

Above all, our survey results suggest that we need solutions for widespread mental health challenges in schools. Many districts are already taking steps to help meet students’ increased mental health needs. As we found back in June 2021, seven in ten districts planned to provide mental health programming in 2021–2022, including two in ten districts that planned to newly provide these services (Schwartz and Diliberti, 2021). In a review of districts’ pandemic-relief spending plans—which outline multiple investments—FutureEd found that one-third included various social and emotional learning (SEL) investments, such as curricula and training; one-third included hiring psychologists and mental health professionals; and one-third included investments in behavioral and mental health initiatives or counseling and mentoring (Jordan and DiMarco, 2022). Furthermore, in a federal survey of schools in September 2021 (the results of which should be interpreted with caution given low response rates), 86 percent reported encouraging staff to address student well-being, 46 percent said that they created or expanded a program for students’ social and emotional or mental well-being, 59 percent indicated offering professional development to train teachers to help, and 42 percent hired new staff related to SEL or mental health (Institute of Education Sciences, undated-b).

It is too early to say whether these student mental health efforts will be effective during the pandemic. However, prior research shows that SEL has positive effects on students’ social and emotional skills and their behavior; it also has positive effects on teachers’ emotional exhaustion and sense of personal accomplishment (Durlak et al., 2011; Oliveira et al., 2021; Taylor et al., 2017). Likewise, meta-analyses show positive effects of certain types of school-based mental health programs on adolescents, with more-limited, but also positive, evidence for treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms in younger school-age children as well (Feiss et al., 2019; Oliveira et al., 2021; Rolfsnes and Idsoe, 2011).

There is less research about the efficacy of ways in which to alleviate educators’ work stress and sense of burnout. Education research has shown that work stress and burnout can affect not only an individual’s mental ill health, work performance, and attrition—with its own attendant ripple effects—but also classroom climate and students’ well-being (Oliveira et al., 2021). A meta-analysis of interventions to reduce teacher burnout showed the largest effects from mindfulness interventions and larger effects from programs that lasted longer than a month compared with programs that lasted from 1 to 3 weeks (Iancu et al., 2018). A second meta-analysis that focused on SEL interventions found positive effects on teacher burnout, which the authors hypothesize could be because many of the sources of teachers’ stress relate to labor contracts, polarization among staff about how schools should operate, and district board approvals.
to the social and emotional demands of working with many students and of interpersonal conflicts (Oliveira et al., 2021).

Moving forward, districts should create contingency plans for next school year by mapping out scenarios that reflect staff shortages that may well continue into next school year (which we discuss in more detail in our companion report); investigating alternative staffing arrangements through new partnerships; anticipating the possibility of continued enrollment declines; and developing viable plans for remote and hybrid instruction if future variants or pandemics evolve to require it. Districts also should develop in-person school COVID-19 safety mitigation policies and communication plans that anticipate divided opinion among parents and staff.

Note
1 Invitations were sent to district superintendents (or their previously specified designee) who could complete the survey themselves or designate another leader (or leaders) to complete the survey on behalf of their district. Most surveys (83 percent) were completed by the district’s superintendent, while 4 percent were completed by an assistant or associate superintendent, 8 percent were completed by the district’s research director, and the remaining 5 percent were completed by personnel with other job titles.
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How This Analysis Was Conducted and Limitations

RAND Corporation researchers fielded the fourth survey of the ASDP from October 25, 2021, through December 10, 2021. This report uses survey responses from 359 district leaders. Responses reflect district leaders’ perceptions, which might or might not align with districts’ actual experiences. Also, respondents might not consistently interpret such terms on the survey as “major,” “moderate,” “low attendance,” or “political polarization,” which might affect how they complete survey items.

Researchers randomly sampled traditional public school districts and CMOs to invite them to enroll in the ASDP. All enrolled districts were invited to complete this survey. Of the 987 districts and CMOs that have enrolled in the ASDP between fall 2020 and fall 2021, 359 participated in this survey.

Survey responses have been weighted to be representative of the national population of public school districts, not the national population of public school students. Students are not evenly distributed across school districts. Roughly 30 percent of the country’s 50 million public school students are enrolled in urban districts (National Center for Education Statistics, undated-a), and the country’s 120 largest school districts—many of which are urban—alone account for roughly 20 percent of all student enrollments (National Center for Education Statistics, undated-b). Among the population of 13,000 school districts in the United States, only 9 percent are urban, while 25 percent are suburban and 66 percent are rural (Grant et al., 2022). In our sample, urban districts have an average enrollment size of 33,400 students, while rural districts have an average enrollment of 1,700 students. Thus, although rural district leaders represent a majority of school districts, they do not represent a majority of public school students. Accompanying technical documentation (Grant et al., 2022) provides more information about survey methodology and weighting procedures.

Because districts’ experiences vary, we examined differences in district leaders’ responses by district characteristics. We obtained the data on district characteristics by linking survey data files to the 2019–2020 Common Core of Data issued by the National Center for Education Statistics. We analyzed the following four categories, which yield nine subgroups:

1. district type (traditional public school district versus CMO)\(^a\)
2. locale (urban, suburban, and rural)\(^b\)
3. student racial and ethnic composition (we categorize districts in which more than half of students are Black, Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, or of two or more races as majority students of color, with the remaining districts categorized as majority white)\(^c\)
4. district poverty level (districts in which half or more of students qualify for a free or reduced-price meal are categorized as high-poverty, whereas the remainder are categorized as low-poverty)\(^c\)

It is important to keep in mind that each district in the survey belongs to four of the nine subgroups—e.g., a single school district that is a traditional public school district, suburban, low-poverty, and enrolls a majority of students of color. Thus, patterns observed across locale, poverty status, and student racial/ethnic composition might be driven by the same set of districts that share multiple characteristics.

We conducted significance testing to assess whether subgroups were statistically different at the \(p < 0.05\) level. Specifically, we tested whether the percentage of district leaders in one subgroup reporting a response was statistically different from the balance of district leaders who took the survey who were not in that subgroup who said the same (e.g., leaders of urban districts versus other respondents who did not lead an urban district). Because of the exploratory nature of this study, we did not apply multiple hypothesis test corrections.

In this report, we describe only those differences among district subgroups that are statistically significant at the 5-percent level, unless otherwise noted. To see the full set of results by district subgroups, visit our Interactive Survey Results Tool at www.americanschooldistrictpanel.org/survey-results.

---

\(^a\) Note that all 26 CMOs in our sample are members of the Charter School Growth Fund (an organization that funds charter school expansion) and, therefore, are likely not representative of all CMOs nationally.

\(^b\) Our locale definition aligns with the four-category locale definition used by the National Center for Education Statistics, with the exception that we collapsed the districts located in towns into the rural category for sample size reasons.

\(^c\) We also examined differences in district leaders’ responses by district size. We observed similar patterns by district size and locale (urban, suburban, and rural). Therefore, we present only differences by locale to avoid repetition.
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