

**Fordham University Graduate School of Education
Division of Educational Leadership, Administration, & Policy (ELAP)**

October 19, 2009

ASGE 7430—

**POLITICAL FACTORS IN EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATION:**

Understanding and Using Politics to Improve Our Schools

Executive Leadership-XIV

Dr. Bruce S. Cooper

Fall 2009



Dr. Bruce S. Cooper
Bscooperph@aol.com
TEL: 212-636-6441 or 212-875-9371
Lincoln Center Campus
Fall 2009

113 W. 60th St.
NY, NY 10023
Room 1119G
Fax: 212-636-7875

Course Introduction

Schools are political institutions, governed, regulated and influence by the federal, state, and local environment in which they live. Leaders, in public and private education, are thus “political animals,” working to do their jobs within highly political settings. To lead effectively, and to understand the political nature of schools, we need to answer three related questions.

First, what is the *political history* of particular educational laws, policies, and programs?

Second, what *political theories* inform these laws, regulation, programs, and policies?

Three, how can we as educational leaders and observers operate effectively as political leaders in our own schools and systems (the *personal micro-politics* of leadership)?

This course, based on 35 years of research on the politics of education, has four related goals:

1. To understand how politics is used in transforming social values and public resources into public policy and education.
2. To analyze the roles of the Federal, State, and Local governments (courts, legislatures, executives) in making and changing school policies and regulations.
3. To place school leaders (principals, assistant principals, central office staff, and superintendents) in an advantageous position to use their own political skills (the micro-politics of education for the benefit of students and communities).
4. To relate the work of the political process to the policies and outcomes of education.

Monty Python’s Apology . . .

We would like to apologize for the way in which politicians are represented in this program. It was never our intention to imply that politicians are weak-kneed, political time-servers who are more concerned with their personal vendettas and private power struggles than the problems of government, nor to suggest at any point that they sacrifice their credibility by denying free debate on vital matters in the mistaken impression that party unity comes before the well-being of the people they supposedly represent, nor to imply at any stage that they are squabbling little toadies without an ounce of concern for the vital social problems of today.

Nor indeed do we intend that our viewers should consider them as crabby

ulcerous little self-seeking vermin with furry legs and an excessive addiction to alcohol and certain explicit sexual practices, which some people might find offensive. We are sorry if this impression has come across.

(Monty Python's Flying Circus)

Course Rationale

- I. Educational leaders need to develop conceptual knowledge and skills in analyzing, exploring, thinking about, and acting on the societal and organizational forces that influence educational policy and decision making at all levels of the educational system, as well as within different organizational settings.
- II. Effective leaders should be able to analyze, synthesize and apply research and theory derived from the political and social sciences, educational politics and policy-making literature, and ones own experiential background to problems associated with positions they either currently occupy or aspire to hold.
- III. By combining theoretical and research contributions with personal resources, experiences, and problem solving capacities of students enrolled in the class, each class participant will increase his/her capability to deal with uncertainty, instability, uniqueness and value conflicts inherent in problem solving situations.

Course Objectives: On completion of this course, each student should:

1. Be familiar with perspectives on politics and governance from political science, the evolution of the politics of the education field, and major conflicting social values of American society that form the basis of the politics of education.
2. Be able to use alternative conceptual frameworks and theories, i.e., political systems, conflict and power, etc., in explaining political behavior in educational settings.
3. Know key actors and agencies and what they do to translate demands and resources into policies and decisions affecting American education.
4. Understand the process by which policies, decisions and actions are made and implemented in educational institutions at school and school district, state, and federal governmental levels, and the differences between political and policy research.
5. Be able to apply political frameworks and theories to your own work setting and institutional environment.

6. Be able to apply political frameworks and theories to evaluate policy issues.

Course Content Focus and Overview:

I . The focus of the course is on:

a--The Politics of Education in local, state, and federal educational agencies and institutions.

b--Educational agencies and institutions as political systems or subsystems of larger political systems affecting American education (while there is a K-16 orientation to our study of educational politics and policy, the emphasis in this course is on schools, districts, and educational policy agencies within local, state, and federal bureaucracies, interest groups, governmental institutions).

I. The content of the course includes:

- a. Politics: What does it mean? How is it analyzed? Definitions and frameworks, as well as approaches to political problems/issue analysis.
- b. Major Concepts:
 - Political cultures within political systems: How deep rooted values dominate agendas in different regions, states, and institutions and influence the demands and supports processed by political systems.
 - Power, influence, and control: rational vs. irrational understandings of “who gets what, when, and how” (Laswell, 1936) when dealing with a zero-sum (finite resources unequally distributed) game of politics.
 - Conflict and political culture: pluralistic values of excellence, equity, choices, and efficiency with moralistic, individualistic and traditionalistic cultures; competition over priorities, policies and potential outcomes; system stress, uncertainty, stability, turbulence.
 - Interest groups, community participation and coalitions: politics in action within and outside and educational organization; strategies and tactics of negotiating agreements.
 - Micropolitics: analysis of departments, divisions, schools, school districts, universities, governing boards and committees.
 - Macro-politics: analysis of educational reform since the 1980s; current events pertinent to educational politics; socio-political context of educational policy making.
- c. Research perspectives: Different schools of thought place different emphases on the constructs of structure, culture and rationality. How do the different ontological and epistemological foundations of various research schools yield different insights into the problems of educational politics?

Teaching/ Learning Strategies: This course relies heavily on student participation. It is problem-based, and inquiry oriented. While learning in this course will take place as a result of lectures, guest speakers, readings, and concentrated study by individual students within the course, a major teaching/ learning strategy calls for small group discussions, individual and group presentations (spontaneous and planned), class discussion, role

playing exercises, debates, and participating in an intensive problem based learning exercises. Students are expected to develop skill in applying theoretical constructs to real problems, issues, and situations.

Required Reading

Cooper, Bruce S., Cibulka, James, & Fusarelli (2008). *Handbook on Education Politics and Policy*. Mahway, NJ: Routledge.

Other Readings

Wirt, F. M. & Kirst, M. W. (2009). *The political dynamics of education* (3rd ed.). Richmond, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Conley, D. T. (2003). *Who govern our schools? Changing roles and responsibilities*. New York: Teachers College. (Optional).

Course Assignments:

1. Oral Presentations (10 pts. each = 20 pts.): Each student will make two presentations, one on her/his short paper (below), describing a theory and how it could be used in leadership and school reform; and a second presentation on two chapters from the Cooper, Cibulka, & Fusarelli *Handbook* (pick 2 chapters that relate).

2. Short Paper (35 pts.): Pick a Political Theory: This 5 to 8 pp. paper is an analysis of a political theory applicable to education; summarize the theory, perhaps starting with a chapter from the Cooper, Cibulka & Fusarelli *Handbook*, or the Wirt and Kirst book, drawn from a chapter, as selected, and from readings on that theory (see the Lindbloom paper as an example). Be prepared during Day 2 and thereafter to present a synopsis of the short paper, concentrating on the theory and its possible uses in the course. Sign up below; extra credit given to any June 3rd presenters!

2. Long Group Paper (45 pts.): The course has several key themes that are drawn from our study of the politics of education reform and leadership. Work together to produce a 12-15 pp. paper with an Introduction, Statement of the Problem, Theories that Apply, and Usefulness (of the process in improving the skills and acumen of school leaders), dealing with one of the political scenarios presented below. Join a group and elect a leader... and work on the paper together, dividing the work and writing!

Suggested long-paper themes for reading and analysis:

TEAM 1: Prayer at West Side High School Graduation: Analyze a case of the Patersons, a highly religious family, that wants the graduates of West Side High School to say the Lord’s Prayer and sing several Christian hymns at graduation in June, 2008. You are assigned by the School Board and Superintendent, to check the laws and policies on this; to tie this into the 1st Amendment guaranteeing “freedom of religion.” What other policies apply? What else has been written on this? (I can put you in touch with several lawyers who are expert on school prayer cases.) What political approach would you use to handle this “problem” and make concrete suggestions and role plays to figure this out. Feel free to elaborate on the situation and best ways to handle the political fall-out from the situation. Your paper should be 12 to 15 pages, double-spaced.

Sign-Ups _____, _____, _____

TEAM 2: Handling a Tough Case of Teacher Incompetence and Union Militancy: Analyze the unionization laws and policies (see the Taylor Law etc.) as it applies to handling an incompetent teacher, who has united the parents of 3rd and 4th graders who have either had Ms/Mr. Robertson before or who do NOT want to get her next year. The principal is desperate and has called the School Board and Superintendent. However, the president of the Appleton Teachers Associations (AFT), Ms/Mr. Smuthers, is also a teacher in that school and a friend of Ms/Mr. Robertson, and is threatening to go on strike. What research and politics, governance and policy apply to the “rights of teachers” and the responsibilities of school boards to protect students from incompetent teachers, particularly in wake of No Child Left Behind. Fill in the case, talk about the micro-politics of labor relations, and propose and role play a solution. Your paper should be 12-15 pp. long, relating the case to the research and theory of labor relations and personnel policy-making.

Sign-Ups _____, _____, _____

TEAM 3: Effects of Intra-District Transfers under No Child Left Behind. Your team faces the problem of being at a fairly-high achieving George Washington Elementary School, which is now receiving transfers “out” of three nearby elementary schools that are “failing to make Adequate Yearly Progress” (AYP). Not only are these children crowding your school, GW Elementary, but the students are ill prepared and are disrupting the classes which are already full. Write a 12-15 pp. paper that analyzes the NCLB and the AYP requirements, the history of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), which is the basic law that pre-dates NCLB. What were the purposes of NCLB, and how these laws affecting your and other schools? What would you advise the President of the US and

your Senators and Representatives be done? How might NCLB actually level all schools DOWN by abandoning the weak schools and over-loading and adversely affecting the performing schools like George Washington Elementary?

Sign-Ups _____, _____, _____

TEAM 4: Handling a Growing Number of Parents Who are Suing their Districts to Get their Special Needs Children Transferred to Very Expensive Private Schools at Public Expense: More and more, families are abandoning public schools at public expense, suing the districts to receive public money to pay tuition at very expensive special education schools. Judges are almost always ruling on the side of the parents, when they state that the special education programs in the district are failing and inadequate and that the cost of this out-sourcing is costing millions of dollars and taking money away from these programs. Look at the development of PL 94-142 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act; the laws and regulations, and how these parents are acting. Role-play a meeting between the family, the Swaringers, and the district special education leadership, around trying to keep the child “in the system versus the parents asserting failure of the in-district program and the need to leave. Try to find a case study (I have contacts). Might be a dissertation for someone, too. Write a 12-15 pp. group paper on the topic, looking at the politics of special education in the US.

Sign-Ups _____, _____, _____

Team 5: Politics of a Failing Superintendent Who Must be Replaced: Micro-politics looks at the culture and personality of the setting, acknowledging that the life in schools is highly engaging and political. And what could be more political than the firing and hiring of a local school superintendent, particularly now with a shortage of good candidates and a nearly impossible job to fill. This paper should look at a case of real superintendent who was fired and replaced, or make up a case. A new school board is elected, reflecting new values in the community; this board wants their own chief executive and votes to remove the current superintendent and is working to find another. What does the research say about superintendents? Their work and lives? And what are the politics of replacing a superintendent? Put on a srole play of an interview with a new superintendent, who’s not the first choice of everyone. Read Joseph and Jo Blasé on micro-politics and relate the theory to the case. The final paper should be 12-15 pp. that looks at the case of replacing a superintendent, the politics involved, and how this can be improved.

Sign-Ups _____, _____, _____

Class Attendance and Discussion: important and a source of 10 pts.

Schedule for Fall Session 2009

Class 1: Oct. 30th, 2009, Friday 4:00-8:00 PM. Lincoln Center

Introduction of Students and Overview of the Course.

TOPIC ONE: The Political Landscape: Federal to State to Local to School/Community Control over Education in US from 1863 to Present.

How the 1st major educational legislation got passed: Interest Group Politics at Work; read David Bloomfield’s paper on Mayor Blumberg. Guest lecturer, Dr. Terry Orr, TC.

Key terms in the field: POLITICS, GOVERNANCE, TURBULENT ENVIRONMENTS, POWER, POLICY, AND SYSTEMS THEORY OF POLITICS.

Read: Attached article on the role of the mayor in NYC politics, by David Bloomfield.

Class 2 Nov. 6th, Friday: 4:00-8:00

Concepts and Historical Perspectives:

READING: Pick 3 chapters from the *Handbook*, Section 1. Read Lindbloom handout.

Write one or two short paragraphs on each chapter, to get the gist of it, to be handed in.

Who ever said that education was “apolitical”? Where did this myth come from and why is so false? Frameworks? Get together in groups to start working on the final group papers.

Presentations of Short Paper ideas on theory from the readings?

_____, _____

****Team Meetings.**

Class 3: Nov. 13th, Friday: 4:00 PM to 9:00 PM

LOCAL POLITICS OF EDUCATION

Read: Chapters in Cooper et al. *Handbook*.

Presenters of Short Paper theory and concepts from Reading:

_____, _____, _____

Basic Values, Access to Political Influence (elections, appointments), School boards.
Meet in your groups to plan the final paper and presentation.

Team Meetings.

Class 5: Nov. 20th, Friday--4:00-8:00 PM.

**Putting the Politics together with the Government and
Governance in the Nation and States**

Read: Section of Cooper et al. *Handbook*.

Discuss models of federalism: layers of government and the rising role of the State (NY, NJ) in controlling educational standards, curriculum, testing. What's the role of the courts in the new politics of education?

****** Short Paper Draft is due: Nov. 20th.**

****Team Meetings**

Presentation of Short Paper on Theory and concepts from the Reading:

_____, _____, _____, _____

Nov. 27th: No Class for Thanksgiving.

Class 6:

**Class 6: Dec. 4th, Friday:
4:-8:00 PM. Current Controversies**

Listing the major controversies in education: Take a poll of the class, so please answer the following questions for June 18th. What is the role of the New Right in education?

In rank order, please ask a colleague or two at your school or work to list the four major political issues in schools:

#1: Top Issue/Controversy Today: _____

#2: Next Most Critical Issue/Controversy _____

#3 Next _____

#4: Next _____

Read: Cooper et al. *Handbook*.

Be prepared to present our short paper, one or two of the Group Paper Presentations, and several of the final Short Papers:

Team Meetings.

_____, _____, _____

Draft-in-progress of Group Paper is due. Friday, Dec. 11th Happy Chanukah (first candle tonight.)

Class #7: December 11th, Friday

Micro-politics of Education

Assignment: Bring in two examples of politics in your school or setting, one which was handled correctly with engagement, clear information, and a strong outcomes; and one that was botched and unclear information, misleading leadership, and bad outcomes (lost someone's job) were seen. Relate to a theory of leadership and political factors from the course. **Read:**

Class 8th: December 18th, Friday 4:30-8:30 PM:

FUTURE POLITICS OF EDUCATION:

Where are we going? Why?

Joint Class with Dr. Lew Smith

Presentation of the role-play from the Group Papers. And present the results from your final papers: PowerPoint is encouraged and available.

Dr. Smith's class will be involved in responding and asking questions at the presentations.

Final Group Papers and Revision of Short Papers due today.

***Bibliography on the
Politics of Education***

Anyon, J. (1997). *Ghetto schooling: A political economy of urban educational reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Apple, M. W. (1996). *Cultural politics and education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Apple, M. W. (1993). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. New York: Routledge.c

Ball, S. J. (1994). *Education reform: A critical and post-structural approach*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bauman, P. C. (1996). *Governing public education: Public sector reform or privatization*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Berube, M. R., & Gittell, M. (1969). *Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Bondanella, P., & Musa, M. (1979). (Eds.). (Trans.). *The portable Machiavelli*. New York: Penguin Books.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.

Brantlinger, E. (1993). *The politics of social class in secondary school*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Brunner, C. C. (Ed.). (1999). *Sacred dreams: Women and the superintendency*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bryk, A. S., Lee, V. E., & Holland, P. B. (1993). *Catholic schools and the common good*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cibulka, J. G., Reed, R. J., & Wong, K. K. (1992). (Eds.). *The politics of urban education in the United States*. London: Falmer Press.

Cooper, B. S., & Randall, E. V. (1999). (Eds.). *Accuracy or advocacy: The politics of research in education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Cooper, B.S., Fusarelli, L.D. & Randall, E. V. (2005). *Better policies, better schools. Theories and applications*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Cooper, B.S. & Bloomfield, D.R. (1998). The new politics of information in education: Five dimensions of the change from district-level to school-site financial analysis. In William Lowe Boyd (Ed.), *Increasing school allocations and efficiency*. Greenwich, CT: Greenwood Press.

Cooper, B.S. (1992). Public choice perspectives in education," In *The politics of urban education in the United States*. James G. Cibola, Rodney J. Reed, and Kenneth J. Wong (eds). (Pp. 67-85). New York: Flamer Press and the Politics of Education Association, 1992.

Cousin, A. J. (1999). *Market education: The unknown history*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Crowson, R. L., Boyd, W. L., & Mahoney, H. B. (Eds.). (1996). *The politics of education and the new institutionalism*. Washington, DC: Flamer Press.

Danzberger, J. P., Kirst, M. W., & Usdan, M. D. (1992). *Governing public schools: New times, new requirements*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Fantini, M., Gittell, M., & Magat, R. (1970). *Community control and the urban school*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Finn, C. E., Jr. (1991). *We must take charge: Our schools and our future*. New York: The Free Press.

Flaxman, E., & Passow, A. H. (Eds.). (1995). *Changing populations/changing schools*. 94th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fuller, B., & Elmore, R. F. (1996). (Eds.). *Who chooses? Who loses? Culture, institutions, and the unequal effects of school choice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fusarelli, L. D. (2003). *The political dynamics of school choice: Negotiating contested terrain*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hassel, B. C. (1999). *The charter school challenge: Avoiding the pitfalls, fulfilling the promise*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Henig, J. R., Hula, R. C., Orr, M., & Pedescleaux, D. S. (1999). *The color of school reform*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hess, F. M. (1999). *Spinning wheels: The politics of urban school reform*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Hess, G. A. (1991). *School restructuring, Chicago style*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Hess, G. A. (1995). *Restructuring urban schools: A Chicago perspective*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Jackson, B. L. (1996). *Balancing act: The political role of the urban superintendent*. Washington, DC: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies.

Johnson, S. M. (1996). *Leading to change: The challenge of the new superintendency*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Katz, M. B. (1971). *Class, bureaucracy, and schools: The illusion of educational change in America*. New York: Praeger.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Macpherson, R. J. S. (Ed.). (1998). *The politics of accountability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Marshall, C. (Ed.). (1993). *The new politics of race and gender*. London: Falmer Press.

Mirel, J. (1993). *The rise and fall of an urban school system: Detroit 1907-1981*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Nathan, J. (1996). *Charter schools: Creating hope and opportunity for American education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1991). *A political sociology of educational reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ravitch, D. (1983). *The troubled crusade: American education 1945-1980*. New York: Basic Books.

Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left back: A century of failed school reforms*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ravitch, D. (2000). *The great school wars*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Redman, E. (). *The dance of legislation*.

Rich, W. C. (1996). *Black mayors and school politics: The failure of reform in Detroit, Gary, and Newark*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Rogers, D. (1968). *110 Livingston Street: Politics and bureaucracy in the New York City school system*. New York: Random House.

Rogers, D., & Chung, N. H. (1983). *110 Livingston Street revisited: Decentralization in action*. New York: New York University Press.

Sarason, S. B. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schrag, P. (1967). *Village school downtown: Boston schools, Boston politics*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Scribner, J. D. (Ed.). (1977). *The politics of education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Scribner, J. D., & Layton, D. H. (Eds.). (1995). *The study of educational politics*. London: Falmer Press.

Shakeshaft, C. (1989). *Women in educational administration*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Smrekar, C., & Goldring, E. (1999). *School choice in urban America: Magnet schools and the pursuit of equity*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Stone, C. N., Henig, J. R., Jones, B. D., & Pierrannunzi, C. (2001). *Building civic capacity*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

Sugrue, T. J. (1996). *The origins of the urban crisis: Race and inequality in postwar Detroit*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Taylor, S., Rizvi, F., Lingard, B., & Henry, M. (1997). *Educational policy and the politics of change*. London: Routledge.

Tyack, D. B. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D. B., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D. B., & Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820-1980*. New York: Basic Books.

Wirt, F. M., & Kirst, M. W. (2001). *The political dynamics of American education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

*For the past several years, and continuing to the present, the Politics of Education Association has published a special Politics of Education Yearbook in the January/March issue of the journal *Educational Policy*. Interested students should consult these annual issues – each of which focuses on a particular issue in the politics of education. The issue presents the latest advances in research on the politics of education. Recent topics include:

- The politics of accountability (1998)
- The politics of research (1999)
- The politics of teacher preparation reform (2000)
- Interest groups in U.S. education (2001)
- The politics of elections and education (2002)
- The politics of higher education (2003)

First Reading:

HIGH SCHOOL REFORM: THE DOWNSIDE OF SCALING-UP

By David C. Bloomfield

© David C. Bloomfield. All rights reserved. May not be forwarded, reproduced, copied or otherwise duplicated, reprinted, or appropriated in whole or in part in any manner or by any means without express written permission of the author. Article is completely embargoed until published. Forthcoming in the *PEA Bulletin*, 2005.

The move to create smaller high schools is in full swing across the nation. Yet, it's not always so easy to accomplish, as the case of New York City explains. For, in scaling-up small high schools, New York City Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg is betting his re-election hopes in part on a successful transition away from large comprehensive high schools. The good news is that small schools are getting their first large-scale test as a way out of urban high school failure. The bad news is that Bloomberg's implementation strategy seems to be doing more harm than good for the vast majority of city students attending large high schools and, perhaps, creating a reaction that will give small schools a bad name despite their promise.

As the National Governors Association and others call for widespread high school reform, New York's is a cautionary tale of scaling-up without adequate planning and lack of focus on systemic consequences. When the state legislature established mayoral control of the city's public schools in 2001, Bloomberg explicitly connected his re-election efforts to education reform. In a series of bold moves, he announced a radical reorganization of the system's administrative structure, an end to social promotion in elementary and middle schools, a unified curriculum policy, and the restructuring of failing large high schools into new themed mini-schools. No question exists that a new high school strategy was needed with graduation rates in many schools under 50% and only 16% of students graduating in 4 years with a high-standard New York State Regents diploma.

THE CASE FOR SMALL SCHOOLS

The literature on small schools is positive. In addition to treatises by movement founders like TheodoreSizerⁱ and Deborah Meierⁱⁱ, a preliminary body of research supports the effectiveness of small learning communities in improving student engagement, positive student-teacher interaction, increased time on task, and high teacher morale.³ Graduation rates also appear to gain.⁴ It is possible that these effects are the result of generally smaller class size in small schools⁵ but, if small schools accomplish this task, there is reason to support methodical transition of large failing schools to smaller entities. (Of course, transition from any failing environment to one with more promise makes sense, whether the new school is large or small.)

With grants in excess of \$100 million from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Bloomberg and his hand picked Schools Chancellor, Joel Klein, have embarked on an ambitious mission to open over 150 new high schools over 5 years. Many of these schools are being carved out of existing comprehensive schools with

enrollments in excess of 3,000 students. To accomplish this, the large school is eliminated (with the happy collateral benefit of end-running designation of failure under No Child Left Behind) and replaced by up to 7 new small schools within the same building (which re-starts the NCLB clock for each).

SYSTEMIC IMPACTS

But while this early literature is largely positive, it may not be predictive of the scaled-up Bloomberg version. Mini-schools in larger buildings have notoriously difficult relations with other programs in the same facility.⁶ Pioneers often succeed through passion, vision, and Herculean drive that successors lack. Able, self-nominated principals were available when small schools were a rarity but the national principal shortage will have a major impact as Bloomberg seeks to open dozens of schools even before leadership is identified. Accountability for over 100 new schools further strains administrative staff and depletes the ranks of school-based supervisors. Already observers are noting signs of trouble, including staff turnover, inexperienced leadership, failure to address student learning needs, and security issues. In the end, the sheer magnitude of Bloomberg's commitment to small schools without an adequate research base seems a huge short-term political bet (with students as the ante) on a promising yet untested reform.

Even these arguments over the effectiveness of small schools do not tell the whole story. Like a 3-card monte player in pre-Disney Times Square, Bloomberg's re-election spiel only draws attention to small schools, creating a favorable impression of innovation. But a look at his other cards shows a significant downside. By partially emptying large schools and transferring thousands of displaced students -- often the most at-risk -- to other, already overcrowded schools, Bloomberg has harmed more students than he's helped.

Overcrowding

The system-wide impact is not on the side of reform. The multiplier created by reducing enrollment and establishing small schools in a dozen or more buildings impacts deleteriously on tens of thousands of the system's students. When a large, failing high school is restructured and total building enrollment is reduced, the "extra" students numbering as many as 1,000 are left to transfer to other large schools of 3,000 or more. This adds to already severe overcrowding in the receiving schools. When Prospect Heights High School in Brooklyn was emptied, enrollment plunged from 1,748 in 2001 to 791 in 2003-04. Similar stories occurred at Roosevelt and Taft High Schools in the Bronx, Bushwick and Erasmus Hall High Schools in Brooklyn, and George Washington and Seward Park High Schools in Manhattan. According to the New York Times, "In the last two years [the period of Bloomberg's small school initiative], enrollment has soared at big schools like Samuel J. Tilden in Brooklyn, up 22 percent; Norman Thomas in Manhattan, up 26 percent; and DeWitt Clinton in the Bronx, up 21 percent, while high school enrollment citywide has grown only slightly."⁷

The effect on remaining large high schools that receive most of these students has been disastrous. Lehman High School in the Bronx went from 3,700 students in 2003 to 4,205 in 2004, and is projected to increase to 4,601 in 2005 with an additional 300

students in a mini-school within the building. Students at Lehman with I.E.P.s increased 50% between 2003 and 2004 because of the system's failure to include these students proportionately in the new schools.

Even older small high schools created by previous Chancellors have suffered. A principal of one stated that these schools had seen a sizable increase in enrollment, especially among students with learning disabilities who have not found places in the restructured schools. Many new students arriving as a result of other schools' closure have not acculturated to the older small schools, leading to deterioration in school climate and challenges to maintaining former attendance and graduation rates.

Safety

According to data supplied by the city teachers union, because of nearby school reorganizations Walton High School in the Bronx increased its enrollment by 439 last year and the number of violent incidents increased by 125% over the previous year. At Midwood, a well-regarded high school in Brooklyn, enrollment increased by 260 and reported incidents increased 123%. Manhattan's prestige A. Phillip Randolph High School witnessed a tripling of suspensions this school year, 117 through January, as new students from restructured high schools streamed into the building, leading to severe overcrowding.

While it is surprisingly difficult to link a single school closing to a corresponding increase at a single other school (factors of student mobility, high school admissions practices, and multiple school reorganizations cloud the data), there is no doubt that severe overcrowding of large high schools and older small schools has occurred with little attention from the Chancellor while he concentrated on his new small schools efforts.⁸

The negative impacts of this precipitous scaling up are even more extensive than overcrowding and safety. The strategy drains other schools of leadership, funding, and high performing students.

Cannibalizing School Leadership

If you were a good assistant principal in a large high school of 3,000 students or more and Chancellor Klein offered you tens of thousands of dollars more to become the principal of a 125 student school (most small schools start with an entering class of fewer), what would you do? In this way, dozens of effective administrators are being lured away from jobs serving thousands for jobs serving hundreds, even as far too many schools of all types find themselves with inexperienced administrators at the helm. Again, the math doesn't add up.

Funding Inequities

Funding, too, favors new small schools. A study by the city's Independent Budget Office found that per capita instructional funding for large schools of all types is greater than for small schools "not only because they have more students, but also because so many large schools are high schools and the per capita funding formula for

high schools is greater than for elementary and middle schools.”⁹ But, the IBO found, small schools gained though disproportionate increases in overhead funding for non-classroom personnel such as principals, librarians, and guidance counselors.

The Independent Budget Office concluded “while a percentage point decline in the overhead allocation for large schools appears modest, for schools with more than 1,200 students the dollar loss averaged over \$92,000 – roughly the cost of an assistant principal.”¹⁰ Funding for small high schools received the largest budget allocations while large elementary schools received the smallest.

Student Selection

Cherry-picking by small schools is also a problem for larger schools. While many small schools are nominally “unscreened” (though many others require tests, auditions, or portfolios), the widespread use of interviews and other application strategies limit the pool to at least the strongly motivated. Similarly, small schools’ institutional constraints concerning education of students with disabilities, English language learners, students seeking technical training, and the like translate into a more favorable instructional demographic.

An analysis of fall 2004 enrollment data for 278 academic high schools (excluding competitive schools such as Stuyvesant High School and the Bronx High School of Science) led New York Public Radio Station WNYC to conclude that, “special education and English language learners are, in fact, over-represented in the city’s most violent and failing schools. At the same time, special ed kids are missing out on one of the city’s leading education reforms – the creation of new small schools.”¹¹ The data indicate that special education students are only half as likely as other students to attend small high schools.¹²

SCALING UP SOLUTIONS

The issue is not small schools vs. large schools. A slower, better-planned transition would avoid many of these problems. Lack of adequate funds for new school space is the biggest obstacle to a smoother transition. If new schools occupied new facilities, the problem of displaced students would be largely resolved but Bloomberg’s rush to add programs has increased the problem. Similarly, if new leadership was given time to develop, the system would not be forced to cannibalize large schools for small school principals. If small schools were better planned and required to address the learning needs of more challenging populations such as students with disabilities and English language learners, the remaining schools would not have to do more with less.

For a Mayor seen as a non-ideological tactician, more interested in “what works” than political correctness, his monomania for small schools seems particularly ill considered. Some big schools fail, as do small ones. No one believes that only size matters. In addition, the sheer size of New York’s public school system means that most students will continue to attend large schools. But rather than rigorously monitoring school quality so that all students are helped by his reforms, the startups seem to be given a free ride while larger schools are ever more burdened. If the Mayor ran on a platform of better schools of every size, there would not be the kind of educational triage that damages the reputations of large and small schools alike.

David C. Bloomfield is a professor and head of the graduate program in Educational Leadership at Brooklyn College, CUNY and Vice President of the Citywide Council on High Schools in New York.

ⁱ See, e.g., most recently, The Red Pencil: Convictions from Experience in Education by Theodore R.Sizer (Yale Univ. Press, 2004)

ⁱⁱ See, e.g., In Schools We Trust: Creating Communities of Learning in an Era of Testing and Standardization by Deborah Meier (Beacon, 2002)

³ WestEd., Rethinking High School: Five Profiles of Innovative Models for Student Success (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2005) and WestEd, Rethinking High School: An Introduction to New York City's Experience (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2005); Ready, Douglas D., et al., "Educational Equity and School Structure: School Size, Overcrowding, and Schools-Within-Schools," Teachers College Record, vol. 106, no. 10 (October, 2004)

⁴ Leanna Stiefel, et al., The Effects of Size of Student Body on School Costs and Performance in New York City High Schools (New York University, April, 1998)

⁵ Deutsch, Francine M., "How Small Classes Benefit High School Students," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, vol. 87 (June, 2003)

⁶ See, Gootman, Elissa, "Dismissal of School's Security Manager Points to Problems With Mayor's Crackdown Efforts," New York Times, January 11, 2005

⁷Herszenhorn, David, "In Push for Small Schools, Other Schools Suffer," New York Times, January 14, 2005

⁸ See "Overcrowded Schools," letter from Chancellor Joel Klein, New York Times, January 29, 2005 responding to Herszenhorn, supra.

⁹ Madrick, Martina, "Go Figure: How a Bigger Education Budget Became Less Money for Schools," Inside the Budget, no. 134 (New York City Independent Budget Office, October 26, 2004); see Andratta, David, "Small Schools Beat Big Ones in Battle for Bucks," The New York Post, October 27, 2004

¹⁰ Madrick, supra.

¹¹ Fertig, Beth, "Neediest Students Crowd Worst Schools: WNYC Investigation," WNYC, New York Public Radio, March 14, 2005

¹² Id.