



POLITICS OF EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

A Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association

VOLUME 29, No. 1

BULLETIN

FALL, 2004

Table of Contents

Page 1	<i>Education and the 2004 Presidential Contest.</i> Frederick M. Hess & Andrew Kelly, American Enterprise Institute.
Page 6	Of Interest...
Page 7	Message from the President
Page 7	PEA-USCM Fellowship Announcement
Page 8	Message from the Treasurer
Page 9	Message from the Program Chair
Page 9	Message from the Publications Chair
Page 9	Call for Proposals
Page 9	PEA Officers & Chairs
Page 11	PEA Membership Application
Page 12	PEA-USCM Fellowship Application Forms

Education and the 2004 Presidential Contest

Frederick M. Hess & Andrew Kelly
American Enterprise Institute

Predictably, the 2004 Democratic and Republican National Conventions were largely about terrorism, the war in Iraq, and the economy. Lost amidst the testimonials to John Kerry's wartime service and George W. Bush's steadfast leadership was any serious attention to education or the nation's schools. Though education has been a central issue in recent presidential elections, this year the Democrats and Republicans mostly skipped school. Professor and pundit Larry Sabato has suggested that issues other than the war and the economy "are just footnotes" in this year's election.¹ Nonetheless, given the razor-thin margin of the 2000 election and the possibility that this year's contest will play out in similar fashion, even the "footnotes" may prove required reading in 2004. More substantively, what are the implications of the Presidential election for federal education policy?

Historically, Democrats have enjoyed a substantial advantage over the Republicans on education due to their support for education spending and their decades-old alliance with unions and public employees. By the late 1980s, however, Reaganite critiques of liberalism and expensive social programs led many Democrats to seek a more moderate course on domestic policies, including education.² In 1992, Democratic

¹ Larry Sabato quoted in Robelen, "Ed. Issues Take Back Seat at Convention." July 29, 2004. *Education Week* (Web Only) Available at http://www.edweek.org/ew/ewstory.cfm?slug=43dems_6web.h23.

² Frederick M. Hess and Patrick J. McGuinn. 2002. Seeking the mantle of "opportunity": Presidential politics and the educational metaphor, 1964-2000. *Educational Policy*, 16 (1): 72-95.

PEA Breakfast
during the
University Council for Educational Administration
2004 Convention
Saturday, November 13, 7:30 am
Meet at Registration Desk of Marriott Hotel Front
Lobby

nominee Bill Clinton jettisoned the rhetoric of redistribution and called for shared responsibility to expand opportunity while pruning back big government. Clinton attacked Republican President George Bush for not ensuring that every American had the opportunity to succeed. Opinion polls from the fall of 1992 showed that the public favored Clinton over Bush by a 47 to 24 percent margin on the issue of improving public education.³

Whereas education had once been a non-issue in federal elections, by 1992 voters were consistently listing it as one of their top five priorities. By 1996, 86 percent reported that the candidates' education positions were extremely or very important in determining their votes.⁴ Meanwhile, the Clinton administration's education agenda, including support for charter schools, educational standards, and school uniforms had widened the Democratic advantage on the issue. In 1996, exit polls showed Clinton beating Republican nominee Bob Dole 78 to 16 percent amongst voters who said that education was the most important issue in determining their vote.⁵

Election 2000

In 2000, however, the Republican nominee, Texas governor George W. Bush, successfully neutralized the Democratic advantage on education. The Bush campaign's decision to promote their candidate as an education reformer and the candidate's promise to "leave no child behind" marked a break with the conservative notion that the federal government could not play a constructive role in solving social problems. As governor of Texas, Bush had firmly supported the state's stringent accountability plan as a way to ensure that all children were learning. Bush touted routine state testing coupled with consequences for poor school performance, mounting a rhetorical assault on the "soft bigotry of low expectations." In making education the centerpiece of his "compassionate conservatism," Bush reached out to swing voters concerned that conservatives were oblivious to racial inequality or urban blight.

³ People, The Press & Politics, Campaign 1992 Poll, October 1992. Data furnished by the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut.

⁴ Hess and McGuinn. 2002. 87.

⁵ Voter News Service, Exit Poll, November 5, 1996.

Bush's record permitted him to thwart criticism of his position and to portray his opponent, Vice President Al Gore, as an agent of the public school establishment. As a result, Bush achieved near-parity with his Democratic opponent on education with 46 percent of likely voters favoring Bush on education and 47 percent favoring Gore in October 2000.⁶ Bush's credibility on education proved crucial to his narrow victory, as voters reported that education was the second most important issue that year in determining their Presidential vote.⁷

No Child Left Behind

Shortly after his election, Bush made it clear that he wanted to pass a bipartisan education bill that would bring Texas-style accountability to the nation at large. After thousands of hours of difficult negotiations, President Bush, flanked by high-ranking Democrats and Republicans, signed the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act in early 2002. The law enjoyed broad bipartisan support and is universally regarded as the administration's signature domestic policy initiative.

NCLB represents a remarkable evolution in the federal role. For the first time, it put performance and accountability at the center of federal education policy. The law marks a break with conservative tradition; it represents a massive shift of educational authority from the states to the federal government, and its far-reaching provisions dictate how schooling is delivered at the district and school level. The rhetoric surrounding implementation is also surprisingly un-conservative. For years conservatives have promoted the use of concrete incentives and sanctions to encourage performance, while railing against government programs that lean too heavily on good intentions and expansive spending. In contrast, on the second anniversary of NCLB, President Bush told an audience in Knoxville, Tennessee, "Now the federal government is sending checks, at record amounts, I might add . . . But we're now saying, listen, we trust you. We trust the . . . teachers to accomplish a mission; why don't you just show us that you are."⁸

⁶ ABC News Poll, October 23-25, 2000. Data furnished by the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut.

⁷ CNN, Exit Polls (President-National), 2000. available at: <http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2000/results/index.epolls.html>

⁸ President George W. Bush, "President Discusses No Child Left Behind Act: Remarks by the President in Conversation on

The Politics of NCLB Implementation

The passage of NCLB seemed to signal the consolidation of the Republican advantage over the Democrats in education. By late 2002, the President's approval rating in education hovered around 60 percent⁹ and 45 percent of likely voters believed that the Republicans could do a better job on education while 44 percent favored the Democrats.¹⁰ As one education journalist points out "the party" surrounding NCLB's passage "[was] a bit premature."¹¹ Because the law was bipartisan, it featured a number of awkward compromises regarding school accountability, school choice, funding, and federal monitoring of state efforts that have caused implementation headaches and fostered public resentment.

By the summer of 2004, grumbling on the part of some state and local officials had metastasized into an emerging revolt. As of April 2004, 23 states had voiced a formal complaint about No Child Left Behind to the Department of Education.¹² The criticism has come from both sides of the aisle in state legislatures and in the US Congress. Republican legislators in Arizona, Minnesota, and Utah have promoted measures that would allow those states to reject some provisions of NCLB. Vermont has voted to prohibit the use of state

the Second Anniversary of the No Child Left Behind Act," (Washington, DC: The White House, January 8, 2004). Available at: www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/01/print/20040108-3.html

⁹ ABC News/Washington Post Poll, September 23-September 26, 2002. Data obtained courtesy of the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut.

¹⁰ ABC News Poll, October 2002, Data provided by the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut.

¹¹ Siobhan Gorman, "Bipartisan Schoolmates," *Education Next* 2, no 3 (Summer 2002), 36-43. 36.

¹² 23-state figure attributed to Scott Young of the National Conference of State Legislatures in Michael Dobbs, "More Changes Made to 'No Child' Rules," in the *Washington Post*, March 30, 2004, A2.

funds for NCLB-related programs,¹³ while a Pennsylvania district has brought a lawsuit against the state to correct "inequities" in the law.¹⁴

More recently, a resolution brought by state Democrats in Oklahoma that called on Congress to overhaul the law was shelved in favor of another resolution—championed by a conservative Republican—that favored repealing NCLB entirely. Republican Arlen Specter, the chairman of the education subcommittee of the Senate appropriations committee, asserted in March, "the pot is definitely boiling on this law. The law is good on standards and accountability, but it clearly needs some modifications, because it's going through growing pains."¹⁵ Department of Education officials have traveled to the recalcitrant states seeking to stamp out fires and have launched a coordinated war-room effort for this purpose but have enjoyed mixed success.

Public opinion has begun to mirror the state-level rancor over NCLB. Like most pieces of sweeping compromise legislation, NCLB elicits mixed reactions, with people tending to affirm its goals while expressing concerns about its means. The percentage of people who had heard of NCLB increased from 56 percent in 2003 to 75 percent in early 2004. However, the initially positive public reaction to the law has moderated over time while opposition has grown. From 2003 to 2004, the percentage of voters embracing the law remained roughly constant while the ranks of the critics tripled. A recent poll by the nonpartisan Educational Testing Service found that adults were evenly split on NCLB; 38 percent had an unfavorable view of the law while 39 percent approved of it. The trend was consistent across partisan lines and in key battleground states.¹⁶

¹³ Michael Dobbs, 2004, "More States are Fighting 'No Child Left Behind' Law," *The Washington Post*, February 19, 2003, A3.

¹⁴ Amanda Paulson, "An Education Rebellion Stirring," *Christian Science Monitor*, February 11, 2004.

¹⁵ Specter quoted in Sam Dillon, "President's Initiative to Shake Up Education is Facing Protests," in the *New York Times*, March 8, 2004. 12.

¹⁶ Greg Toppo, "Parents take schools to task," in *USA Today*, June 21, 2004. 9D.

The Bush administration's response to these complaints has been two-pronged. On the one hand, the Department of Education has stuck to its guns in defending NCLB and has highlighted its successes: "One hundred or so superintendents and a handful of state resolutions . . . hardly qualify as a widespread rebellion," an administration spokesperson said in March. "No one should be surprised, and we certainly aren't, that there is some anxiety about change. It's a sign the law is working."¹⁷ Margaret Spellings, one of the President's domestic policy advisors, has pointed out that Georgia has closed the gap between African-American and white students in reading this year, and that Maryland has successfully freed 25 schools from the "in need of improvement" list.¹⁸

In a bid to ameliorate critics, the Department modified its stance on four of NCLB's most unpopular provisions in late 2003 and early 2004. Secretary of Education Rod Paige pledged to educators that the Department would work to "wring every ounce of flexibility out of the existing language."¹⁹ Between December and March, the Department announced changes to the testing requirements for students with disabilities and limited English proficient (LEP) students, amended the highly-qualified teacher mandate by relaxing regulations on rural teachers, teachers of multiple subjects, and science teachers, and relaxed the strict rules governing student participation in testing.²⁰

Despite these calculated retreats, Bush has continued to tout NCLB as "the most important federal education reform in history" and promised to extend standards-based accountability to the nation's public high schools. In his brief discussion of education at the convention, the President stated that he would increase program funding for underperforming high school students, would renew emphasis on the teaching of math and science, and would require that all states develop a

¹⁷ Susan Aspey quoted in Dillon, March 8, 2004.

¹⁸ Diana Jean Schemo, "Effort By Bush on Education Hits Obstacles," *The New York Times*, August 18, 2004. p 1.

¹⁹ Sam Dillon, "U.S. Set to Ease Some Provisions of School Law," in the *New York Times*, March 14, 2004. 1.

²⁰ Press releases outlining the four changes can be found at: <http://www.ed.gov/news/pressreleases/2004/07/index.html?src=ln>

rigorous high school exit exam.²¹ The administration has yet to lay out the details of its high school reform agenda.

Higher Education

NCLB has monopolized the administration's education efforts and has distracted attention from other areas of education policy. Democrats like George Miller (D-CA), a cosponsor of NCLB, have asserted that the inaction can be blamed on the administration. The bipartisan support that passed NCLB has equaled "a wasted opportunity," according to Miller, because the President "essentially exited the field" after its passage.²² The Higher Education Act is due to expire under the current Congress, but reauthorization has stalled in the House due to a number of technical disputes. In its first term, the administration was forced to confront deep-seated concerns about rising tuition costs. In 2003-04, state spending on colleges decreased for the first time in more than a decade with total state spending for postsecondary education falling 2.1 percent to \$60.3 billion in 2003-04. The product of a soft economy and massive state budget deficits, the recent decreases may constitute the single largest cut to higher education spending ever.²³

The Federal government's major program in higher education is its grant and loan support for college students. The majority of federal aid is directed through Pell Grants, federal aid that is reserved for low-income students who are pursuing an undergraduate degree. While the total amount spent per year on Pell Grants has increased from \$8.7 billion in 2001 to \$12 billion in 2004, the maximum award has remained capped at \$4,050 per student for the last three years.

In his 2004 budget, President Bush proposed an expansion of the Pell program that would give low-income students who were enrolled in a challenging high

²¹ Sean Cavanagh, "Bush Touts Ed. Law's Successes, Promises High School Reforms," *Education Week* 24 no. 1. Web Only.

²² George Miller quoted in Erik Robelen, "'No Child Law' Remains at Top of Bush Record," *Education Week* 24, no. 5. 1, 23, 24.

²³ Michael Arnone, "State Spending on Colleges Drops for the First Time in 11 Years," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 50, no. 19, January 16, 2004

school curriculum an extra \$1,000 in each of their first two years of college.²⁴ The proposed increase went nowhere in Congress, though a few smaller higher education grant programs received modest increases in funding.²⁵ With the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act still before Congress, the 2004 election promises to have great import for higher education.

The Democrats' Challenge

Democratic Presidential nominee John Kerry voted for No Child Left Behind in the Senate but on the campaign trail has repeatedly criticized the Bush administration for inadequately funding the law and for the way it has implemented the law's accountability provisions. Though Kerry has claimed that he "will hold George Bush accountable for making a mockery of the words Leave No Child Behind,"²⁶ the education plank of the 2004 Democratic platform does not contain any radical revisions or midcourse corrections to the law, though it does propose some controversial teacher quality provisions.

The thrust of the party's education platform is the need to spend more to support pre-school, reduce class size, expand after-school programs, and increase tuition support for college students. In the words of conservative education expert Chester Finn, president of the Thomas Fordham Foundation, the platform's education plank "offers something for everybody but nothing in particular."²⁷ In addition to promoting an America where "every classroom has a great teacher," "every student gets enough personal attention," and

²⁴ Jamilah Evelyn and Jeffrey Brainard, "Bush Proposes More Money for 2-Year Colleges and Bigger Pell Grants for Some Students," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 50, no. 21, January 30, 2004.

²⁵ Jeffrey Brainard and Jeffrey Selingo, "Congress, Finally Finishing 2004 Budget, Keeps Pell Grants Level and Gives 3.7% More to NIH," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 50 no 21, January 30, 2004.

²⁶ John Kerry, "Education Trust Fund: Remarks by Senator John Kerry," available at http://johnkerry.com/pressroom/speeches/spc_2003_1125.htm

²⁷ Chester E. Finn, Jr., "Out to Lunchtime: Kerry's got nothing to study re: education," *National Review Online*, July 26, 2004. available at: <http://www.nationalreviewonline.com/comment/finn200407260700.asp>

every congressional mandate is paid for via an "education trust fund," the platform mounts an attack on the Bush administration's K-12 and higher education record.²⁸ The document charges that the present administration has under-funded NCLB by \$27 billion and has attempted to cut Pell Grants at the same time that the cost of college has risen. Amidst the convention rhetoric, however, the platform provides some atypical language on teacher compensation and dismissal.

In May 2004, John Kerry called for a \$9 billion increase in teacher salaries, a large portion of which would go to teachers whose students have improved on standardized tests or those that teach in inner cities or hard to staff subjects. In conjunction, Kerry proposed increased accountability for teachers and education schools, citing the need to remove poor performers from the classroom and improve teacher training by withholding federal funds from underperforming teacher preparation programs.²⁹ These comments evidently upset the national teacher union leadership, who requested that the nominee refrain from using the term "pay for performance." Kerry has since toned down his teacher quality language; he no longer mentions "pay for performance" and seems to have substituted "removal" for "dismissal."³⁰

Despite this softening, the Democrats' platform still addresses increasing the pay of teachers in hard to staff subjects and hard to staff schools, providing "rigorous new incentives and tests for new teachers," and calling for "fast, fair procedures for improving or removing teachers who do not perform on the job."³¹ While far from revolutionary, these positions do represent a break with traditional Democratic rhetoric, are at odds with the traditional union stance, and set up potentially intriguing opportunities for bipartisan reform of teacher preparation, compensation, and termination.

John Kerry has also eased his criticism of No Child Left Behind, a shift likely to perturb the teachers unions. Throughout the primaries, Kerry was one of the

²⁸ Democratic Party Platform, p. 30.

²⁹ David M. Halbfinger, "Kerry Wants \$30 billion for Teachers," the *New York Times*, May 7, 2004. 28.

³⁰ Mike Antonucci, "Kerry Retreats on 'Pay for Performance,'" (Chicago: The Heartland Institute, July 1, 2004). <http://www.heartland.org/Article.cfm?artId=15223>

³¹ Democratic Party Platform, 31.

law's most vociferous critics, promising to "hold George Bush accountable for making a mockery of the words Leave No Child Behind."³² As Erik Robelen of *Education Week* has pointed out, Kerry's campaign website originally stated that the candidate sought to "revise the accountability standards in [the law] to include ways of assessing student performance in addition to testing."³³ Recently, however, the campaign has stricken any comments about revising or rewriting the law, instead saying that Kerry is "committed to making No Child Left Behind work for our children."³⁴

The Impact of Education on the 2004 Election

To be blunt, the result of the 2004 election will have little to do with either candidate's stance on education. Voters have consistently ranked education a distant fifth when it comes to the most important national issues in 2004. It would be unwise, however, for either candidate to completely discount the issue as an electoral concern; a close election could be decided by any number of ostensibly trivial factors.

After eliminating a persistent Democratic advantage on education in 2000, Bush has again closed a yawning gap between him and John Kerry. While a July poll by the Gallup Organization found that 50 percent of voters favored John Kerry on education and 43 percent favor Bush,³⁵ more recent polling shows that Bush has regained ground on his opponent. Early September polls have Bush trailing Kerry in education by between one and three points, and some polls show the President opening up a slight lead. Bush's approval rating on education has declined from its high of 65 percent in March of 2001, but late August polls in the run-up to the

³² John Kerry, "Education Trust Fund: Remarks by Senator John Kerry," available at http://johnkerry.com/pressroom/speeches/spc_2003_1125.htm

³³ Quoted in Erik Robelen, "Departing from Primary Season Rhetoric, Kerry Soften's Criticism of 'No Child' Law," *Education Week* 23, no 44 (August 11, 2004) pps. 34-35.

³⁴ Quoted in Erik Robelen, "Departing from Primary Season Rhetoric, Kerry Soften's Criticism of 'No Child' Law," *Education Week* 23, no 44 (August 11, 2004) pps. 34-35.

³⁵ *Gallup/CNN/USA Today Poll*, July 19-July 21. Data courtesy of the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut.

RNC revealed the president had a 52 percent approval rating on education.³⁶

While Bush's comeback on education has closely mirrored his increasing approval on other issues, the incumbent may yet be very vulnerable on the issue, particularly among important demographic groups. A nationwide poll in July revealed that 51 percent of registered Hispanic voters thought that Kerry would do a better job on education while just 27 percent thought the same of Bush.³⁷ Bush's educational profile has suffered since his triumphant passage of NCLB; the candidate who looked as if he might give the Republicans parity or predominance on education in 2001 has lost some of his momentum in the issue heading into election 2004. Whether the president has regained enough ground on the issue to help him in a tight contest, and what a victory by either candidate will actually mean for schools and universities in the next four years, remains to be seen.

Fredrick Hess and Andrew Kelly are researchers with the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (AEI). AEI was founded in 1943 and is located in Washington, D.C.



OF INTEREST...

To increase the reach of the politics of education field and build collegiality, please send periodic updates about your own research publications, agency reports, grants, and promotions. We will print these updates in this section of upcoming bulletins. Please send them to Kyle Ingle, Managing Editor at wki02@garnet.acns.fsu.edu .

³⁶ ABC News/Washington Post Poll: August 26-29. Data Courtesy of the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut.

³⁷ *Washington Post/Univision/Tomas Rivera Policy Institute Poll*, July 6-July 16. Data Courtesy of the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT:

BRUCE S. COOPER
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY



Once again, PEA is a Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and is growing stronger. As a part of AERA, yet with our own identity and mission, we continue collaborating with university researchers, graduate students, political leaders and associations, as well as AERA's Division L: Policy and Politics of Education—to understand how the political system fosters and affects our schools—Kindergarten through postsecondary.

In so doing, PEA is undertaking several efforts. We continue to publish outstanding scholarship. In early 2005, dues-paying members will receive the latest issue of *Educational Policy* on the politics of teacher and administrator preparation and development (edited by Lora Cohen-Vogel and Carolyn Herrington, both of Florida State University). Additionally, the *Peabody Journal of Education* will publish in 2005, "Federalism Reconsidered: The Case of the No Child Left Behind Act" (Eds. Elizabeth H. DeBray, University of Georgia, Kathryn A. McDermott, University of Massachusetts, and Priscilla Wohlstetter, University of Southern California). This special edition will present a series of articles analyzing the Act's intent, implementation, and effects.

PEA has also worked with the U. S. Conference of Mayors to establish the PEA-USCM Fellowship

(please see the announcement and application in this issue of the *Bulletin*).

I would like to thank Lance D. Fusarelli, of NC State University, for his leadership as the membership chair and Treasurer of PEA. AERA members should renew their PEA SIG membership when they renew their AERA membership. Non-AERA members should renew their PEA membership by completing the membership form also included in the *Bulletin*.

ANNOUNCING A NEW FELLOWSHIP OPPORTUNITY:

PEA-USCM FELLOWSHIP

The Politics of Education Association and the U. S. Conference of Mayors (USCM) are proud to announce for 2004-2005 the PEA-USCM Doctoral Fellowship. The Fellowship is designed to give talented doctoral students interested in national and local (mayoral) politics of education an opportunity to work at the U. S. Conference on current research and development projects, as a way of enriching the doctoral experience and possibly informing the student's dissertation research.

The Fellowship can last from 6 to 12 months in residence at the U. S. Conference of Mayors. Former PEA President Kenneth Wong of Vanderbilt University has placed doctoral students at the US Conference during the summer. The amount of the Fellowship will be up to \$40,000, depending on the length of service (term or full year) and experience.

The PEA-USCM fellow(s) will work alongside the leadership of USCM on current projects of the U. S. Conference, both contributing to the effort and learning from it. Part of this effort is thus project support and management, as well as research and analysis. The PEA fellow(s) will also have the chance to attend meetings in the nation's capital and come to know the politics of education at the federal and mayoral levels first hand. Dr. Fritz Edelstein, Senior Advisor at the U. S. Conference of Mayors has volunteered to act as an on-site advisor and supporter of the doctoral student(s) while in residence.

PEA members and other university researchers can nominate doctoral students for this experience by filling out a recommendation form and writing a letter in support of the student.

The student should prepare a research interest statement, and indicate the background and skills they would bring to the fellowship. In addition, a writing sample and curriculum vitae is required from each applicant, as well as a completed application. Additional letters of recommendation from professors and advisers at the students' universities are also useful and recommended.

Deadline for receipt of all materials is November 24, 2004.

Who is eligible? Nominees must be doctoral students in educational policy, political science, educational leadership, or a related field.

Steps:

1. PEA members and other university researchers nominate doctoral students for the Fellowship;
2. Students submit the application (at end of this bulletin), plus a letter of interest, a writing sample and curriculum vitae, to both the chair of the Search Committee, Dr. Patrick J. Wolf at Georgetown University and Dr. Fritz Edelstein at the U. S. Conference of Mayors;
3. The Search committee will review nomination materials, and interview by phone the finalists to make their award decision. Selected student(s) and the U.S. Conference of Mayors together will determine the length of service (3 to 12 months).

MESSAGE FROM THE TREASURER:

LANCE D. FUSARELLI

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

As Treasurer and Membership Chair of PEA, I encourage you to renew your membership. For only \$25 per year, you will continue to receive this electronic PEA Bulletin (the Association's newsletter), recent publications, and information about upcoming conferences and events. Members also receive the special double issue of *Educational Policy* (January/March) which serves as the annual yearbook of the Politics of Education Association.

Since the Politics of Education Association is again a special interest group (SIG) of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), if you are a member of AERA, then you should henceforth pay your SIG dues when you renew your AERA membership.

If it is not time to renew your AERA membership, you can still update your membership to PEA by logging onto <http://www.aera.net/signs/index.htm> and filling out a membership form.

If you are NOT a member of AERA, and wish to join or renew your PEA membership, please fill out the membership form and send it to me at the address given with the application that is included in this edition of the *Bulletin*.

All members who have paid their dues for calendar year 2004 should have recently received the 2004 *Politics of Education Association Yearbook*, edited by Bonnie C. Fusarelli and William Lowe Boyd, entitled "Curriculum Politics in Multicultural America". If you did not receive the Yearbook, please email me: fusarelli@hotmail.com and I will check into the matter.

MESSAGE FROM THE
AERA PROGRAM CHAIR:

LORA COHEN-VOGEL
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Thanks to all of you who submitted or reviewed presentation proposals to the SIG for the 2005 meeting of AERA in Montreal. As usual, the first session we were allotted has been dedicated to the Yearbook.

For the remaining 3 slots (1 session, 2 paper discussions) allocated to the SIG based on membership counts, proposals will be selected from among the two session proposals and three paper proposals received. Each proposal was sent to at least three volunteer reviewers. The pool of reviewers was so large that each person was assigned to review only one proposal. Reviewers' ratings and comments are currently being pooled by proposal, and I expect to be able to announce the results soon.

MESSAGE FROM THE
PUBLICATIONS CHAIR:

JOHN FITZ
CARDIFF UNIVERSITY, WALES

The Committee encourages all PEA members to consider submitting a proposal for one of the upcoming publications (see Call be at right). Submissions from duos or small teams of senior and junior scholars (to secure the future and strength of the field) are encouraged.

Members of the committee also include

- Lisa Cuerars, Sage Publications
- Alfred Hess, Northwestern U.
- Gerardo Lopez, Indiana U.
- V. Darleen Opfer, Ohio State U.
- Marion Orr, Brown U.
- Catherine Lugg, Rutgers U.
- Anne Allen, U of Michigan
- Ken Wong, Vanderbilt (Peabody Journal of Education)
- Philip Altbach, Boston College (Educational Policy)

CALL FOR PROPOSALS

Each year the Publications Committee is responsible for identifying a theme and editors for the next *PEA Yearbook* which is published as a special edition of *Educational Policy*. If you would like to submit a proposal for the 2007 Yearbook, the Call for Proposals provides guidelines that will assist you with its preparation and submission. Closing date for submission is **May 15, 2005**.

Additionally, every other year, the *Peabody Journal of Education* dedicates one issue to the politics of education. An issue will be published in 2005 concerning the politics of No Child Left Behind. Call for Proposals for the 2007 issue is now open and closes **on June 15, 2005**.

The Call for Proposals is available at our web site:
<http://www.fsu.edu/~pea>



PEA OFFICERS

Bruce S. Cooper	President
V. Darleen Opfer	Secretary
Lance Fusarelli	Treasurer

PEA COMMITTEE CHAIRS

John Fitz	Publications Committee
David Monk	R. Campbell Award Committee
Lora Cohen-Vogel	Grants; AERA Program Chair
Patrick Wolf	Fellowship Search Committee

Politics of Education BULLETIN is an official publication of the Politics of Education Association (PEA) and is published three times per year. We encourage authors to submit essays on topics of interest in school policy and politics to the co-editors:

Lora Cohen-Vogel, Stacey Rutledge, and Jeff Brooks

Politics of Education *Bulletin*, Co-editors

Florida State University

113 Stone Building

Tallahassee, FL 32306

850-644-6777

E-mails:

cohenvog@coe.fsu.edu

rutledge@coe.fsu.edu

jbrooks@coe.fsu.edu

Kyle Ingle

Politics of Education *Bulletin*, Managing Editor

Florida State University

113 Stone Building

Tallahassee, FL 32306

wki02@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

Politics of Education Association Membership Application

Name (please print): _____

Title: _____

Affiliation: _____

Address: _____

Phone: () _____

Email Address: _____

YOU MUST INCLUDE YOUR EMAIL ADDRESS IN ORDER TO RECEIVE THE *BULLETIN*.

Enclosed please find a check to PEA for \$25 for full, one-year membership

**Send to: Lance D. Fusarelli, Treasurer, Associate Professor and Coordinator
Educational Leadership Program
Department of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies
608N Poe Hall
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC 27695-78**

Application for PEA - U.S. Conference of Mayors Fellowship, 2004-2005

CANDIDATE for Fellowship: Please fill in the application and send it to Professor Patrick Wolf at Georgetown University and Dr. Fritz Edelstein at the U. S. Mayors Conference.

Name: _____ Email: _____

Address: _____

City/Zip: _____

University: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____

Nominating Faculty Member: _____

If different, name of your academic adviser(s) or mentor(s): _____

Name other professors with whom you have studied?

If chosen, what is your preferred term of placement? (e.g., January-June, 2005) _____

1. How many more courses do you need before starting the dissertation? _____

2. What relevant professional experience do you have?

3. What are your major interests that might be extended and enriched by spending a fellowship at the U.S. Conference of Mayors in Washington, DC?

4. What might be topics and ideas for your dissertation?

5. What are your career plans when you finish your dissertation and degree?

Please ask your advisor/mentor to fill in the recommendation form and forward copies to Dr. Patrick Wolf at Georgetown University, and Dr. Fritz Edelstein at the US Conference of Mayors **by November 24, 2004** at the addresses provided:

Dr. Patrick J. Wolf, Chair,
PEA Fellowship Search Committee
Georgetown Public Policy Institute
3520 Prospect Street, NW, 4th Floor
Washington, DC 20007
Tel: 202-687-9152 (fax: 687-5544)
Georgetown University
wolfp@georgetown.edu

Dr. Fritz Edelstein, Senior Advisor
U.S. Conference of Mayors
1620 Eye Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20006
Tel: 202.861.6737
fritz@usmayors.org

Faculty Recommendation Form for PEA-U.S. Mayors Conference Doctoral Fellowship, 2004-2005

Your Name: _____

Your Institution: _____

1. Name of student whom you are recommending _____

2. How long, and in what capacity have you known the candidate?

3. How many more courses does this nominee have before fulfilling her/his course requirements and starting her/his dissertation?

4. Does he or she have a possible dissertation topic? _____ If so, briefly describe.

5. I recommend this student:

- ___ 4. Wholeheartedly and without reservation
- ___ 3. Strongly
- ___ 2. Somewhat
- ___ 1. Not very strongly (why?)

Signature of Faculty Member: _____ Date: _____

Would you be willing to discuss this candidate if he or she is a finalist with a Search Committee member(s)?

Where might we reach you? _____

Please return this confidential form along with a letter of recommendation addressing the strengths that qualify the candidate for the PEA-U.S. Mayors Conference Doctoral Fellowship. Please send copies to **both** of the following committee members **by November 24, 2004:**

Dr. Patrick J. Wolf, Chair,
PEA Fellowship Search Committee
Georgetown Public Policy Institute
3520 Prospect Street, NW, 4th Floor
Washington, DC 20007
Tel: 202-687-9152 (fax: 687-5544)
Georgetown University
wolfp@georgetown.edu

Dr. Fritz Edelstein, Senior Advisor
U.S. Conference of Mayors
1620 Eye Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20006
Tel: 202.861.6737
fritz@usmayors.org