



POLITICS OF EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

A Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association

Published with the support of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Florida State University

VOLUME 31, No. 1

BULLETIN

Fall, 2006

A Forty-Year Perspective on the Politics of Education and its Association, PEA¹

Michael Kirst, Stanford University

Introduction

These reflections were inspired by my retirement from teaching politics of education at Stanford University which will provide me with more time for research and writing. I began analyzing the politics of education in 1964 through the seminal writings of Steve Bailey, Alan K. Campbell, Thomas H. Eliot, and Laurence Iannaccone. Iannaccone's *Politics in Education* (1967) was the best overall summary stressing the substantial control of school policy by professional educators which Iannaccone termed the "politics preferred by pedagogues." The dominant paradigm of the mid-1960s was a locally-based "closed system" that had few non-educator groups or non-local forces as major influences on school politics (Wirt & Kirst, 1972). State education policy was dominated by state teacher associations that included administrators and other educators in one big happy family.

(Continued on Page 4)

A Forty-Two Year Perspective on the Politics of Education and the Future of PEA²

Enrique Alemán, Jr., University of Utah

&

Brendan D. Maxcy, University of Missouri - Columbia

Introduction

Much has changed in the forty-six years since Thomas Eliot's (1959) call for a formal field of study of educational politics—and too little. For some the change in topics, methods and theoretical approaches of the field are troubling, signaling a field that has lost (or never found) its way. For others, it is what remains unchanged during that time that is most troubling (Bell, 2004; San Miguel & Valencia, 1998). As Betty Malen intimated in accepting the Stephen Bailey Award earlier this year, much work remains for scholars of educational politics if we hope to leave an institution more just, more democratic and more productive for our labor.

(Continued on Page 7)

² Enrique Alemán, Jr. is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy at the University of Utah.

Brendan D. Maxcy is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri – Columbia.

¹ The feature article is from remarks given by the author at the Politics of Education Association business meeting, April 8, 2006, Palo Alto, California. Michael Kirst has recently retired from many years of service at Stanford University.

TABLE of CONTENTS

Page 1	<i>A Forty-Two Year Perspective on the Politics of Education and Its Association, PEA</i> Michael Kirst, Stanford University
Page 1	<i>A Forty-Two Year Perspective on the Politics of Education and the Future of PEA</i> Enrique Alemán, Jr., University of Utah Brendan D. Maxcy, University of Missouri - Columbia
Page 3	Message from the President
Page 4	Of Interest...
Page 6	Awards Committee Report
Page 10	Organizational Spotlight: APSA
Page 10	2006 Politics of Education Yearbook
Page 12	The Outstanding Dissertation Award in the Politics of Education Call and Forms
Page 15	Politics of Education Membership Application

**The
PEA Business Meeting will be held
at the
University Council for Educational
Administration 2006 Convention**

**Friday, November 10, 2006
7:00 am until 7:50 am
Peraux Room
The St. Anthony Hotel
San Antonio, Texas**



**A second informal meeting to discuss
long-range planning (PEA journal
proposal, PEA events at AERA-Chicago)
is also scheduled for:**

**Saturday, November 11
7:00 am until 7:50 AM
Crockett Room
The St. Anthony Hotel
San Antonio, Texas**

**BREAKFAST WILL BE SERVED
PLEASE COME!
Email Brendan Maxcy at
maxcyb@missouri.edu to RSVP.**

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT:

BRUCE S. COOPER
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

PEA is anticipating yet another active and productive year as our many committees and functions all work hard and well together. First, we urge you to join (or re-join) the Politics of Education Association, one of AERA's most exciting special interest groups. You can re/join and pay dues through AERA's membership system, or you can contact our Membership Chair and Treasurer, Vincent Anfara at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville (see membership application on page 15).

Publications are going full tilt. We are working on new yearbooks under the leadership of our Publications Committee, chaired by Katie McDermott (U. Massachusetts-Amherst). As soon as you pay your 2006-2007 dues, we will send you the new yearbook.

Second, we're hard at work on a major new book in our field, *The Politics of Education Handbook: Theory, Concepts, & Practices*, published by Lawrence Erlbaum. Lance Fusarelli (North Carolina State U.), Jim Cibulka (U. of Kentucky), and I are editing the volume. We're currently reviewing the first set of handbook chapters now and eagerly awaiting the chapters currently in progress.

And third, we're considering starting a PEA journal, possibly published on-line. If you have ideas or opinions about this, please let us know. In fact, you should have received by E-mail the Journal Opinion Survey, sent out by Janice Hansel (U. of Texas), to determine whether you would support the idea of our own PEA journal (the first ever to be published by an AERA Special Interest Group).

Please let us know what you think about this new journal. Should the journal be "hard copy" or on-line? Would you be interested in serving on its editorial board, contributing an article and/or even editing an issue? Several major universities have expressed an interest in being the host-sponsor for

the journal if we get a show of interest and commitment from our membership.

I would like to recognize the hard work of our PEA Executive Committee, including our Treasurer, Vincent Anfara (U. of Tennessee-Knoxville); our Secretary and manager of the PEA list-serve, Lora Cohen-Vogel (Florida State U.); and Executive Committee members, Rick Ginsberg (U. Kansas) and Brendan Maxcy (U. of Missouri-Columbia).

Last April, we had a wonderful meeting at Stanford University, prior to AERA in San Francisco, to recognize and celebrate the career of one of our members and former PEA presidents, Michael Kirst, who retired from teaching but not from research. The morning at Stanford was run by PEA, with some outstanding speakers and panels. The afternoon was organized by Mike and colleagues at Stanford during which time we discussed the field and Mike's work. At AERA, Mike was our special speaker at the PEA Business Meeting, charging us with working on a long-range plan for PEA and the field of education politics research--using the study of the economics of education as our model.

We shall meet again in 2007, at the American Education Research Association annual meeting in Chicago. We hope you can attend as well as participate in our PEA sessions and business meeting. We are also discussing a reunion, possibly, for alumni graduates of the University of Chicago at the university during AERA; perhaps we could combine the UC meeting with a brief off-shore PEA gathering as we did at Stanford last year? Just a thought.

If you are a member of PEA and AERA already, please remember to update your dues. If you're not a member of PEA, please join us now and receive a special yearbook issue of *Education Policy* (in the even years). And you'll receive a double treat in the odd years: a yearbook of *Education Policy* and a fifth issue of *The Peabody Journal of Education*, contributed to and edited by scholars in our field.

We value your membership, participation and support! Please consider editing/contributing to a yearbook in the future and, of course, about submitting a proposal to present at AERA 2008 in

New York City. We are also interested in new ideas like sharing syllabi and creating on-line course materials as well as exercises/simulations for those of us who teach education politics at the masters and doctoral levels.

And yes, PEA is meeting at the annual meeting of the University Council for Education Administration (UCEA), this year in San Antonio. See you there.

On the organizational side, we again recognize the important contribution that Florida State University makes to PEA, as Stacey Rutledge and Jeff Brooks serve as co-editors of the *PEA Bulletin*, Kyle Ingle serves as managing editor, and Lora Cohen-Vogel as PEA secretary. If you have ideas for an article or announcement for the *PEA Bulletin*, let Stacey and Jeff know soon at rutledge@coe.fsu.edu and jbrooks@coe.fsu.edu. All said, we are busy, and hope to continue serving you and our field. I hope you had a great summer. 2006-2007 will be another great year for PEA with your help.



OF INTEREST...

Please send updates on your publications, agency reports, grants, and promotions to Kyle Ingle, Managing Editor at wki02@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

Congratulations to Dr. Gary Crow on becoming the Chairman of the Department of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies at Florida State University. Dr. Crow formerly served as Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership & Policy at the University of Utah.

Congratulations to Dorothy Shipps of Baruch College, CUNY, who won the award for best paper delivered in urban politics at the American Political Science Association's 2005 annual meeting. The paper is entitled, *'Sticky' School Reform: A Path Dependent Argument about Corporate Influence and Union Weakness in 20th Century Chicago*. Dorothy can be contacted at the School of Public Affairs, Baruch College, City University of New

York, where she continues to teach educational policy courses and prepare leaders in urban schooling.

Don't forget to get in nominations for the PEA Outstanding Dissertation Award. See page 12-14 of this Bulletin for specifics and forms. Completed forms should be sent to Dorothy Shipps via her Baruch email: dorothy_shipps@baruch.cuny.edu.



A Forty-Two Year Perspective...

(Kirst, continued from page 1)

Early Phase

This early research focused on politics, with education policy as a dependent variable, rather than a prime source of inquiry. Political patterns were featured, and the principal research question was who controls our schools? The dominant theses of subsequent research has been the gradual, but major loss of influence by local professional educators to a myriad of outside forces and higher levels of government. Since PEA began, influence over educational policy has increased substantially from the federal and state governments, courts, foundations, and nationwide business organizations and unions

My concerns about the longitudinal evolution of politics of education research center on the identity of our research domain. The essential questions are, "Who are we? Where are we going? Are there any core studies that should be continued longitudinally? Do we have any overarching theories to guide us? How do we relate to the 'mother discipline' of Political Science?" The Politics of Education Association could settle for a future vision of the field as whatever individual professors happen to find interesting at a particular time. Conceptual frameworks could cycle around every conceivable possibility from rational choice to social justice and critical race theory. But before trying to address these questions, more historical observations are useful.

Relating to Political Science

From the start, politics of education research had an uncertain relationship with political science. From the 1960s, most political scientists regarded education as one of many partial variables that would help them explain political theory. Most political scientists seek general theories spanning several policy areas (health, welfare, housing, etc.), rather than a primary interest solely in education. Specialization in education politics has been an uncertain route to tenure in political science departments. Some established political scientists, like Paul Peterson at Chicago and Lorraine McDonnell at UC Santa Barbara, work continuously in education, but many exited after addressing some component of education politics. For example, the entire sub-field of political socialization of children lost priority in political science during the 1970s.

Consequently, politics of education became ensconced in educational administration departments and was not always a required course. Politics was an adjunct of administrator preparation in the 1970s, but some states did not require knowledge of politics for certification. The number of scholars grew rapidly, however, and the 1970s brought an explosion of research and publications (Wirt & Kirst, 1982). Major studies were developed on voting behavior, federalism, city political patterns, and loss of local educator control, for example.

Frameworks

The conceptual frameworks for such research had considerable commonality and were reinforcing. Fred Wirt edited 30 books for D.C. Heath/Lexington from 1970 to 1980 on the politics of education. PEA, created in the 1960s, grew rapidly. Major data-bases were instituted on such topics as voting, interest groups, and political institutions at the federal, state, and local levels. Several scholars worked on comparative state politics, creating detailed quantitative and qualitative knowledge of state political patterns (Campbell & Mazzone, 1976).

There were few policy recommendations with a consistent focus on who governs. If scholarly cohesion is a desirable criterion, 1970-1980 was a golden era. The 1980s was a decade of

more scholarly conceptual and topical diversity and an increased focus on policy analysis per se by PEA members. In part, this was caused by even more fragmentation of institutional governance, and added political players. Attention to local politics and the role of professional educators eroded. At the same time, education voting databases were not maintained. Consequently, the electoral connection at the crucial local level (school boards, tax and bonds, etc.) was lost, as well as analyses of trends in non-voting and the social bases of electoral participation. Localities still operate the schools. They hire and negotiate with teachers through 95,000 elected school board members, but it has become easier to make generalizations about state or federal politics. Despite this focus, PEA research on comparative state politics dropped substantially from the 1970s.

Policy and Political Analyses

By the 1990s, Wirt and Kirst observed that “recent analyses of the linkages between policy analysis, on the one hand, and politics on the other, suggested that contemporary focus on the first has been poorly linked to the theoretical needs of the second” (Wirt & Kirst, 1997, p. 321). PEA members expanded their focus on changing education policy, but the underlying politics often receded from the forefront of their analyses. For example, we know little about how education interest groups mobilize (e.g. traditional Christians); how group leaders relate to and recruit members; and the impact of interest groups upon policy.

We did gain more understanding of the impact of ideas and policy entrepreneurs (Mintrom, 2000; McDonnell, 2005). During the 1990s, think tanks like Brookings, Hoover, American Enterprise Institute, and Fordham Foundation began to produce more politics research, but these organizations lack close ties to PEA. These think tanks focused on unions, and politics of choice among other areas. The 2006 special issue of PEA exemplifies the current profusion of conceptual frameworks and topics used by PEA scholarship (Educational Policy, 2006). Articles feature social justice, critical race theory, sodomy, teen pregnancy, and Arab American youth. None of these domains would have been featured in the initial years (1965-75) of PEA. But the world has

changed a lot in the past 42 years! (Wirt & Kirst, 2005).

PEA's Identity

This brings me back to the questions posed in the Introduction. Who are we? Are there any core studies or domains? What theories are most useful? Should we feature longitudinal studies? In her 2005 review, McDonnell observed that, "the strong link between material interests and idea-based conceptions of what constitutes an appropriate education is recognized now. But strangely missing from this analytical portrait of educational politics is a depiction of the politics closest to schools and classrooms" (p. 38).

The local focus is where PEA began in 1965, but the task now is daunting. We know something about a few big cities, but there are huge black holes of inner ring suburbs, exurbs, small towns, and rural areas. Perhaps a longitudinal study of a sample of many of localities with the same policy issues is a priority. Federal, state, and local interactions would be featured in these specific local contexts.

But this would require a coordinated research effort that goes beyond letting individual scholars follow their current interests, or hot topics like charter schools. It would draw on interdisciplinary perspectives in political science, economics, and sociology. Political institutions (including bureaucracies) would be at the forefront. But this is only one possibility for PEA collaboration and focus based on historical experience. The main thing is to get a PEA discussion started on our future directions.

References

- Campbell, R., & Mazzioni, T.Z. (1976). *State Policymaking for the Public Schools*. Richmond, CA: McCutchan.
- Iannaccone, L. (1967). *Politics in Education*. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education.
- McDonnell, L. (2006). "The politics of education influencing policy and beyond," in Susan Fuhrman (ed). *State of Education Policy Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.
- Mintrom, M. (2000). *Policy Entrepreneurs and School Choice*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Wirt, F., & Kirst. (1972). *The Political Web of American Schools*. Boston: Little Brown.

Wirt, F., & Kirst, M. (1982). *Schools in Conflict*. Richmond, CA: McCutchan.

Wirt, F., & Kirst, M. (1997). *The Political Dynamics of American Education*. Richmond, CA: McCutchan.

Wirt, F., & Kirst, M. (2005). *The Political Dynamics of American Education, Third Edition*. Richmond, CA: McCutchan.



MESSAGE FROM THE AWARDS COMMITTEE CHAIR:

DOROTHY SHIPPS
BARUCH COLLEGE, CUNY

Dear PEA members:

On page 12 you will find the Call for Nominations for the Outstanding Dissertation in the Politics of Education. It is intended to support graduate student research and publication on political processes and outcomes in organized education grades preK-16, from the United States and abroad. Recent winners of the Outstanding Dissertation in the Politics of Education award include Tiina Itkonen (2003-05), Brendan Maxcy (2003-05), Julie McDaniel (2002), and Lance Fusarelli (2000).

Doctoral students who received their degree between June 30, 2005 and July 1 2006 are eligible. The winner will be given serious consideration for publication in our PEA book series, if the winner is interested in publication with us. This new benefit is aimed at encouraging high quality nominations and early career publication. Recognition at our annual business meeting held at AERA comes in addition to a token cash prize of \$250. In addition, the winner will be given written comments from the awards committee with publication of the dissertation as a series of articles or book in mind.

The initial application process will be electronic, as it was last year. In addition to a nomination form from the dissertation sponsor (attached), each nominee must complete an application form (also attached) including a 400-word abstract of his or her dissertation. Both

documents should be sent to dorothy_shipps@baruch.cuny before **midnight of November 30, 2006**. Members of the PEA Awards Committee will rate all of the applications and request three copies of the full dissertation from finalists in the late fall. We will advertise this call widely via AERA, UCEA, APSA and of course, PEA members. You may nominate more than one student. Please feel free to post the attached call for nominations at your institutions, but as previously noted, there is a limited time left to nominate.

Members of the PEA Awards Committee are:

Dorothy Shipps, Chair, Baruch College, CUNY
James Cibulka, University of Kentucky
Eric Freeman, Georgia State University
Bonnie Fusarelli, North Carolina State University
Hanne Mawhinney, University of Maryland
Douglas Mitchell, University of California, Riverside



A Forty-Two Year Perspective...

(Alemán & Maxcy, Continued from page 1)

We are recent arrivals in our respective institutions and to the politics of education as a field of study. Still, as students of educational politics in the always colorful and contentious state of Texas, we were encouraged throughout our course of study to reflect on our place in the changing politics of education arena by our mentor Jay D. Scribner. We did so guided by our prior experiences and our emerging questions. As former young guns of PEA such as Professors Kirst, Scribner, and others retire, we find ourselves and our way among a younger cadre of researchers and scholars who are continuing to infuse the field with diverse perspectives, methodologies, and lines of inquiry. As part of this cadre, we agree with Dr. Kirst that “[t]he main thing is to get a PEA discussion started on our future *directions*”—plural.

It is very clear to us that how we choose to proceed as a field into the next forty years will have direct policy and political implications. This is particularly so for diverse student populations

coming of age in societies brought closer through information technologies and globalizing economic trends—two trend that catalyze and undermine localized democratic movements. We are excited by the ferment of a field which has incorporated and continues to seek a wide array of methods and theoretical approaches to inform our research and recommendations. Looking to the future from our modest 2-year tenure in academia, we would like to offer what we think are important topics of discussion, differ in our reading of the history of the politics of education field of study, and call for a more aggressive and engaged research incorporating multiple perspectives on politics and policymaking to serve the ends of social justice.

Multiple Views of PEA History

While Kirst asks whether our field should be guided by our “mother discipline of political science,” we note that political science and political scientists had for decades largely ignored power, values, and conflict at play in American schools (Eliot, 1959). Forgotten were the long historical and ideological battles that marginalized communities and students had to struggle against in order to reach any semblance of equality and equity (Bell, 1980; Donato, 1997; Kozol, 1991). Although issues of who was allowed to attend school (and with whom), what was to be taught, or how schools were to be funded were considered and debated, many political scientists, as noted by Kirst, chose not to pursue this line inquiry because “[s]pecialization in education politics was an uncertain route to tenure in political science departments...” However, other scholars have and continue to re-center questions of power, conflict, and values within their research, some drawing attention to the sinews of power lightly covered by the veneer of “knowledge neutrality” in educational research (e.g., Spring, 1992; 2005).

These questions have been pursued through various lines of inquiry and informed by a variety of theoretical perspectives. As we discuss in our EAQ article (Scribner *et al.*, 2003), the portrayal of PEA as a field with a messy center may mischaracterize a field with multiple and intersecting traditions. It also suggests a field that is meandering rather than one characterized by a great deal of contention over the direction(s) that might be taken. In putting

together that article we found a re-reading of the literature from this point of view revealing. By describing the integrative and aggregative tensions that have characterized the evolving field, we warned against forcing the research or researchers into a narrow understanding of what “good” research in this field really was. As stated, “At issue for our field is the nature and control of the gate-keeping mechanisms. Integrative efforts to define and enforce the boundaries of the discipline are problematic and counterproductive where non-mainstream research and researchers are systematically excluded” (p. 33).

When we attended PEA meetings as graduate students, we found a similarly diverse and accomplished group of scholars. Moreover, as scholars new to the field we were party, and in large part witnesses, to a great dialogue between scholars who engaged in respectful and incisive exchanges of ideas. In one exchange initiated at a symposia regarding the 2002 PEA Yearbook—an exchange which subsequently spilled over into the foyer and seems to be re-animated in various foyers at subsequent annual meetings—the levels of engagement and discourse were suggestive of what the politics of the politics of education research might be. For young scholars seeking a field of study, we were hooked. However, more than enticing us to listen and engage in the conversation, this level of discourse exemplified what we read in the historical account as well as future promise of our field:

[T]he field has advanced through dynamic interplay among paradigms or research traditions, critiquing and complementing one another, as each competes to define the center. The field has and will continue to benefit from a genuine and critical engagement of a wider array of problems, theories, and methods. We would argue that although messy and contentious, this interplay is central to the field. (Scribner et al., 2003, p. 33)

Future of (a socially just) PEA

We acknowledge the potential problem of balkanization and share a concern that PEA is ill-served by a purely aggregative approach to research—as a “big tent” stretched over a

balkanized field characterized by “benign neglect” of one another’s research, to borrow Donmoyer’s (1999) portrayal of educational administration. We feel a choice between an integrative (like the positivistic push in the 1960s) and an aggregative vision is a false one. Rather, the field is best served by a critical dialogue among theorists and researchers in an inclusive but engaged field. In this sense, we applaud Kirst’s call to bring the issue to the table and have little worry that the case can be made for theoretic approaches such as Critical Race Theory, critique of apolitical characterizations of distributing leadership in ethnically and linguistically diverse, high poverty schools, axiological orientations toward socially just outcomes, or shedding light on the complex issues of power encountered by GBLT administrators.

We concur with Marshall and Gerstl-Pepin’s (2005) premise that our field of study and manner of practicing leadership is in need of a focus on educational and political realities. This hermeneutic understanding of reality—where historical context is visible, power dynamics are incorporated, and understanding the needs of marginal groups is part of the equation—contributes to the healthy tension between integrative and aggregative interests of which we speak (Scribner et al., 2003). For example, Andersen and Herr (1993) reveal how “dominant institutional norms and the struggle of students to form an identity constitute a micro-political struggle,” a struggle that “takes place under the noses, but outside the consciousness, of most educational institutions” (pg. 59). Guajardo and Guajardo (2004) speak to the ongoing influence of student political empowerment and organizing in 1968 on an evolving community identity and perceptions of segregation, teaching, and curriculum in a South Texas school. López (2003) further challenges the field to fulfill its duty in training educational leaders to critique and interrogate the ways race and racism affect the larger discourse on practice and politics. Finally, Lugg (2003) describes how many statewide and local political fights were ignited by “the possible homosexual influences lurking about in public schools” (p. 96). Probing un- or under-interrogated understandings of the world while researching and inserting critical interpretations of political

reality(ies) must remain central elements to scholarship on and of educational politics if the field is to continue to flourish.

Where we respectfully disagree with Kirst’s perspective is in the apparent call to “re-integrate” the field, re-directing the field to the study of common concerns and foci—“a coordinated research effort that goes beyond letting individual scholars follow their current interests.” This is not to suggest that we oppose large scale research or collaborative efforts, or that we aren’t in need of some occasional guidance. Rather, we are concerned that bringing research to scale to increase its penetration often has the effect of narrowing its focus, with substantial consequences for those serving in and served by the endeavor (Hinings & Greenwood, 2002). While particular questions and interests are served well by such an approach, the field may not be. We favor a more pluralistic approach to political inquiry made rigorous through vigorous, engaged dialogue and one that is incisive through respectful critique. Messy as it appears, aggregating our political accounts from local and individual levels and hashing it out in the journals, on conference panels, at the PEA meeting, or even in any available foyer seems the more productive if less grand and pristine approach.

References

Anderson, G. L., & Herr, K. (1993). The micro-politics of student voices: Moving from diversity of bodies to diversity of voices in schools. In C. Marshall (Ed.), *The new politics of race and gender* (pp. 58-68). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of education and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93, 518-533.

Bell, D. A. (2004). *Silent covenants: Brown v. Board of education and the unfulfilled hopes for racial reform*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Donato, R. (1997). *The other struggle for equal schools: Mexican Americans during the civil rights era*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Donmoyer, R. (1999). The continuing quest for a knowledge base: 1976-1998. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration: A project of the American Educational Research Association* (2nd ed., pp. 25-44). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Eliot, T. H. (1959). Toward an understanding of public school politics. *American Political Science Review*, 53(4), 1032-1051.

Guajardo, M. A., & Guajardo, F. J. (2004). The impact of *Brown* on the Brown of south Texas: A micropolitical perspective on the education of Mexican Americans in a south Texas community. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 501-526.

Hinings, C. R., & Greenwood, R. (2002). Disconnects and consequences in organization theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47(3), 411-421.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities*. New York: Harper Perennial.

López, G. R. (2003). The (racially neutral) politics of education: A critical race theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(1), 69-94.

Lugg, C. A. (2003). Sissies, faggots, lezzies, and dykes: Gender, sexual orientation, and a new politics of education? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(1), 95-104.

Marshall, C., & Gerstl-Pepin, C. (2005). *Re-framing educational politics for social justice*. Boston: Pearson.

San Miguel, G., & Valencia, R. R. (1998). From the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo to *Hopwood*: The educational plight and struggle of Mexican Americans in the southwest. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68(3), 353-412.

Scribner, J. D., Alemán, E., & Maxcy, B. (2003). Emergence of the politics of education field: Making sense of the messy center. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(1), 10-40.

Spring, J. (2005). *Conflict of interests: The politics of American education* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Spring, J. (1992). Knowledge and power in research into the politics of urban education. In J. G. Cibulka, R. J. Reed, K. K. Wong & Politics of Education Association (Eds.), *The politics of urban education in the United States: The 1991 yearbook of the Politics of Education Association* (pp. 207). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.



**CONGRATULATIONS TO OUR
NEWLY ELECTED OFFICERS**

Bruce Cooper	President
Lora Cohen-Vogel	Secretary
Vincent Anfara, Jr.	Treasurer
Rick Ginsberg	Member At-large
Brendan Maxcy	Member At-large

Organizational Spotlight~

The American Political Science Association

Over the years, the possibility of collaboration with the American Political Science Association (APSA) has been discussed and debated. However, nothing has ever developed. In order to foment discussion on this topic, some general information about the urban politics section of the APSA has been contributed by Dorothy Shipps (Baruch College, CUNY)

The urban politics section of the APSA and the PEA have many common and overlapping interests, often bringing complementary conceptual lenses to the problems of urban schooling. APSA urbanists often debate the regime theory and pluralist perceptions of urban school reform, and the political scientists involved have contributed a strong body of work in both traditions to our understanding of the politics of urban school reform, including the NSF 12-city study of civic capacity for school reform (by Clarence Stone, Jeff Henig and others), and Paul Peterson's still influential body of work connecting urban development to schooling policy exemplified by "City Limits." More recently the urban politics section of APSA has seen work on school board elections, and political incorporation of minority groups. But the Urban Politics section of APSA is debating the need to embed its urban focus in better understanding of state and national politics more generally. The PEA membership brings a stronger tradition of examining state and national education reform politics, and has helped established the baseline for educational politics in times of equilibrium.

For those considering membership in both organizations, the urban politics section of APSA requires membership in APSA (based on a sliding scale dependent on income) as well as an additional section fee of just under \$30.00. Members receive a couple of APSA publications including a free subscription to *Urban Affairs Review*, recently voted the official organ of the Urban Politics section.

2006 POLITICS OF EDUCATION YEARBOOK

Be on the lookout for the upcoming 2006 Politics of Education Yearbook, entitled, *Power, Education, and the Politics of Social Justice*. This year's yearbook was co-edited by Andrea K. Rorrer (University of Utah) and Catherine A. Lugg (Rutgers).

The focus for the 2006 Politics of Education Yearbook is the intersection of power, education, and social justice. Issues surrounding social justice and education have become increasingly salient for both researchers and practitioners during the past 10 years as public school workers strive to ensure equitable conditions for the diverse populations whom they serve. Despite the need for critical attention, frequently, social justice is a secondary matter, isolated from larger, operational issues such as meeting No Child Left Behind mandates or is subordinated to general discussions about leadership, teaching, and schooling. Consequently, given the intermittent and secondary attention within the politics of education to these issues, this specific yearbook is both timely and necessary.

This yearbook re-centers attention to issues of social justice in schooling, again, issues that have not received explicit scrutiny by recent yearbooks. Here, scholars who are interested in the politics of education extend the important dialogue begun in the 1992 PEA yearbook edited by Catherine Marshall on the new politics of race and gender. Thus, this yearbook addresses the complexities surrounding power, education, and social justice, including the expanding scope of schooling opportunities, methodological tools, and theoretical perspectives relevant to these topics. The contributing authors examine such issues as the role of multiple actors, the nature and availability of participation, whose interests are represented, the role of conflict, and the influence of power in educational practice, structures, policy, and research.

The 2006 Yearbook will include:

- *Introduction: Power, Education, and the Politics of Social Justice.* Andrea K. Rorrer & Catherine A. Lugg
- *The Continuing Struggle for Social Justice.* James Joseph Scheurich & Kathryn Bell McKenzie
- *Race, Politics, and Arab American Youth: Shifting Frameworks for Conceptualizing Educational Equity* Thea Renda Abu El-Haj
- *Thinking about Sodomy: Public Schools, Legal Panopticons, and Queers.* Catherine A. Lugg
- *Teen Pregnancy and Education: Politics of Knowledge, Research, and Practice.* Wanda Pillow
- *The Costs of Being a Child Care Teacher: Revisiting the Problem of Low Wages.* Debra J. Ackerman
- *Is Robin Hood the ‘Prince of Thieves’ or a ‘Pathway to Equity?’ Applying Critical Race Theory to School Finance Political Discourse.* Enrique Alemán, Jr.

- *The Paradox of Poverty Narratives: Educators Struggling With Children Left Behind.* Cynthia I. Gerstl-Pepin
- *The Politics of Distributing Leadership: Reconsidering Leadership Distribution in Two Texas Elementary Schools.* Brendan D. Maxcy & Thu Su’o’ng Thi Nguyen
- *Constructing Accountability Performance for English Language Learner Students: An Unfinished Journey Toward Language Minority Rights.* William R. Black
- *Eroding Inequity: Straddling the Margin of Tolerance.* Andrea K. Rorrer
- *Hiding the Politically Obvious: A Critical Race Theory Preview of Diversity as Racial Neutrality in Higher Education.* Otoniel Jimenez Morfin, Victor H. Perez, Laurence Parker, Marvin Lynn, & John Arrona
- *Evaluating Equity: A Framework for Understanding Action and Inaction on Social Justice Issues.* V. Darleen Opfer



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

Stacey Rutledge and Jeffrey Brooks
Politics of Education Association Bulletin, Co-editors
Florida State University
113 Stone Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306
850-644-6777
jbrooks@coe.fsu.edu or rutledge@coe.fsu.edu

Kyle Ingle
Politics of Education Association Bulletin,
Managing Editor
wki02@garnet.acns.fsu.edu



The Outstanding Dissertation Award in the Politics of Education:

A call for nominations for the best dissertation in the politics of education.

This call is for the 2006 Award. It is designed to foster and support graduate student research and publication on political processes and outcomes in organized education grades preK-16, from the United States and abroad. One aim is to highlight and reward scholars studying political issues in education, as distinct from the interdisciplinary approaches taken by policy studies.

The PEA Awards Committee welcomes any nominated dissertation that addresses the politics of education, including, but not limited to, those that focus on questions of democracy, voice, governance, inequality/equality, power, authority, political accountability, interest group interactions, coalitions and agency at any level of analysis (federal/national, state/provincial, local). Acceptable methods include, but are not limited to, comparative political analysis, case-study analyses of broad trends and reform efforts, qualitative studies, political history and biography, primary and secondary data analysis.

The Award: A \$250 cash award, editorial and stylistic suggestions for publication from the PEA Awards Committee, and recognition at the annual business meeting of PEA held at the annual meeting of AERA. In addition, all finalists will receive a one-year honorary membership to the Politics of Education Association.

The Review Process: Completed nominations received by midnight November 30, 2006 will be reviewed by the PEA Dissertation Award Committee. Up to four finalists will be selected for further consideration by January 2007. Finalists will be asked to submit three complete hard copies of the dissertation to the chair of the PEA Awards Committee for review by committee members. Finalists and winners will be announced in the spring PEA Bulletin and honored at the annual PEA business meeting at the regularly scheduled AERA meeting in April 2007.

Eligibility and Application Process: Dissertations from students who have officially graduated with either an Ed.D. or a Ph.D. in political science or education between June 30, 2005, and July 1, 2006, are eligible for nomination.

The nomination process involves submitting a two-page (400 word maximum) abstract of the dissertation, which clarifies the topic, methods, findings, and conclusions as part of a student application form, as well as a nomination form (both forms accompany this call) from the dissertation sponsor. The sponsor's nomination should include a half page describing why the dissertation is exemplary and its contribution to the politics of education. It also verifies that the doctoral degree was granted between June 30, 2005, and July 1, 2006. No incomplete nominations will be considered. The forms are also available at the PEA website: <http://www.fsu.edu/~pea/>

Completed applications are to be emailed before midnight November 30, 2006 to dorothy_shipps@baruch.cuny.edu. Emailed applications will receive a brief confirmation of receipt. If necessary, applications may be mailed to the address below:

Dorothy Shipps, Chair
PEA Dissertation Awards,
The School of Public Affairs
Baruch College, CUNY
One Bernard Baruch Way, Box D-901
New York, NY 10010-5585

THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
OUTSTANDING DISSERTATION IN THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION
NOMINATION FORM FOR FACULTY-SPONSOR
2005-2006

Dear Faculty Sponsor,

Please fill out this form and email it to dorothy_shipps@baruch.cuny.edu along with the student application form and the student's 400-word abstract of the dissertation. All student nominees for this award should have officially completed the Dissertation between June 30, 2005 and July 1, 2006. You may nominate more than one student for the award, but each nominee must be accompanied by a complete package including a separate abstract and student application form.

Faculty Sponsor Information (please note if your title or address is different now than when you sponsored this dissertation)

Name:

University Affiliation:

Street Address:

Street Address 2:

City, State, Zip:

Country:

Sponsor's email:

STUDENT NOMINEE

Name:

DISSERTATION INFORMATION

Full Title of Nominated Dissertation:

Date of Defense:

Date of Conferral of Degree:

Please attach a statement (between 2-5 paragraphs) describing:

- 1) what makes this student's dissertation exemplary and*
- 2) its overall contribution to the field of the politics of education.*

Nomination Statement (type your statement directly into the field below):

**THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
OUTSTANDING DISSERTATION IN THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION
APPLICATION FORM 2005-2006**

*Please remember to include a two-page (400 word maximum) abstract of the dissertation, which clarifies the topic, methods, finding and conclusions, and a letter of nomination from the dissertation sponsor **with your completed application form** (mailing instructions below).*

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name:

Street Address:

Street Address 2:

City, State, Zip:

Country:

Email:

DISSERTATION INFORMATION

Title of Dissertation:

Sponsor/Mentor/Primary Faculty Advisor Contact Information

Name:

Street Address:

Street Address 2:

City, State, Zip:

Country:

Sponsor's email:

Committee Member/Reader Information

Member/Reader #1:

Member/Reader #2:

Member/Reader #3:

Member/Reader #4:

Member/Reader #5:

Date of Defense:

PROGRAM INFORMATION

Date of Conferral of Degree:

Location of Program:

Degree Awarded:

Email completed applications no later than midnight **November 30, 2006** to **Dorothy Shipps, Chair PEA Awards Committee** at dorothy_shipps@baruch.cuny.edu . Emailed applications will receive a brief confirmation of receipt. If necessary, applications may be mailed to the address below. (*Snail mail nominations will not receive a confirmation of receipt.*)

Dorothy Shipps, PEA Dissertation Awards Chair
The School of Public Affairs
Baruch College, CUNY
One Bernard Baruch Way, Box D-901
New York, NY 10010-5585

**POLITICS OF EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION
(COMPLETE ONLY IF YOU ARE NOT A MEMBER OF AERA)**

Name (please print): _____

Title: _____

Affiliation: _____

Address: _____

Phone: () _____

Email Address: _____

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

Enclosed please find a check to PEA for \$30 for full, one-year membership

**Send to: Vincent A. Anfara, Jr., Treasurer
 Politics of Education Association
 A321 Claxton Complex
 1126 Volunteer Boulevard
 Knoxville, TN 37996-3442**