



*How Did We Get Here? Paradigms, Fields,
and Professions in Education Policy*

Jal Mehta¹
Harvard University

American education was dramatically reshaped between 1980 and 2001. States moved rapidly towards standards-based reform, the federal role greatly expanded, the Republican Party moved from proposing to abolish the Department of Education to presiding over the greatest expansion in its history, and accountability-centered reform triumphed despite the opposition of the strongest interest group in the field, the teachers' unions. What explains these changes?

I engaged in a three-year study seeking to answer this question. Since reform first moved through the states and only later became federalized, my study examined the movement to standards-based reform in three case study states (Maryland, Michigan, and

(Continued on page 3)

¹ Jal Mehta (Ph.D., Sociology and Social Policy, Harvard University) is currently an Assistant Professor at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. His dissertation, which was chaired by Christopher Jencks, is entitled "The Transformation of American Educational Policy, 1980-2001: Ideas and the Rise of Accountability Politics." Dr. Mehta was a co-winner of the Outstanding Dissertation Award in the Politics of Education for 2007-08.

In Memoriam – William L. Boyd



William Lowe Boyd of State College died September 21, 2008 at home. He was born on September 11, 1935 in Louisville, Kentucky to Norris and Helen Boyd and is survived by his wife of 50 years, Emily Remine Boyd, and children, Stephen Norris Boyd, Katherine Shields Boyd, Anne Boyd Rabkin and son in law, Brian Rabkin and a granddaughter, Helen Ila Rabkin.

Bill was a graduate of the University of Tennessee (B.S., 1957), Northwestern University (M.M., 1961), and the University of Chicago (Ph.D., 1973). Bill and Emily met as undergraduate musicians in the Knoxville Symphony Orchestra. Bill was a French hornist and shared his lifelong love of music with all that he knew.

(Continued on page 7)

Save the Date!
PEA's 40th Anniversary Gala
6:30 – 10:30 pm
Monday April 13th, 2009
Hotel Del Coronado, San Diego

TABLE of CONTENTS

Page 1	<i>How Did We Get Here? Paradigms, Fields, and Professions in Education Policy</i> Jal Mehta, Harvard University
Page 1	<i>In Memoriam - William L. Boyd</i>
Page 2	Message from the President
Page 8	Honoring William Lowe Boyd's Intellectual Contributions
Page 8	PERSPECTIVES ~ <i>Ed (Not) in '08</i> Carolyn Herrington, Florida State University
Page 10	Treasurer's Report
Page 10	Dissertation Awards Committee Seeking Nominations
Page 11	Publications Committee Report
Page 12	PEA Announces the William L. Boyd National Education Policy Workshop
Page 12	Membership Committee Report
Page 13	Clark Seminar Seeking Nominations
Page 13	PEA Program Chair Report
Page 13	Of Interest...

The Politics of Education Association Annual Breakfast UCEA Convention 2008

Date: Saturday, November 1, 2008
Time: 7:00-7:50 am

Yeoman Room
Buena Vista Palace Hotel
Orlando, Florida

Catherine Lugg, Rutgers University
will present

*Skipping Towards Gomorrah: US Public Schooling at
the End of the Conservative Era*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT:

LORA COHEN-VOGEL
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Our friend and colleague, William L. Boyd, inspired us to build deeper understandings of the political and institutional influences on public and private education in the U.S. and around the world. We remember him on page 1 of this issue.

As we say goodbye to a lion of PEA, we also celebrate the work of emerging politics of education scholars in this issue of the *Bulletin*. In his article entitled "How Did We Get Here? Paradigms, Fields, and Professions in Education Policy", Jal Mehta (Harvard University) summarizes findings from his award-winning dissertation project. A second article in this issue by Carolyn Herrington highlights the politics surrounding the 2008 election.

In the spring issue, another recipient of PEA's Outstanding Dissertation Award, David Tandberg (Pennsylvania State University), will delineate key lessons from his dissertation, *Politics, Budgetary Trade-offs and State Funding of Public Higher Education*. Information about nominating candidates for the 2009 Dissertation Award is included in this issue and at the PEA website (http://www.fsu.edu/~pea/award_diss_description.html).

Also in this issue, you will find updates from our Treasurer, our Program Chair for AERA '09, the William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop Committee, and the Publications Committee.

Mark your calendars. PEA's 40th Anniversary Gala is scheduled for Monday evening, April 13, 2009 at the Hotel Del Coronado in San Diego, California. To date, Stacey Rutledge and I have raised over \$11,000 in sponsorship monies for the event. Paul Vallas, Superintendent of the Recovery School

District (New Orleans), will be our guest speaker. A limited number of tickets will go on sale in December. Advance ticket sales and a reduced ticket price will be available for PEA members.

If you will be attending the UCEA meeting later this month in Orlando, please join us for breakfast at 7:00 am on Saturday, November 1 in the Yeoman room. Catherine Lugg will speak about education policy in what she terms “the end of the conservative era.”



How Did We Get Here?
(Mehta, continued from page 1)

Utah) as well as at the federal level.² I conducted more than 80 interviews with state and federal actors who had been involved in the growth of standards-based reform and looked at more than 2,000 pages of archival documents that trace the emergence of these reforms. In this essay, I focus on five central findings from my study.³

A Powerful Paradigm: The Long Shadows of “A Nation at Risk”

A new paradigm emerged out of *A Nation at Risk* that set off a chain of events that reshaped educational politics and policy. While the impact of the 1983 *A Nation at Risk* report is widely acknowledged by education scholars, this study shows in more detail the process by which the “long shadows” of *A Nation at Risk* influenced subsequent events.⁴ *A Nation at Risk* issued recommendations

² These states were chosen because of their diversity along a range of dimensions hypothesized to be important for educational politics. I was also trying to choose less frequently studied states, to increase our overall body of knowledge on state reforms in the 1980s and 1990s.

³ The work described here is under review at several journals and is part of a developing book manuscript. I would be happy to provide more information about methods or findings. I can be reached at jal_mehta@gse.harvard.edu.

⁴ In the study, I also explore the roots of *A Nation at Risk*. *A Nation at Risk* crystallized and publicized a set of concerns which had been building over the previous two decades. So while *A Nation at Risk* provided the spark for the

(some of which were adopted), but its more lasting effect has been in crystallizing a *paradigm* that shaped how policymakers think about reform. This paradigm, which continues to dominate school reform today, has four critical elements: 1) it posited that the economic purpose of education is the most central one to America’s future; 2) it shifted the focus from improving the lot of high poverty students to the need for improved performance by *all* students; 3) it emphasized that schools were the primary culprit for what it described as declining performance, and suggested that schools, and not broader social forces, were responsible for improvement; and 4) it specified that the outcome measure of success should be performance on quantitative tests.

Archival data at the state level reveals sharp shifts in state educational goals after *A Nation at Risk*, with a de-emphasis of more humanistic educational aims and an increased emphasis on goals of efficiency. In one particularly striking example, the Utah goals changed almost overnight. The 1982 Utah goals focused on developing eight types of “maturities”—intellectual, ethical-moral-spiritual, emotional, social, physical, environmental, aesthetic, and serving the community. These diffuse 1982 goals were replaced in 1984 by a more specific practical goal: “The Utah State Board of Education sets as its primary goals the attainment of excellence in education and the improvement of productivity.”

Not only did the terms of the debate shift, the changing definition of education also brought new actors to the table. Interviews at the state level revealed that as schooling became central to economic development, state legislators and governors laid claim to an area that had previously been largely ceded to local school boards. To evaluate this story more quantitatively, I gathered 30 years of State of the State addresses and tracked how education was discussed and the relative share of the addresses devoted to education. Findings

developments I discuss here, a wider range of forces are needed to explain what “caused” *A Nation at Risk*.

suggested that education was increasingly discussed in human capital terms after *A Nation at Risk*, and, that as education was linked to economic development, it became much more prominent relative to other issues on the government agenda. In each state, there was a fourfold increase in the average share of these addresses devoted to education in the years since *A Nation at Risk*.⁵

The changing paradigm not only transformed the terms of the debate and who was involved at the state level, it also precipitated greater federal involvement. Reagan, who in 1980 had argued for the abolition of the Department of Education, changed his tune in 1984 and campaigned on the “excellence” reforms inspired by *A Nation at Risk*. Education also began to rise in voters’ concerns, culminating in its ranking as the most important issue in the 2000 election. Presidents George Herbert Walker Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush all pledged to be education presidents in this shifting environment. Careful archival process tracing shows the importance of the *A Nation at Risk* paradigm in the Charlottesville Summit of governors convened by the elder President Bush in 1989, in President Clinton’s 1994 legislation for Goals 2000 and the Improving Americas’ Schools Act, and in the No Child Left Behind Act, President George W. Bush’s signature domestic initiative. At each of these key moments, actors were motivated (and opponents were constrained) by *A Nation at Risk*’s assumptions about the centrality of education to economic success, about the need for higher standards for all students, about the importance of school accountability, and about tests as the only viable outcome measure of success.

Different Rationales, Same Policy: The Rise of Standards and Accountability

If the paradigm of *A Nation at Risk* explains how the educational problem is defined, what explains the widespread emergence of standards and

⁵ More precisely, the fourfold increase measures the difference in the share devoted to K-12 education on average in the ten years before *A Nation at Risk* in comparison to the share devoted on average in the more than 20 years since *A Nation at Risk*.

accountability as the solution? This study suggests that standards and accountability won the day because they were popular with different constituencies for different reasons. Consider the movements towards standards and accountability in Maryland, Utah, and Michigan and in federal policy. Broadly speaking, one impetus for the movement in each of these contexts was the economic rationale framed by *A Nation at Risk*—that states and the nation as a whole needed to improve their stock of competitive workers if they were to successfully compete in the new economy. This supports the paradigm-centered argument laid out above. But what is particularly interesting about standards and accountability is that the issue drew together a wide set of backers with otherwise differing concerns. In Maryland, the charge was led by a set of Democratic state legislators whose primary stated concern was improving the performance of the weakest schools in the state. These legislators emphasized traditional goals of the political left such as equity, and saw standards and testing as a mechanism to transform schools throughout the state. By contrast, in Utah, the charge was led primarily by the dominant Republican legislature. There the stated concerns were the underperformance or even incompetence of the public school system. Privately, some conservative aides spoke of an opportunity to break the teachers unions and claim what had previously been an issue dominated by Democrats. Interviews conducted for this study suggest that this opportunity for “issue trespassing” was also an important motivation for President Bush to emphasize the issue and for Congressional Republicans to support his push for No Child Left Behind. In the Michigan case and in the federal No Child Left Behind legislation, standards and accountability drew strong support from both left and right. Liberals emphasized the values of higher standards for all schools and disaggregated data as a way to track the performance of minority students, while conservatives emphasized the values of gaining accountability over a failing system.⁶ The

⁶ These are general tendencies; some reformist Democrats also emphasized the importance of accountability to force change

fact that standards and accountability could draw support from different quarters for different reasons explains why it became much more widespread than more partisan strategies for school reform like school vouchers.

From Institutions to Ideas: Explaining the Transformation

This idea-centered account complements a more institutional account in explaining aspects of this transformation, particularly the expansion of the federal role. In an important book, Paul Manna (2006) emphasizes that America's decentralized federalism need not always impede policy developments, as sometimes the federal government can gain "borrowing strength" from policies developed at the state level. This is true of education policy in this case. It also begs three important questions: Why this set of reforms, why now, and why was there such a consensus at the state level to build upon? The idea-centered explanation addresses these questions. It offers a specific account of the ideas that sparked reform over the past two decades; it explains why it took off when it did; and it explains why such different states would sign on to the same set of reforms. Once we understand why so many states were willingly heading in the direction of standards and accountability (42 states had some form of standards by 1994), we can understand why it was possible for the federal government to build on top of those reforms in the 1994 Improving America's Schools Act and then in No Child Left Behind. The paradigm also helps to explain why Bill Clinton and George W. Bush became involved in standards-centered school reform as governors, which in turn became central issues that they ran on when they were seeking to become president.

"Partisan Politics" to "Institutional Politics"

The new "accountability politics" features cleavages which are less "partisan" and more "institutional." Accountability politics divides the educational world in a different way than before:

upon a moribund system, and some Republicans, including President Bush, also emphasized the equity arguments.

while in 1960s and 1970s the most prominent educational cleavages were between Democrats and Republicans, the new cleavages pit schools on one side and a whole range of actors seeking to improve the schools on the other. Accountability is a tool that can and has been used by community activists, civil rights advocates, business groups, and state and federal legislators, among others, to make schools do their bidding. Each of these groups have different concerns and goals for schools, but in all cases they sit outside the schoolhouse walls and are seeking tools that will change the processes that happen inside them. On the other side are teachers and their representatives, who are the ones being held to account, and, not surprisingly, have been the most opposed to the policies. What look like strange bedfellows from the perspective of partisan cleavages—President Bush and civil rights advocates—is more comprehensible when the divide is understood as a set of institutional cleavages between those on the outside of schools trying to bring them to account and those on the inside who would prefer less external interference. My study concluded before the emergence of the recent debate between the "Broader, Bolder" approach that has focused on non-school reform, and the "Educational Equality Project," which emphasizes greater accountability within schools.⁷ It is possible that what I observed in my study of the 1990s through 2001 (legislators vs. educators) is gradually being supplanted by (transformed into?) a struggle *within* the profession between a new set of reformers and those who prefer more traditional solutions.

A "Semi Profession" in an Era of Accountability

One of the distinctive aspects of the study was adding a "sociology of the professions" lens to the study of education politics. Teaching has long been seen by scholars of the professions as a "semi-

⁷ Information on the "Broader, Bolder" approach can be found at <http://www.boldapproach.org/>; information on the "Education Equality Project" can be found at <http://www.educationequalityproject.org/>. An overview of the debate between the two can be found at <http://www.slate.com/blogs/blogs/schoolhouse/archive/2008/09/11/the-divide.aspx>.

profession.” Like other highly feminized professions such as nursing and social work, teaching achieves this dubious distinction because of its short or non-existent levels of training, lack of a knowledge-based that is widely respected by the public, and its inability to set standards to exclude unqualified practitioners. The rapid unionization of the profession between 1960 and 1980 had a number of important positive byproducts for the wages and working conditions of teachers, but it also had the effect of undermining the strongest claim that teachers could make about their profession—that they were primarily concerned with the welfare of their students. To put it more sharply, a profession’s legitimacy rests on its technical knowledge and its social ethos. Teachers had never been highly respected for their technical knowledge; when they compromised their social ethos, they had little left to stand upon. Interviews with legislators, both Republicans and Democrats, suggested that the legislators feared the power of the teachers unions, but that they saw the unions as a largely obstructionist force not interested in real school reform.⁸ With the public clamoring for reform, legislators saw no choice on highly public issues but to favor accountability measures that weren’t popular with the unions, particularly the NEA. The consequence was a downward spiral of distrust: unions dug in as external forces blamed them for failing to improve schools; this resistance only emboldened external reformers to push for even greater accountability. More theoretically, what is hard to understand from an interest group perspective—why did the strongest interest group actor not prevail?—is much more straightforward when viewed through a sociology of the professions lens.

I also compare *A Nation at Risk* to a companion report issued the following year, *Involvement in Learning*, which was intended to be the parallel report about higher education. While both sectors have been subject to similar concerns about under-

⁸ In the study I explore the differences between the AFT and the NEA, particularly AFT president Al Shanker’s efforts to reform the profession.

productivity and the need to produce more skilled workers for a post-industrial economy, I find that the higher education sector has been largely protected from similar accountability demands because of its higher status, more respected professional knowledge base, and the decentralized nature of the sector. The fact that K-12 teaching was institutionalized in an administrator-dominated bureaucracy, as opposed to the guild-type power of faculty in higher education institutions, has also left teachers much more vulnerable than university faculty to movements for increased top-down control.

Directions for Future Research: Paradigms, Fields and Professions

These substantive conclusions suggest a more general theoretical point of interest for future work in the politics of education. New lenses such as paradigms, fields, and the sociology of the professions may be as much use in understanding educational politics as more traditional lenses such as interest groups and institutions. To take these one at a time: The summary above should give a good sense of the decisive role that a new paradigm played in changing educational politics and policy. Paradigms or ideas are gradually becoming more prominent within political science and political sociology (Beland 2005, Berman 2001, Blyth 2002) and have even more recently started to be used in educational politics (Boyd, Kerchner, and Blyth 2008). But there is much more to do here. While a first generation of scholars was intent on convincing skeptics that ideas matter, an emerging second generation is considering the more complicated question of *how* ideas matter (see Mehta forthcoming). A second lens is the notion of fields (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992), a sociological concept which has made little imprint on the study of American politics.

This study suggests that over the past 25 years the economic field has colonized the educational field in certain important respects, as educational goals have been subordinated to economic ones, business methods have been valorized, and holders of MBAs have increasingly been invited to take charge of

school systems. This is not the same as saying that the reforms were driven by business *groups* (governors were the most important actors), but it is rather to say that those who could attach themselves to the economic *field* were given greater legitimacy, and those who favored softer educational purposes saw their influence shrinking. A third lens is the sociology of the professions, which suggests that a profession's characteristics and its history of how it has institutionalized its power are important variables to pay attention to. Sociologists concerned with the nature of teachers' work have long been interested in the sociology of the professions, but this perspective has been rarely utilized to explain the politics of a professional sector. Future work could incorporate these new lenses with the old as we seek to make sense of an increasingly complicated educational landscape.

References

- Beland, Daniel. 2005. "Ideas and Social Policy: An Institutional Perspective." *Social Policy and Administration* 39(1): 1-18.
- Berman, Sheri. 2001. "Ideas, Norms and Culture in Political Analysis." *Comparative Politics* 33(2): 231-250.
- Blyth, Mark. 2002. *Great Transformations: Economic Ideas and Institutional Change in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loic Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Boyd, William Lowe, Charles Kerchner, and Mark Blyth. 2008. *The Transformation of Great American School Districts: How Big Cities Are Reshaping Public Education*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.
- Manna, Paul. 2006. *Schools In: Federalism and the National Education Agenda*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Mehta, Jal. Forthcoming. "From 'Whether' to 'How': The Varied Roles of Ideas in Politics." In *Ideas and Politics in Social Science Research*, eds. Daniel Beland and Bob Cox. Accepted into volume; volume under review at Oxford University Press.



William Boyd, In Memoriam (Continued from page 1)

Dr. Boyd served as Batschelet Chair Professor of Educational Leadership at Pennsylvania State University and editor of the *American Journal of Education*. He was a professor at Penn State University for 28 years. A specialist in education policy and politics and educational administration, he has published over 140 articles and has co-edited seventeen books. He served as president of the Politics of Education Association, as an officer of the American Educational Research Association, and was a Fulbright Scholar in Australia and England, and a Professor or Visiting Scholar at eleven universities in the US and around the world including the University of Rochester, the University of Washington, Monash and Deakin Universities in Australia, Gothenburg and Umea Universities in Sweden, the University of British Columbia, the University of Wales, the Universities of Liverpool and Warwick, and the Chinese University of Hong Kong. In 2002 he received the "Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award" from the University Council of Educational Administration. In 2007, he received the "Student Mentorship Award" from Penn State University's Department of Education Policy Studies.

As a practitioner he served as an elementary and high school teacher, Assistant to the Principal of the University of Chicago High School (part of the famous Laboratory School founded by John Dewey), Assistant to the Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Liaison to the Chicago Public Schools at the University of Chicago, Professor-in-Charge of the Educational Leadership Program at Penn State, and in a variety of leadership roles for almost 50 summers in the educational programs at the Interlochen Center for the Arts in Michigan. His lifelong commitment to improving the quality and equity of education in this country and around the world is carried forward by his friends, colleagues, students and family.

A Celebration of Life will be held at Interlochen next summer (2009). Memorial donations, in lieu of flowers, may be made to:

The Educational Leadership Program
College of Education
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

Or:

The Minnesota Building or Braeside
Preservation Fund
Interlochen Center of the Arts
Interlochen, Michigan 49643

**HONORING WILLIAM LOWE BOYD'S
INTELLECTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS**

**DOUGLAS E. MITCHELL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE**

Gedenkschrift: A book honoring a respected academic, containing original contributions by the academic's close colleagues.

The Politics of Education Association is recognizing and honoring Bill Boyd's intellectual contributions in three important ways. First, there is the William L. Boyd National Education Politics Workshop (See page 12 of this edition). Second, Jim Guthrie, editor of the Peabody Journal of Education has offered to create a special edition of that journal devoted to memorializing Bill Boyd's leadership and intellectual contributions. Third, the Association is also sponsoring the development of a book taking up Bill's unfinished work devoted to reviewing education policymaking over the tumultuous years of 1950 to 2010. Doug Mitchell (UC, Riverside), Bob Crowson (Vanderbilt) and Dorothy Shipps (CUNY) have agreed to edit these two tributes. They will be seeking contributors to each of these venues. The Peabody Journal articles will concentrate on the personal, intellectual and leadership aspects of Bill Boyd's life. The edited book will start with Bill's outline of critical policy initiatives, and provide an interpretive framework

for understanding the past and orienting toward the future of education politics and policy.

If you are interested in participating in either of these ventures, please contact one of the co-editors: Douglas E. Mitchell (mitchell@ucr.edu) Robert L. Crowson (robert.l.crowson@vanderbilt.edu) Dorothy Shipps (shipps@mac.com)



PERSPECTIVES ~

Ed (Not) in '08

Carolyn Herrington*
Florida State University

Once again, a United States Presidential campaign is coming to a close without any serious or prolonged discussion of the role of education in the nation's future. This is not unusual and not for lack of trying. Education is not normally one of the top two or three issues that draw the focus of national presidential campaigns. Convincing explanations exist for this, despite how frustrating it is to the education community. The small federal role in educational policy generally and K-12 policy specifically is an oft offered reason to account for the lack of saliency of education in presidential campaigns. Another is the purported lack of payoff. Arguably, campaign strategists do not believe that it will generate new or more committed voters into a candidate's fold.

Armed with that knowledge, education advocates tried to buck the odds this year. Two efforts are particularly interesting. The first, *Ed in 08*, is a campaign funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates and Eli Broad foundations. It is dedicated precisely to making sure that education issues are not lost in the overall campaign and that the candidates be pressured to offer detailed proposals and forced to

* Carolyn Herrington is a Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Florida State University.

defend these through vigorous give and take on the campaign trail. A purported \$60 million has been dedicated to this cause. How much is \$60 million? Apparently not enough. Despite national marketing efforts to bring focus on high-profile events and leaders in key battleground states, there is little evidence *Ed in '08* has broken through the cacophony fueled by the blogosphere or the 24-hour news machines.

The Aspen Institute organized a related but more focused and timely effort, convening educational, governmental, business and foundation heavy-hitters in mid-September. The group sought to press candidates and their strategists, arguing that to ignore education is to ignore the country's future. Unfortunately, this convocation met the indignity of watching the country's financial sector implode as the week ended in the federal government's planned takeover of the country's enormous portfolio of real estate mortgage-fueled bad debt. As if to mock the brave attempt to push education to the fore of the campaign agenda, the week witnessed the alarming crash of one financial giant after the next (and the deregulatory principles they left in their wake). Both events revealed the difficulty of increasing the profile of educational issues, much less to achieve substantive public debate regarding the education needs to go and the policies needed to get it there.

The precedent-breaking changes to the federal support of elementary and secondary education—a signature policy thrust of the last successful presidential candidate—presented one reason to hope education would play a prominent role. Propelled by seeming success in raising test scores for low and minority children in Texas, the 2000 Bush campaign hinted that education can help put someone in the White House. Further more the reputation for bi-partisanship—proffered as evidence of the pragmatic and results-orientation of the first MBA-styled presidency—was honed to a considerable degree by his work on Texas education policy. How much any one issue contributes to decisions by millions of Americans on who to vote for is always difficult to determine. Given the sheer chaos of the Florida electoral debacle in 2000 it is

even less clear if Bush owed any of his victory to his efforts as an education reformer in Texas. A recent cause to believe education might have moved to the fore this year is the growing awareness of America's eroding economic edge to foreign competitors. The Beijing Olympics felled overnight many Americans outdated views on China and presumably other rising economic powerhouses.

But writing just four weeks before Election Day, it must be said that none of the reasons noted appear to be distinguishing this campaign from others. A narrow band of policy areas—the economy and the Middle East—have dominated the substantive policy debate and personal-attribute oriented campaigns have made even these important policy areas difficult to achieve notice.

If anything, education policy—at least as viewed through the prism of the two dominant parties' platforms—appears to have slid back from the non-partisan thrust of the early years of the Bush administration. The Bush platform for the Republican Party in 2000 softened language on disparaging the federal role in education and some other red-meat Republican issues. In contrast, the current platform features issues that divide the parties such as vouchers and parental choice and local and parental control. Still, the No Child Left Behind Act receives support from both candidates with only the degree of change needed remaining in play. Both candidates also speak to the importance of early childhood education. This is particularly strong theme in the Obama campaign, which consistently lists education as a top priority. Should we have hoped this year would buck the odds? In one sense, the *Ed in '08* campaign admits to the difficulty of the enterprise. After all, \$60 million is not “chump change.” It was a stake that the Bill and Melinda Gates and Eli Broad Foundations deemed necessary to garner attention to the issue. For those of us interested in a lively discussion and an energized debate on the strengths and weaknesses of the current federal role in education, the role of education in strengthening civic life and its priority in economic development, the disappointment continues...

TREASURER'S REPORT

TAMARA V. YOUNG
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

AERA Account Balance

Between January and June of this calendar year, we have received \$3,354.56 in membership dues and spent \$2,640.29 from our AERA account. Table 1 describes our expenditures as of June 30, 2008.

AERA Financial Statement (January 2008 – June 2008)

Description	Income	Expenses
Beginning Balance	\$14,437.77	
Membership Dues	\$3,354.56	
Award Plaques		\$767.27
Honorarium - Dissertation Award Winners (2)		\$600.00
Events - National Education Politics Workshop '08 & Annual Breakfast '07 (reimbursed in '08)		\$1,255.52
Postage		\$17.50
Total	\$17,792.33	\$2,640.29
Balance	\$15,006.93	

FAQs

Members commonly ask about the distribution of expenditures. The short answer is that the bulk of membership fees pays for the publication and mailing of the special editions of *The Peabody Journal of Education (PJE)* and *Educational Policy (PEA Yearbook)*, which are sponsored by the Association. For 2007, 88% of our expenses were allocated to publications and their mailing. Annual SIG fees to AERA, and awards and plaques recognizing outstanding dissertations, theoretical and practical contributions to the politics of education, as well as service to the Politics of Education Association have accounted for most of the non-publication related expenses in the past.

In celebration of the Association's 40th year, we are embarking this year on two new one-time initiatives—A Legacy Project (audio and video project tracing the history of the Association and educational politics field) and PEA's 40th Anniversary Gala. These endeavors will no doubt shift the distribution of expenditures; however, our current fee structure will support these activities. Also this year, we will continue to fund our two publications, the Annual Members Breakfast at UCEA, the William L. Boyd National Education Politics Workshop, and our Awards projects.

We will continue to strive to keep our financial processes transparent and membership fees sufficient to carry out worthwhile activities while not producing undue financial stress on the Association and our members.

DISSERTATION AWARDS COMMITTEE SEEKING NOMINATIONS

DOROTHY SHIPPS

BARUCH COLLEGE, CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW
YORK

The PEA Dissertation Awards Committee is seeking nominations for the Outstanding Dissertation in the Politics of Education for 2008-2009. This year's competition is for dissertations successfully defended between June 30 2007 and July 1 2008. The deadline for nominations is November 15, 2008. The winner(s) will receive a \$250 award and one year's free membership to the PEA in addition to being honored at the 2009 PEA business meeting at AERA in San Diego.

The Outstanding Dissertation Award 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.

The Committee welcomes nominated dissertations that address 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.

Nominations require two simple forms and a four-to-six page (1200 word maximum) dissertation abstract. The two forms are 1) a nomination form from the scholar's dissertation sponsor and 2) a scholar application form, to be completed by the dissertation's author. Forms should be downloaded, filled out and emailed to Dorothy Shipps at shipps@mac.com. Both forms and this year's call for nominations are available on the PEA website: http://www.fsu.edu/~pea/award_diss_description.html

The Review Process: The Dissertation Awards Committee evaluates each nomination packet, paying special attention to the scholar's abstract and the sponsor's assessment of the dissertation's contributions. We are seeking a clear understanding of the dissertation's topic and conceptual approach, a detailed description of the data collection procedures and methods used, as well as findings and conclusions. Based on this review, between four and six finalists are selected by the committee as a whole. Each finalist is asked to submit three copies of the full dissertation to the committee. Every finalist dissertation is read, and commented upon, by at least three committee members. The full committee selects the award winners, to be announced at the PEA business meeting held during AERA's annual meeting.

There is no limit to the number of nominations each institution can submit. Please nominate your students, and encourage your colleagues to do so as well. If you have questions, feel free to contact the committee chair Dorothy Shipps, CUNY (shipps@mac.com).

Dissertation Awards Committee

Dorothy Shipps (Chair), Baruch College, CUNY
Betty Malen, University of Maryland, College Park
Brendan Maxcy, University of Missouri, Columbia
E. Vance Randall, Brigham Young University
Erik C. Ness, University of Pittsburgh
Lorraine McDonnell, University of California, Santa Barbara

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

KATHRYN A. MCDERMOTT
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS, AMHERST

The Publications Committee is pleased to announce that it has selected the editors for the 2010 Politics of Education Yearbook (published simultaneously as an issue of *Educational Policy*.) Edited by Jeffrey S. Brooks of Auburn University and Brendan D. Maxcy of the University of Missouri, the 2010 Yearbook will be entitled "International Perspectives on the Politics of Education: Leadership and Identity in Multiple Contexts," We have also been working with the PEA officers to clarify recruitment procedures and terms of office for Publications Committee members. We will soon be putting out a call for applications and nominations to fill vacancies on the committee.

Publications Committee

Kathryn McDermott (chair), University of Massachusetts-Amherst
Lisa Cuerars, Sage Publications
Alfred Hess, Northwestern University
Gerardo Lopez, Indiana University
V. Darleen Opfer, University of Cambridge
Marion Orr, Brown University
Catherine Lugg, Rutgers University
Phil Altbach (Editor, *Education Policy*)

Graduate Students
Join PEA for only \$20 per year at
<http://www.aera.net>

**PEA ANNOUNCES THE WILLIAM L. BOYD
NATIONAL EDUCATION POLITICS
WORKSHOP**

**KATIE BULKLEY
MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY**

Planning for the William L. Boyd National Education Politics Workshop is well underway. The mentoring workshop, which brings together experienced and emerging scholars to work on research relevant to PEA's mission, will take place at AERA 2009 (in San Diego) on Monday, April 13th, from 1:30-4 pm.

We will hold our first organizing meeting at UCEA in late October. We anticipate beginning mentor recruitment and participant registration for the meeting in late 2008.

Workshop Planning Committee

Katy Bulkley (Co-chair), Montclair State University
Catherine Lugg (Co-chair), Rutgers University
Eran Tamir, Brandeis University
Catherine Di Martino, New York University
Rebecca Jacobsen, Michigan State University
Katherine Mansfield, University of Texas-Austin
Jo Bennett, Wichita State University
Darleen Opfer, University of Cambridge
Kathryn Borman, University of South Florida
Dana Mitra, Pennsylvania State University

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE REPORT

**MARLA SANDERS
FRANCIS MARION UNIVERSITY**

We would like to take this opportunity to tell you about some of the recent changes that have an impact on the quantity of PEA members and the quality of their experiences. First, we have enacted a two-tier system for dues. **Graduate student**

membership fees are now \$20. Regular membership fees are still \$40. Second, our membership is growing—we now have approximately 206 members, most of which are active members of AERA. In the coming months, we will embark upon a membership drive to encourage individuals interested in the politics of education to join or rejoin our organization when they renew their AERA memberships, which expire at the end of this calendar year in accordance with AERA's new calendar-based membership year. Additionally, we are considering some activities that will attend to the concerns of graduate student members. Given this focus, we are seeking another graduate student member to help us develop and carry out innovative ideas for membership recruitment and retention. Lastly, Marla Sanders, an assistant professor at Francis Marion University in South Carolina, has agreed to lead the membership committee, replacing Tamara Young, our newly elected Treasurer, and will take upon full responsibilities for this position in December. Please contact members of the membership committee if you have any questions or suggestions or you are interested in joining the committee.

The PEA Membership Committee is currently seeking both faculty and graduate members to serve on the committee. The committee is responsible for managing membership records and coordinating membership recruitment activities. This is a great leadership and service opportunity! If you are interested, please contact Marla Sanders at msanders@fmarion.edu.

Membership Committee

Marla Sanders (Chair), Francis Marion University
Tiina Itkonen, California State University,
Channel Islands
Wayne D. Lewis (Graduate Student Representative),
North Carolina State University.
Tamara V. Young (Ex Officio Member), North Carolina
State University
Open (College/university affiliation; Policy/Research
Organization)
Open (Graduate Student Representative)

CLARK SEMINAR SEEKING NOMINATIONS

The David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration & Policy, sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), Divisions A and L of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and SAGE Publications, brings emerging educational administration and policy scholars and noted researchers together for two days of presentations, generative discussion, and professional growth. Many of the graduates of this seminar are now faculty members at major research institutions in the US and Canada. This year's seminar will be held at the end of the AERA meeting in San Diego in April, 2009).

Nominations for the David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration & Policy are due November 10, 2008.

Clark Seminar nominees should be outstanding doctoral students in educational leadership, administration, and/or policy, seeking careers in academe. Nominees must have substantially completed their courses and must be in the process of formulating a dissertation proposal. Although nominees who have begun working on their dissertations will be considered, the seminar is structured for students who are at the proposal development stage. Nominations of students from underrepresented groups are strongly encouraged. Invitations will be issued to up to 40 doctoral students, with competition based on the judged quality of the student's research and capacity to gain from and contribute to the seminar.

Each university may nominate up to two students. Please compile a nomination packet (nomination information sheet, a letter of nomination, a research abstract form, and a two page statement of proposed research) for each nominee and mail or email all

four items to be received by the UCEA staff no later than November 10, 2008. All nomination packet forms are available on the "Clark Seminar" page of UCEA website (<http://www.ucea.org>). We expect to extend invitations in early December 2008. If you have any questions, please call (512) 475-8592.

PEA PROGRAM CHAIR REPORT

MICHAEL MCLENDON
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

I would like to thank the reviewers who adjudicated over the highest number of proposals received by PEA since we became a SIG in 2002. All told, we received 19 individual paper and 5 symposia session proposals. AERA has allocated us 4 session slots in the AERA program. We are currently considering reviewers' comments and calculating their numeric ratings to help guide our final selection process.

OF INTEREST...

Please send updates on grants, awards, moves, and promotions to Roxanne Hughes, Managing Editor at rmh05e@fsu.edu

Do you have a book idea, proposal, or manuscript on the politics of education that you want to publish? If so, the Politics of Education Association has a book series published by Information Age. Send your idea, proposal, or manuscript to:

George Johnson, Publisher
Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Post Office Box 79049

Charlotte, NC 28271-7047

Phone: 704-752-9125

Fax: 704-752-9113

george@infoagepub.com

www.infoagepub.com

DIVISION B (Curriculum Studies) is pleased to announce its sponsorship of an AERA Pre-conference seminar entitled, *Educational Research and Activision for Social Justice*. This seminar is open to advanced doctoral students and faculty at all levels who research issues of social and educational inequity and who wish to have their academic research contribute to public debate, public policy, and community activism. The seminar will provide guidance in developing writing and public speaking expertise for reaching audiences outside of academia. We will examine strategies for sustaining activist commitments and building community coalitions and we will discuss the contested role of social justice activism in academic settings. The seminar will run Sunday, April 12, 2009, 1:00 to 5:00pm, dinner that evening, and Monday morning, 9:00am to noon. The location for the seminars will be provided when AERA completes its schedule. Please contact Leslie Rebecca Bloom: blooml@iastate.edu

Congratulations to Patrice Iatarola, who has been promoted to the rank of Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Florida State University.

Congratulations to Lora Cohen-Vogel, who has been promoted to the rank of Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Florida State University.

Dr. Jeffrey Brooks is now an Associate Professor at Auburn University in the Department of Educational Foundations, Leadership & Technology.

PEA EXECUTIVE BOARD

Lora Cohen-Vogel	President
Stacey Rutledge	Secretary
Tamara Young	Treasurer
Dina Mitra	At Large Member
Dorothy Shipp	At Large Member

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:

Kyle Ingle, Co-Editor

Bowling Green State University
519 Education Building
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
wingle@bgsu.edu
Phone: (419)372-7313
Fax: (419)372-8448

Brendan Maxcy, Co-Editor

University of Missouri
202 Hill Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65211-2190
maxcyb@missouri.edu
Phone: (573) 882-8221
Fax: (573) 884-5714

Roxanne Hughes, Managing Editor

Florida State University
113 Stone Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
rmh05e@fsu.edu

Become a member of the Politics of Education Association

Membership Benefits

In addition to its presence on the AERA program, PEA membership provides members with an electronic PEA Bulletin (the Association's newsletter), recent publications, and information about upcoming conferences, books, articles, and events related to the politics of education. Members also receive the special double issue of *Educational Policy* (January/March) which serves as the annual yearbook of the Politics of Education Association and a biennial special issue of the *Peabody Journal of Education*. The association also maintains its own web site <http://www.fsu.edu/~pea/>; offers course materials for teaching courses related to the Politics of Education, POETS (Politics of Education Teachers Services); sponsors timely presentations from senior scholars and political insiders; and provides mentoring for new faculty and graduate students.

Join PEA

Since the Politics of Education Association is a special interest group (SIG) of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), you can join PEA when applying for a new AERA membership or renewing your AERA membership. If it is not time to renew your AERA membership, you can still join or renew your PEA membership online as follows:

- Go to AERA homepage <http://www.aera.net>
- Login
- On the left toolbar select *Member Homepage*
- Under Profile and Member Benefits, select *SIG Memberships*
- Above SIG Memberships, select *Purchase Additional SIG Memberships*
 - \$40 (regular member)
 - \$20 (graduate student)

Please note that all SIG membership will *expire* at the same time AERA membership now expire—at the end of the calendar year.

The Politics of Education Association (PEA) was formed in 1969 as the Politics of Education Society. In 1978, it became the Politics of Education Association, as part of AERA. Interest in educational policy and politics expanded so that in 1987, the Association successfully called for the formation of a new division within the American Educational Research Association. Today, that division is known as Division L: Policy and Politics.

Past Presidents of PEA

Bruce Cooper (2004-2008) Fordham University
Kenneth Wong (2002-2004) Vanderbilt University (currently at Brown University)
Hanne Mawhinney (2000-2002) University of Maryland, College Park
William Firestone (1998-2000) Rutgers University
Jane Clark Lindle: (1996-1998) University of Kentucky (currently at Clemson University)
Robert Wimpelberg (1994-1996) University of New Orleans (now University of Houston)
Betty Malen (1992-1994) University of Washington (now University of Maryland, College Park)
Catherine Marshall (1990-1992) Vanderbilt University (currently at University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill)
William L. Boyd (1990-1992) Pennsylvania State University
William Lowe Boyd (1988-1990) Pennsylvania State University
Michael Kirst (1986-1988) Stanford University
Jay D. Scribner (1984-1986) Temple University (now University of Texas-Austin)
Douglas Mitchell (1982-1984) University of California, Riverside
James G. Cibulka (1980-1982) University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (currently at the University of Kentucky)

Past Chairs of PEA

Donald H. Layton (1978-1980) SUNY-Albany
David K. Wiles (1976-1978) Miami University (later SUNY at Albany)
David K. Wiles (1975-1976) Miami University (later SUNY at Albany) (completed LaNoue's 1st term)
George LaNoue (1974-1975 -- stepped down after one year) Teachers College (currently at University of Maryland, Baltimore County)
Michael W. Kirst (1972-1974) Stanford University
Mike M. Milstein (1970-1972) SUNY-Buffalo (later University of New Mexico)
David L. Colton (First President; 1969-1970) Washington University; (retired from University of New Mexico)