



The Adoption of Loan Replacement Grants for Low- and Moderate-Income Students at American Colleges and Universities: A Comparative Case Study

Adam J.A. Lips¹
University of Pittsburgh

Since 2003, more than 40 selective colleges and universities have implemented aggressive financial aid programs specifically aimed at increasing the representation of lower-income students in their student bodies (Lips, 2010). These initiatives, referred to as “Loan Replacement Grants” (LRGs), seek to greatly reduce or eliminate loans in the financial aid awards of low- and moderate-income students and replace them with grant aid that does not require repayment. In their development and implementation, LRGs are built upon a body of research suggesting that the removal of college price barriers promotes both college access and choice for the economically disadvantaged (e.g. Paulsen & St. John, 2002; Perna, 2002). The initiatives appear to run counter to policy trends that have increasingly directed financial support to wealthier students at the expense of those with financial need and contribute to the uneven enrollment distribution of lower-income students.

(Continued on Page 3)

¹Adam J.A. Lips (Ed.D., University of Pittsburgh, 2009) is currently a stay-at-home father living in Sunnyvale, California. This article is based on his dissertation, which was chaired by Erik Ness. Prior to his graduate work at the University of Pittsburgh, Lips served as the Senior Assistant Dean of Admission and Financial Aid at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia.

Post-Punctuation Politics: The Evolution of Charter School Policy in North Carolina

Wayne D. Lewis²
University of Kentucky

Lacireno-Paquet and Holyoke (2007) posit that following the enactment of dramatic new policies, a partial reversion to the original status quo may occur, depending largely on the strength of resistance to the new policy. They used the evolution of charter school policies in Michigan and the District of Columbia following their initial enactments to test their partial reversion hypothesis. The enactment of charter school policies in both Michigan and the District of Columbia represented dramatic departures from the status quo (Lacireno-Paquet & Holyoke, 2007). In both cases, interests that had previously not been part of education policymaking were able to penetrate policy monopolies held by traditional public school interests, through issue redefinition and venue shopping. However, differential results followed the enactment of the policies. In Michigan, the strength of traditional public school interests’ resistance resulted in a partial reversion of charter school policy.

(Continued on Page 9)

²Wayne D. Lewis (Ph.D., North Carolina State University, 2009) is assistant professor in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies at the University of Kentucky. His dissertation, chaired by Lance Fusarelli, was a finalist for the Politics of Education Association’s Outstanding Dissertation Award for 2009-2010.

TABLE of CONTENTS

Page 1	<i>The Adoption of Loan Replacement Grants for Low- and Moderate-Income Students at American Colleges and Universities: A Comparative Case Study</i> Adam J.A. Lips, University of Pittsburgh
Page 1	<i>Post-punctuation Politics: The Evolution of Charter School Policy in North Carolina.</i> Wayne D. Lewis, University of Kentucky
Page 2	Message from the President
Page 3	Treasurer's Report
Page 13	2010 William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop
Page 13	Division L Dissertation Award Deadline Fast Approaching
Page 14	David L. Clark Seminar: Call for Nominations
Page 14	PEA Outstanding Dissertation Award: Call for Nominations
Page 15	Publications Committee Report
Page 16	AERA Program Report
Page 16	Call for Proposals— Palgrave Macmillan's Educational Policy Series
Page 18	Politics of Education Association 2010-11 Appointments

Annual Breakfast UCEA Convention 2010

Date: Saturday, October 30, 2010

Time: 7:00-8:00 am

**Location: Borgne Room, 3rd Floor
Sheraton New Orleans**

*Anchored and Floating: The Politics
of Establishing a Research Center*

Andrea Rorrer

**Associate Professor, University of Utah
Director, Utah Education Policy Center**

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

**CATHERINE A. LUGG
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY**

Welcome back! Before I begin with association news, I'd like to thank outgoing President Laura Cohen Vogel for her steadfast leadership and service to PEA during her term of office (2008-2010).

As the academic year hits "full speed," I'd like to update you regarding a number of matters. First, the membership of PEA has confirmed its status as a SIG within AERA. Consequently, the executive committee (Stacey Rutledge, Tamara Young, Janelle Scott, Jeff Henig, and me) is working to align our current by-laws with the guidelines provided by AERA. We expect that the membership will be voting on the revised by-laws at our business meeting during the 2011 AERA convention.

Speaking of the AERA convention (April 8-12, 2011), I'd like to thank the following PEA members for their work on the convention program: Rebecca Jacobson, program chair; Betty Malen, Tamara Wilder, La'Tara Osborne-Lampkin, Rebecca Jacobsen, the program committee; and reviewers Ricardo Paredes, Ann Allen, Catherine Di Martino, Dorothy Shipps and Eran Tamir. Their tireless work is critical to our success at the AERA convention.

Please be aware that PEA has a breakfast session at the upcoming UCEA convention in New Orleans (October 28-31, 2010). On Saturday, October 30, at 7 AM, Andrea Rorrer will be presenting on the ins and outs of establishing a policy research center. Her talk is entitled "Anchored and Floating: The Politics of Establishing a Research Center."

If you have any questions, suggestions, or ideas for the association, please e-mail me at catherine.lugg@gse.rutgers.edu.

Have a fabulous fall semester!

Catherine A. Lugg

TREASURER REPORT

TAMARA V. YOUNG
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

The financial statement for our AERA account is found on page 17 of the *Bulletin*. As we move forward, we anticipate the following revenue and expenditures until the end of the fiscal year.

A. A substantial influx of funds from membership income paid at the end of the membership cycle (i.e., December 2010)

B. Payment for the publication and shipping of PEA Yearbooks published in the *Peabody Journal of Education* or *The Journal of Education Policy*

C. UCEA-November 2010 Breakfast and special presentation

Since members have voted to become a SIG of AERA in our recent referendum, we are making a few changes to our financial reporting. To align ourselves with AERA's fiscal year, we will share with members our financial activities based on a January-December fiscal year cycle. The full financial report will be published in our spring edition of the *PEA Bulletin*, which will be distributed to members prior to AERA's annual meeting.

Membership. The total number of members as of September 25, 2010 is approximately 240. Currently 23% of the members are students. Four members are affiliated with other countries--Nigeria, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, and Denmark.

Renewing Membership Online. Because we are a SIG of AERA, members of PEA may only join through AERA at <http://www.aera.net>. Members can join anytime online. However, members should be aware that their membership with PEA will expire on the same day that their AERA membership expires (generally, 12/31/10).



Loan Replacement Grants (Lips, continued from page 1)

The initiatives appear to run counter to policy trends that have increasingly directed financial support to wealthier students at the expense of those with financial need and contribute to the uneven enrollment distribution of lower-income students.

Individual public and private universities have reported enrollment increases among lower-income students since introducing LRGs (Avery et al., 2006; Tebbs & Turner, 2006). However, because LRGs are a recent development, a comprehensive evaluation of program effectiveness has not been feasible to date (Pallais & Turner, 2006). Given early signs of program success, the theoretical basis of the initiatives, the importance of LRGs to lower-income students, and the associated relevance of the programs to researchers and policymakers, understanding the spread of LRGs is a valuable aim. More specifically, investigating *why* institutions have adopted LRGs and *how* they arrived at the decision to implement them provides insight into conditions conducive to their proliferation, and illuminates the extent to which the initiatives will continue to spread and represent a financial aid policy trend.

This study offers a descriptive understanding of the LRG adoption process and reveals conceptual implications for the diffusion of policy innovation by addressing the following research questions:

- 1) Why do institutions adopt LRGs?
- 2) To what extent does the diffusion of policy innovation theory describe the way in which loan replacement grants are adopted by colleges and universities?
 - a) How do internal determinants play a role in the decision to adopt the programs?
 - b) How do diffusion explanations play a role in the decision to adopt the programs?
- 3) What policy adoption characteristics are shared among institutions that have adopted loan replacement grant initiatives?

By examining the spread of LRGs through a policy diffusion framework, this study concurrently addresses postsecondary choice and access issues relevant to lower-income students and expands policy innovation research in higher education. Identifying determinants associated with policy innovation and understanding the LRG adoption process is valuable to those in higher education who seek to encourage efficient proliferation of similar programs. Further, better understanding how and why institutions choose to adopt the initiatives informs policymakers, administrators, and researchers who wish to effectively advocate for LRGs.

Conceptual Framework

The diffusion of policy innovation theory has been developing in political science literature for nearly 40 years and represents a widely accepted mechanism for investigating the spread of new policies (Berry & Berry, 2007). The majority of research on such diffusion in the United States has focused on state-level issues, such as examining how policy changes, including the establishment of state lotteries (Berry & Berry, 1990) and the implementation of various tax initiatives (Berry & Berry, 1992), have spread between states. More recently, scholars have begun to investigate the innovation and diffusion of state higher education policies (Cohen-Vogel & Ingle, 2007; Cohen-Vogel, Ingle, Levine, & Spence, 2008; Doyle, 2006; Hearn & Griswold, 1994; Ingle, Cohen-Vogel, & Hughes, 2007; McLendon, Deaton, & Hearn, 2007; McLendon, Hearn, & Deaton, 2006; McLendon, Heller, & Young, 2005).

An innovation is commonly defined as a policy that is new to the adopting unit, and the diffusion of policy innovation theory considers the spread of policies from one unit to another (Walker, 1969). The theory accounts for complexity in the policy-making process by considering the combined role of social, political, and economic climates, as well as external factors in policy adoption decisions. The theory offers two sets of explanations for the adoption of policies: (a) internal determinants models and (b) diffusion models (Berry & Berry, 2007; McLendon, 2003).

In this study, the analytical framework guides both the interview protocol for participants and data analysis. Consistent with the accepted “integrated model” that is commonly used in policy innovation research, the framework considers how both internal determinant and diffusion explanations influence LRG adoption. These two explanations are broken down along eight dimensions (four internal determinants; four diffusion explanations) in an effort to address the research questions.

Internal determinant explanations consider aspects of the institutional environment that play a role in the adoption of LRGs. The following four determinants utilized in this study have been derived from state policy adoption literature and modified to fit the dynamics of individual institutions:

Institutional Finances: Research investigating state policies (e.g., Berry & Berry, 1990, 1992; Hearn & Griswold, 1994; Walker, 1969) has suggested that the relative wealth and size of a state’s budget influences policy adoption behavior. As a corollary, this study considers the influence of institutional financial aid budgets, endowment stability and size, the potential effect of LRG implementation on institutional pricing, and overall “fiscal health” on adoption decisions.

Policy Entrepreneurs: Mintrom (1997) describes policy entrepreneurs as “people who seek to initiate dynamic policy change” and utilize activities such as “identifying problems, networking in policy circles, shaping the ideas of policy debates, and building coalitions” (p. 739) to promote their agenda. The presence (or absence) of such individuals, and their respective roles in both designing and implementing the LRG is explored.

Institutional Governance Structure/Leadership Dynamics: The structure and culture of the institutional governance structure may influence policy adoption behavior. For example, McLendon et al. (2006) suggest that states without consolidated governing boards are more likely to adopt higher education performance funding policies. For individual institutions, investigation along this dimension considers the extent to which adoption decisions are shared by those across the institution,

the level of transparency in the policy-making process, recent “events” related to institutional governance (such as a new president or provost), and the extent to which the governance structure facilitated LRG adoption. Also considered are characteristics of those occupying institutional leadership positions and the role these characteristics played in adoption.

Institutional Educational “Problems”: Policy researchers who have studied state educational policy adoption behavior have considered the role of perceived “problems” in the decision to implement policies. For example, Cohen-Vogel and Ingle (2007) indicate that states commonly articulate a desire to “keep the best and brightest” students in state and “provide relief for the middle class” (p. 247) as rationales to implement state merit-aid programs. Institutionally, potential problems such as the underrepresentation of lower-income students at case institutions or concerns about student loan debt may influence policy adoption behavior. The extent to which such problems affect decisions to adopt LRGs is explored.

Diffusion explanations consider influences from the external environment that may play a role in the adoption of LRGs. Of particular interest is the influence of previously adopting institutions on the three case institutions. The following four diffusion-related factors have been derived from policy adoption literature:

Competition: Institutions, particularly those with national reputations, compete with peers for students, publicity, and prestige. Researchers who study state policy adoption commonly focus closely on regional competition (Berry & Berry, 2007); this study, however, considers both regional and national competition and their influences in its investigation of LRG adoption.

Convenience or “Satisficing”: Policy researchers have suggested that when adopting units face time or information constraints, they borrow policy ideas from other units (Cohen-Vogel et al., 2008; Mooney & Lee, 1995). Walker (1969) first referred to this behavior as “satisficing.” The extent to which adoption behavior was borrowed from other

institutions out of convenience is considered by observing how institutions arrive at the decision to adopt their LRG, and the manner in which the program is designed.

Normative Pressure: External pressures to adhere to widely accepted standards have been pointed to as an influence in policy adoption behavior (Berry & Berry, 2007). Such pressures increase as more units adopt policies that allow them to conform to such norms. Because LRGs seek to achieve a socially desirable aim – increasing representation of lower-income students in higher education – the extent to which adoption decisions were made out of pressure to adhere to this aim is investigated.

Policy Networks or Communities: Mintrom and Vergari (1998) describe policy networks as “a group of actors who are linked by their direct and indirect contacts with one another” and explain that they are “critical for promoting the diffusion of policy innovation” (p. 128). In the higher education policy arena, these networks commonly include professional organizations that count administrators as their members (Cohen-Vogel et al., 2008). As policy actors interact with others in their profession through professional meetings, organizations, and other forms of communication, policy ideas and details are often exchanged. The extent to which participation in these policy communities influences LRG adoption behavior is considered and analyzed through this study.

Methods

This study utilizes a comparative case study research strategy. Case studies are a preferred methodology for in-depth exploration of events or processes that occur in systems that are bounded by time and activity (King, Keohane, & Verba, 1994) and offer a distinct advantage in research situations when *how* or *why* questions are asked (Yin, 2003). Additionally, the propositions established by a well-developed theoretical framework – in this case the diffusion of policy innovation – assumed a central role in case study data analysis.

The multiple cases considered in this study were selected using purposive sampling and “replication logic” (Yin, 2003, p.47), which treats each case as an individual experiment and allows for comparison

within and between cases. The selection procedure aimed to investigate a diverse set of cases that differ from one another on a categorical variable of interest in order to provide different perspectives (Gerring, 2007). Additionally, the diffusion of policy innovation theory played a role in guiding case selection. The following four criteria were applied to the 49 institutions with active LRG initiatives in order to select relevant cases:

- 1) Selected colleges and universities are of varying “institutional type” – one small private “liberal arts” college, a large public research university, and a medium-sized comprehensive research university.³
- 2) Selected institutions have a currently active No-Loan LRG as part of their financial aid policy; institutions that have only Loan Cap LRGs are excluded.⁴
- 3) Selected institutions must have implemented the No-Loan LRG beginning 2004-05 or later.⁵
- 4) Selected institutions are located in the Southeastern United States.⁶

The four selection criteria yielded three case institutions – The University of Virginia, Davidson College, and Emory University.

Consistent with accepted comparative case study research design, the study relies upon multiple sources of data including interviews, direct observation, and archived documents pertaining to the LRGs (Yin, 2003). Semi-structured interviews with 27 individual policy actors involved in LRG

³ This criterion allows for a diverse set of institutions to be compared, and allows for observation of how the various determinants may have different or similar influences based on institutional type.

⁴ No-Loan LRGs are more common than Loan Cap programs and have more consistent eligibility criteria. This criterion ensures that similar programs are considered.

⁵ Diffusion studies consider the spread and proliferation of policies, and are less concerned with the activities of the policy inventors (Berry, 1994). Prior to 2004, there were fewer than 10 active LRGs. Since then, the initiatives have spread rapidly, suggesting some evidence of diffusion.

⁶ Considering cases from the same region allows for investigation of possible regional diffusion across cases. Additionally, the Southeast is of interest in financial aid policy studies because of the proliferation of new aid initiatives (e.g. state merit aid programs) in the region.

adoption and implementation at case institutions acted as the primary data source. Following data collection, the “pattern matching” (Yin, 2003, p.116) technique was applied to interview and archival data to deduce themes at each institution, and data were coded along the eight dimensions of the analytical framework using qualitative data analysis software.

Analysis was conducted on applicable data within each institution and across institutions. Within-case data analysis occurred in three phases: (1) background context and history of the institution, the LRG itself, and the institution’s decision-making structure; (2) chronological account of the policy process that led to LRG adoption and implementation; and (3) assessment along dimensions of the analytical framework. Across-case analysis provides depth by highlighting similarities and differences in the adoption process across the three separate sites, and offers further insight into the relevance of each policy adoption explanation.

Results

The comparative analysis of the LRG adoption process at the University of Virginia, Davidson College, and Emory University produced one “core finding” and six additional findings. These findings outline commonalities present across the three adoption processes, point out important internal and external influences at the institutions, and address the roles of individual policy actors.

Because of the influence of both internal determinant and diffusion-related factors, this study suggests that a “unified theory” (Berry, 1994) of policy innovation that accommodates both types of explanations best explains the LRG adoption process. Though there are a number of between-case commonalities, the policy adoption behavior of any specific institution depends upon the interaction of the various dimensions with one another. Perhaps the most valuable contribution of this inquiry comes not from the identification of relevant influences, but from its description of how the interaction of internal and external factors varies from case to case. More specifically, in LRG adoption, an evaluation of internal determinants is most effective in describing an institution’s *ability* or *capacity* to

implement programs, while diffusion-related factors provide insight regarding the *likelihood* that institutions will adopt. In all three cases, the institutions were influenced by similar internal determinant factors suggesting that each institution was in position to adopt. The cases of the University of Virginia and Emory suggest that diffusion-related factors represent a sort of “tipping point” that moved the universities from having the capacity to adopt toward actually adopting. The Davidson College case suggests that such diffusion-related factors are not an absolutely necessary element to LRG adoption.

The following six additional findings provide a more thorough description of the influence of various analytical framework dimensions on LRG adoption decisions:

- (1) An institution’s financial condition is a critical consideration in LRG adoption decisions. However, there is no one particular overall financial picture that is necessary for adopting institutions. Comparison of the three cases indicates that institutions with both large and modest endowments may adopt, and can choose from a variety of options to financially sustain their initiatives. One area of consistency that does exist along the financial dimension is the availability of short-term or “start-up” funds to initially support the program.
- (2) The LRG policy adoption process is subject to considerable influence by an individual or small group of policy entrepreneurs. In each of the three cases, individual administrators drove the policy adoption process.
- (3) The presence of institutional educational “problems,” particularly those related to a perceived scarcity of lower-income students, is a significant factor in an institution’s decision to implement an LRG.
- (4) Competition between institutions for publicity, prestige, and students can play a role in the decision to adopt an LRG. The results of this study suggest that the competitive landscape in which individual institutions operate helps dictate the extent to which it shapes program design or the length of the adoption process. Each of the three case institutions

has a highly selective admissions process and competes nationally for students with desired academic credentials. They are also acutely aware of their national ranking and the actively seek greater publicity for their programs. In each case, such influences at least partially fueled LRG adoption.

- (5) Satisficing behavior – the borrowing of existing policy design from other units to craft new policy – is evident in LRG adoption processes at each of these institutions. Furthermore, in each case, institutional efforts to craft the LRG in a rather condensed amount of time led to reliance on existing LRG design.
- (6) While communication of policy ideas between actors via policy networks or communities can influence LRG adoption, competitive factors may reduce the likelihood that institutions reach out through the networks when crafting their initiatives.

Significance to Higher Education

Through its consideration of three distinct four-year institutions of varying size and control, this study provides administrators and policymakers with an in-depth view of conditions that are conducive to adoption of the LRG policy and the specific processes that produced each LRG. Individuals at non-adopting institutions who wish to advocate for similar programs can benefit from these accounts as they look to affect policy change, especially if they work within systems with similar dynamics to those described in this study.

More broadly, this investigation provides valuable insight into the ability of individual institutions to address system-wide problems related to inequitable access. While LRGs appear to hold promise for improving equity, the nature and extent of their influence in this regard remains unclear. Certainly, the premise behind the initiatives is indicative of the type of policy reform that may be needed to reverse prevailing financial aid trends that award merit at the expense of need. However, the institutional conditions necessary to support the programs – many of which are addressed in this study – raises legitimate questions about the likelihood that they will have a wide-reaching influence on the problem of inequitable access. For example, the central role

of institutional finances in the adoption decisions coupled with the current economic climate in the country suggest that LRGs may prevent the further spread of the programs and mitigate their influence. In this way, understanding rationale and motivation for the adoption of these and similar programs allows policymakers and researchers to better understand how inequitable access might best be addressed.

References

- Avery, C., Hoxby, C. M., Jackson, C., Burek, K., Poppe, G., & Raman, M. (2006). *Cost should be no barrier: An evaluation of the first year or Harvard's financial aid initiative*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Berry, F. S. (1994). Sizing up state policy innovation research. *Policy Studies Journal*, 22(3), 442-456.
- Berry, F. S., & Berry, W. D. (1990). State lottery adoptions as policy innovations: An event history analysis. *The American Political Science Review*, 84(2), 395-415.
- Berry, F. S., & Berry, W. D. (1992). Tax innovation in the states: Capitalizing on political opportunity. *American Journal of Political Science*, 36(3), 715-742.
- Berry, F. S., & Berry, W. D. (2007). Innovation and diffusion models in policy research. In P. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the policy process* (2nd ed., pp. 223-260). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Cohen-Vogel, L., & Ingle, W. K. (2007). When neighbours matter most: Innovation, diffusion and state policy adoption in tertiary education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 22(3), 241-262.
- Cohen-Vogel, L., Ingle, W. K., Levine, A. A., & Spence, M. (2008). The "spread" of merit-based college aid: Politics, policy consortia, and interstate competition. *Educational Policy*, 22(3), 339-362.
- Doyle, W. R. (2006). Adoption of merit-based student grant programs: An event history analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28(3), 259-285.
- Gerring, J. (2007). *Case study research: Principles and practices*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hearn, J. C., & Griswold, C. P. (1994). State-level centralization and policy innovation in U.S. postsecondary education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 16(2), 161-190.
- Ingle, W. K., Cohen-Vogel, L., & Hughes, R. (2007). The public policy process among southeastern states: Elaborating theories of regional adoption and hold-out behavior. *Policy Studies Journal*, 35(4), 607-628.
- King, G., Keohane, R. O., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lips, A. J. A. (2010). A typology of institutional Loan Replacement Grant initiatives for low- and moderate-income students: Manuscript submitted for publication.
- McLendon, M. K. (2003). State government reform of higher education: Patterns, trends, and theories of the public policy process. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education handbook of theory and research* (Vol. XVIII, pp. 57-144). London: Kluwer.
- McLendon, M. K., Deaton, R., & Hearn, J. C. (2007). The enactment of reforms in state governance of higher education: Testing the political instability hypothesis. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 78(6), 645-675.
- McLendon, M. K., Hearn, J. C., & Deaton, R. (2006). Called to account: Analyzing the origins and spread of state performance-accountability policies for higher education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28(1), 1-24.
- McLendon, M. K., Heller, D. E., & Young, S. P. (2005). State postsecondary policy innovation: Politics, competition, and the interstate migration of policy ideas. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(4), 363-400.
- Mintrom, M. (1997). Policy entrepreneurs and the diffusion of innovation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 41(3), 738-770.
- Mintrom, M., & Vergari, S. (1998). Policy networks and innovation diffusion: The case of state education reforms. *The Journal of Politics*, 60(1), 126-148.
- Mooney, C. Z., & Lee, J. B. (1995). Legislative morality in the United States: The case of pre-Roe abortion regulation reform. *American Journal of Political Science*, 39(3), 599-627.
- Pallais, A., & Turner, S. (2006). Opportunities for low-income students at top colleges and universities: Policy initiatives and the distribution of students. *National Tax Journal*, 59(2), 357-386.
- Paulsen, M. B., & St. John, E. P. (2002). Social class and college costs: Examining the financial nexus between college choice and persistence. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(2), 189-236.
- Perna, L. W. (2002). Financing higher education at selective private institutions: Implications for college access and choice. *The Review of Higher Education*, 25(2), 225-235.
- Tebbs, J., & Turner, S. (2006). The challenge of improving the representation of low-income students at flagship universities: AccessUVA and the University of Virginia. In M. S. McPherson & M. O. Shapiro (Eds.), *College access: Opportunity or privilege?* (pp. 103-115). New York: College Board.
- Walker, J. L. (1969). The diffusion of innovations among the American states. *The American Political Science Review*, 63(3), 880-889.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.



**The Association for Education
Finance and Policy
36th Annual Conference**

**March 24-26, 2011
Seattle, Washington
Grand Hyatt Seattle**

**Conference Theme:
*Taking Stock in Race to the Top: Research
to Inform the Next Generation of
Education Reform***

**Proposal Submission Deadline:
November 8, 2010**



***Post-Punctuation Politics*
(Lewis, continued from page 1)**

In the District of Columbia, where charter school interests were much stronger than traditional public school interests, charter school interests moved toward establishing a new status quo in District of Columbia education policy.

The policy literature has not adequately addressed the fate of dramatic new policies, such as charter school policies, that come to life during periods of abrupt policy change (Lacireno-Paquet & Holyoke, 2007). Much of the politics of education literature has focused on the events leading up to charter school policy enactment. In an effort to help fill this void, this study examines the politics of the post-policy enactment period. The study has one primary research question: How has charter school policy in North Carolina evolved since the enactment of charter school legislation in 1996? Additionally, one sub-question is explored: (a) How have the post-policy enactment actions of charter school advocates and opponents influenced the evolution of North Carolina's charter school policy?

Punctuated Equilibrium Theory

Before explaining the concept of post-punctuation politics, it is necessary to begin with a discussion of the passage of policies that are dramatic departures from the status quo; what Baumgartner and Jones (1993) term punctuations of the policy equilibrium. Baumgartner and Jones' development of punctuated equilibrium theory as a policy process theory grew out of their desire to explain policy change as more than just incremental adjustments over time. They acknowledge the usefulness of Lindblom's (1959) incrementalist depiction, but charge that incrementalism fails to account for periods of intense conflict and abrupt change; the occasional "large-scale departures from previous policies (True, Baumgartner, & Jones, 1993, p. 97). Punctuated equilibrium theory maintains that periods of stability with incremental policy change are indeed the norm; resulting from a single interest having a monopoly over a policy issue. These policy monopolies "systematically dampen pressures for change" (p. 100). Access to these tightly controlled subsystems is limited by rules and norms that discourage the participation of outsiders, and promote widespread positive understandings of the policy.

However, policy monopolies are not impenetrable. They can and do collapse (Baumgartner & Jones, 1993; True et al., 1999). By simultaneously changing the institutional place where policy decisions are made and forcing a redefinition of the policy issue, previously disengaged parties can be drawn into what becomes a debate on the macro-political stage. It is on this larger stage with increased attention that dramatic policy change most often occurs. Such has been the case in states across the US with the passage of school choice policies. In many instances, previously disengaged groups sought to make substantive education policy changes at the local school board level but were unsuccessful. These groups then used any number of strategies to redefine traditional public schools as the problem with public education, while simultaneously shifting the decision-making venue from local school boards to state general assemblies. At the state level, these groups have generally been more successful; winning the passage of charter school, voucher, tuition tax-credit, and intra-district choice policies.

Post-Punctuation Politics and Policy Reversion

If during policy punctuation, displaced interests are weakened and do not retain enough power to reassert themselves, new interests have the opportunity to establish new rules and institutions to protect the new policy. But displaced interests are not always left powerless. In fact, Lacireno-Paquet and Holyoke (2007) contend that displaced interests are rarely left so powerless that new interests are able to establish new rules and institutions without interference. Policy losers typically do not just die or “fade into the night” (Lacireno-Paquet & Holyoke, 2007, p. 190); instead they fight and attempt to exert their influence in different ways, including shifting the fight back to venues that are more receptive to them, or engaging in grassroots and similar forms of advocacy. Thus, rather than new subsystems or policy monopolies emerging, what results is more likely to resemble what Hecló (1978) termed issue networks; where neither side is in complete control of the policies and issues, and “network members reinforce each other’s sense of issue as their interests, rather than (as standard political or economic models would have it) interest defining positions on issues” (p. 102). Given the apparent absence of any particular interest’s dominance over a policy area, comparatively more balanced policy outcomes can result (Song & Miskel, 2002). As such, the emergence of an issue network following policy punctuation should result in some degree of reversion from the new policy back to the old one (Lacireno-Paquet & Holyoke, 2007).

Lacireno-Paquet and Holyoke (2007) found differential responses in Michigan and the District of Columbia following charter school policy enactment. In Michigan, charter school opponents successfully concentrated their efforts on keeping the statutory cap on charter schools in place and increasing state regulation of charter schools. On the other hand, in the District of Columbia charter school interests faced little opposition from weakened traditional public school interests. Though the results were different, in each case the ability of new interests to establish a new policy status quo was largely dependent on the counter-advocacy efforts of displaced interests. Because charter school policies and political cultures can vary considerably by state (Elazar, 1984; Fusarelli,

2003; Kirst, 2007), differences in post-policy enactment politics should be expected.

Data and Methods

Data were collected using two methods: in-person semi-structured interviews with policy actors and retrieval of archival documents. In-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a purposive sample of 10 study participants. Purposeful sampling was used to select informants that would be able to purposefully inform an understanding of the actions of charter school advocates and opponents, and the evolution of charter school policy. Archival documents were chosen as a secondary data source because of their stability, their unobtrusiveness, and their broad coverage (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003). These documents included newspaper articles, organizational reports, legislative statements, position papers, official letters, State Board of Education policies, and Web pages.

Data Analysis

The constant comparative method of ongoing data analysis as described by Creswell (1997) and Merriam (1998) was used for analyzing both interview transcripts and archival documents. Interview transcripts and documents were open-coded. In order to aid with developing generalizations about the case and comparing those generalizations with the relevant literature, categories of data were collapsed into five themes: oversight, funding, facilities, diversity, and the charter school cap.

Summary of Findings

Traditional public school interests in North Carolina, or the B.L.O.B.—Big Learning Organizations Bureaucracy—as one study participant referred to them, have been extremely successful at keeping charter schools in a box. They have not sought to eliminate charter schools in North Carolina. They have accepted the state’s experiment of 100 charter schools, but have masterfully played political defense and impeded charter schools from encroaching any further on their territory. While charter schools in North Carolina appear to be a permanent fixture in the public education landscape, they are a very small one. In fact, they are so small that they can easily be

missed. The majority of North Carolina's 100 counties do not have any charter schools at all. And even in Wake County, with the state's highest concentration of charter schools, charter school students make up less than one percent of the county's public school enrollment. Charter schools reached their cap in 2001 and since that time, the State Board of Education has only been able to grant new charters when existing ones are revoked or voluntarily relinquished. According to this study's findings, things do not appear likely to change any time soon.

The passage of charter school legislation in North Carolina came at a time when traditional public school interests were most vulnerable. Charter school interests were able to push through passage of charter school legislation during the one time in North Carolina's recent history that Republicans controlled one chamber of the General Assembly. Republican control of the House, however, was very short-lived, resulting in that opportunistic policy window closing rather quickly and making gaining additional ground for charter school interests a near-impossible undertaking. Traditional public school interests' close relationships with Democrats in the General Assembly allowed them to prevent the passage of charter school legislation from being a clean victory for charter school interests. While the advocacy work of groups like NCAE and the North Carolina School Boards Association has been important, of even greater importance has been the institutional access these organizations have to Democratic leaders in the General Assembly. They enjoy this access for several reasons. First, NCAE's political action committee donates an extraordinary amount of money to Democratic candidates for political office. Wright (1990), in study of the Congressional Ways and Means Committee found that interest groups' campaign contributions to committee members were an effective way to gain institutional access. The present study's findings support those of Wright. Additionally, a sizeable minority of Democratic General Assembly members are vested in traditional public schools, either because they or a close family member spent their career working in traditional public schools or because they have very close ties to local school districts. Also, traditional public school employees make up a substantial

number of voters. NCAE and the North Carolina School Boards Association contend that these voters vote as a block based on public education issues. While their assertion may or may not be entirely true, many Democratic legislators have grown comfortable with the support in the polls they have enjoyed in the past, and are not likely to gamble with that support to allow for charter school expansion.

Traditional public school interests have used their institutional access to ensure the blockage of all legislation that would allocate additional funding to charter schools. They have adamantly opposed the allocation of any additional funding to charter schools for two reasons. First, local school districts rightly or wrongly see public school funding as a zero-sum game; funding that goes to charter schools is funding out of the coffers of traditional public school districts. Second, additional funding allocations to charter schools would mean additional resources for them to be more competitive with traditional public schools. Legislators have introduced numerous bills in the General Assembly that would have authorized boards of county commissioners to allocate funds to charter schools for capital expenditures, and authorized the State Board of Education to allocate state funds matching federal grant funds that could be used for start-up costs. Democrats have also blocked legislative attempts to allow revenue generated by the state lottery for capital expenditures to flow to charter schools. Democratic leadership in both chambers of the General Assembly has prevented these proposals from even progressing to committee consideration, much less proceeding favorably out of committee. Another victory for traditional public school interests has been the requirement that all charter schools participate in the state's school accountability system, including the administration of state standardized examinations. At the very beginning, charter schools had the option to choose an alternative to state standardized exams. Media attention to charter schools that were not administering the examination led to the passage of State Board of Education policy requiring all charter schools to administer the exams and participate in North Carolina's ABCs school accountability model. This restriction on charter

schools has to some degree, forced them closer to the mold of traditional public schools. Charter school advocates and administrators in North Carolina have been very vocal in their opposition to the requirement of state testing, but they have done little or nothing in the way of lobbying or political advocacy to change the requirement. Though in disagreement with the requirement, most charter school advocates have chosen to use all of their resources to push for removal of the charter school cap.

Charter school interests have been able to celebrate some minor, but all the same significant, amendments to legislation. These changes have been integral to giving existing charter schools the opportunity to be successful. Charter school operators won a victory with new provisions to the law allowing charter school boards of directors to elect to participate in the state teachers' retirement system. Also significant to the success of charter schools was the early amendment to the original legislation allowing schools to lease school facilities from sectarian organizations, provided that no religious artifacts are visible. Additionally, a relatively soft interpretation and enforcement of the Charter School Act's racial composition provision has been very important in keeping the doors of many charter schools open.

Charter school stakeholders and community members have formed both formal and informal advocacy organizations. Most of these organizations' work has been aimed at lifting or removing the charter school cap. They have engaged in the political process through lobbying at the General Assembly, working at the grassroots level to get voters to contact their legislators asking for their support of legislation favorable to charter schools, and working to defeat local school bonds of school boards that will not pass resolutions in support of lifting the charter school cap. Like the cases of Michigan (Bulkley, 2005; Lacireno-Paquet & Holyoke, 2007), however, charter school interests in North Carolina have been unable to build a large enough or powerful enough coalition to have any chance of defeating traditional public school interests and their Democratic allies in the General Assembly.

Conclusion

Much like charter school opponents in Michigan, North Carolina's traditional public school interests have not sought to eliminate charter schools. Instead, they have set out to do two things: (a) keep charter school operations as close as possible to the operation of traditional public schools, making them appear to not be much of an alternative to traditional public schools at all; and (b) prevent charter schools from expanding any further than the legislatively allowed 100 schools. Following that strategy, during the post-punctuation period, traditional public school interests have successfully blocked changes to the North Carolina's charter school policy that would raise or remove the charter school cap, grant additional funding for charter schools, or allow charter schools to opt out of participating in North Carolina's school accountability system including mandatory participation in state testing.

Recently, North Carolina's interest in competing for funds in the U.S. Department of Education's "Race to the Top" contest has brought charter school policy back to the front of education policy discussions. But again, in 2010 we saw that the political climate toward charter schools had not changed. The enticement of federal grant funds were not enough to push the Democrat-controlled General Assembly to amend state charter school policies; a decision that factored into the state not winning funding in the first round of the competition. However, North Carolina was successful in winning federal funds in the second round of Race to the Top, even without making changes to 100 school limit on charters. It appears that since the passage of charter school policy in 1996, North Carolina charter school advocates have made very little progress, and absent some sizeable shock to state politics, it does not appear that they will make much progress in the near future.

References

- Baumgartner, R. R., & Jones, B. D. (1993). *Agendas and instability in American politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bulkley, K. (2005). Understanding the charter school concept in legislation: The cases of Arizona, Michigan and Georgia. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 18(4), 527-554.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Elazar, D. J. (1984). *American federalism: A view from the states*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
- Fusarelli, L. D. (2003). *The political dynamics of school choice: Negotiating contested terrain*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hecl, H. (1978). Issue networks and the executive establishment. In A. King (Ed.), *The American political system* (pp. 87-124). Washington D. C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy.
- Kirst, M. W. (2007). Politics of charter schools: Competing national advocacy coalitions meet local politics. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82(2-3), 184-203.
- Lacireno-Paquet, N., & Holyoke, T. T. (2007). Moving forward or sliding backward: The evolution of charter school policies in Michigan and the District of Columbia. *Educational Policy*, 21(1), 185-214.
- Lindblom, C. E. (1959). The science of "muddling through." *Public Administration Review*, 19(2), 79-88.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Song, M., & Miskel, C. (2002). *Interest groups in national reading policy: Perceived influence and beliefs on teaching reading*. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement. Retrieved on September 1, 2008, from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/>
- True, J. L., Jones, B. D., & Baumgartner, F. R. (1999). Punctuated-equilibrium theory: Explaining stability and change in American policymaking. In P. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the policy process* (pp. 97-115). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Wright, J. R. (1990). Contributions, lobbying, and committee voting in the U.S. House of Representatives. *American Political Science Review*, 84(2), 417-438.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.



**2010 WILLIAM L. BOYD
NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL POLITICS
WORKSHOP**

**KATY BULKLEY
MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY**

The third annual William L. Boyd National Politics of Education Workshop, co-sponsored by PEA and UCEA, took place at AERA in Denver on April 30th. The session was co-chaired by Katy Bulkley of Montclair State University (on behalf of PEA) and Gerardo Lopez of Indiana University (on behalf of UCEA). It was the biggest session to date, with 113 emerging scholars and 42 senior scholar/mentors participating. Catherine Lugg did a terrific job of getting us started by discussing Bill Boyd's legacy at the beginning of the session, then

everyone got down to work! The feedback from the workshop was overwhelmingly positive, but we're always trying to make it better and welcome your suggestions. The 2011 workshop will be co-chaired by Katy Bulkley (for PEA) and Dana Mitra of Pennsylvania State University (for UCEA).

Details for the fourth annual William L. Boyd National Politics of Education Workshop will be forthcoming at the PEA website and via the listserv. In the meantime, if you have any questions or comments, please contact Katy Bulkley at bulkleyk@mail.montclair.edu or Dana Mitra at dmitra@psu.edu.

**DIVISION L
DISSERTATION AWARD DEADLINE FAST
APPROACHING**

The purpose of the AERA Division L Outstanding Dissertation Award is to recognize the exceptional research accomplishments of recent doctoral graduates. To be eligible, dissertations must have been completed and successfully defended between August 16, 2009 and August 31, 2010. Dissertations employing any theoretical and methodological orientation may be nominated as long as they make an important contribution to education policy. Nominations must be submitted by a faculty member of the nominee's doctoral degree granting institution. The nomination package should include:

- a nomination letter,
- 3-4 page summary of the dissertation,
- copy of the dissertation,
- current contact information for the nominee.

Nomination materials should be sent electronically as a pdf file to Division L Outstanding Dissertation Award Chair, Kathryn M. Borman at borman@cas.usf.edu (put "Div L Dissertation Award" in the subject line) by October 31, 2010.

DAVID L. CLARK SEMINAR: CALL FOR 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. The majority of Clark Scholars go on to become professors at major research institutions around the world. This year's seminar will be held in the spring at the beginning of the AERA meeting in New Orleans (tentatively scheduled for April 7-8, 2011).

Nominations for the David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration & Policy are due November 15th, 2010. Nominees should be outstanding doctoral students in educational leadership, administration, and/or policy, seeking careers in research. Nominees must have substantially completed their courses and must have formulated a dissertation proposal. Students who have already started or completed their dissertations are unlikely to gain as much from the seminar as students who are in the early stages of formulating their research. Nominations of students from underrepresented groups are strongly encouraged. Student proposals are blind reviewed by three prominent scholars.

Each university may nominate up to two students. Nominations must be accompanied by a student research proposal. This year, all materials will be submitted online at the following websites:

<http://www.ucea.org/clark-seminar-app-form/>
<http://www.ucea.org/clark-form-abstract-of-student/>

To be considered complete, both forms must be filled out completely. The information requested includes: nominator's information, nomination statement, student information, abstract of student research, title, and statement of proposed research.

Nominating institutions must also indicate the level of financial support that will be provided to support their nominee's travel and participation.

Additional information concerning the seminar is available on the "Clark Seminar" page of UCEA website (<http://www.ucea.org>). Invitations will be issued to 40 doctoral students, with competition based on the quality of the student's proposal and their perceived capacity to gain from and contribute to the seminar. Invitations will be extended in early January 2011. If you have any questions, please call Michelle D. Young at (512) 475-8592.

PEA OUTSTANDING DISSERTATION AWARD: CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

The call for the 2009-2010 PEA Outstanding Dissertation Award is now open. The 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. 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 Dissertation 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 December 1, 2010 will be reviewed by the PEA Dissertation Award Committee. Four to six finalists will be selected for further consideration by January 2011. 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 2011.

Eligibility and Application Process: Dissertations from students who have successfully defended a dissertation for either an Ed.D. or a Ph.D. in political science or education between June 30, 2009, and July 1, 2010, are eligible for nomination.

The nomination process involves submitting a scholar application form including a four-six page (1,200 word maximum) abstract of the dissertation, which describes the topic and any conceptual underpinnings, details the methods of data collection and analysis, and briefly describes the findings and the conclusions. In addition a nomination form from the dissertation sponsor is required. The sponsor's nomination should describe why the dissertation is exemplary and assess its contribution to the politics of education. It also verifies that the doctoral degree was earned between June 30, 2009, and July 1, 2010. No incomplete nominations will be considered.

Completed applications and nomination forms are to be emailed by midnight December 1, 2010 to eness@uga.edu. Emailed applications will receive a brief confirmation of receipt. If necessary, applications may be mailed to the following address:

Erik C. Ness, Chair
PEA Dissertation Awards
Institute of Higher Education
010 Meigs Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602

Members of the 2009-10 PEA Outstanding Dissertation Award Committee:

Erik Ness (Chair), University of Georgia
Gerardo Lopez, Indiana University, Bloomington
Christopher Loss, Vanderbilt University
Brendan Maxcey, IUPUI
Lorraine McDonnell, University of California, Santa Barbara
Darleen Opfer, University of Cambridge

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

JANELLE SCOTT
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

The 2012 Politics of Education Yearbook will be published as a special issue of *Educational Policy*, edited by Carolyn Herrington and Jason Grissom. The Yearbook's theme is *The Struggle for Coherence and Control in Education: The New Politics of Intergovernmental Relations*.

The Publications Committee members are:

Ana Martinez Aleman, Boston College & *Educational Policy*
Elizabeth DeBray-Pelot, University of Georgia
Luis Huerta, Teachers College
Bob Johnson, University of Utah
Dominique Johnson, Ramapo College
Michael McLendon, Vanderbilt University
Michelle Young University of Texas, Austin

—Janelle Scott, Chair
(University of California, Berkeley).

AERA PROGRAM REPORT

REBECCA JACOBSEN
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

The Politics and Education Association had an increase in the number of proposals this year nearly doubling the number of submissions. Additionally, we received an outstanding response to our request for reviewers with 38 members volunteering to become a member of the PEA review panel. From this outstanding pool of volunteers, five members were selected to be reviewers. They were:

- Ann Allen, Ohio State University
- Catherine Di Martino, New York University
- Ricardo Paredes, Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile
- Dorothy Shipps, Baruch College, CUNY
- Eran Tamir, Brandeis University

The members of the review panel were selected for their diversity in perspectives to ensure that proposals received a thoughtful and constructive review.

The PEA AERA program committee (Betty Malen, University of Maryland; La'Tara Osborne-Lampkin, University of North Florida; Tamara Wilder, University of Michigan) is in the process of developing this year's PEA program. Notifications will go out at the end of October.

PEA members can look forward to engaging and cutting edge research at this year's conference. Please look for these sessions when the program becomes available. Additionally, please remember to mark your calendar with the Politics and Education Association business meeting.

We look forward to seeing you in New Orleans.

Rebecca Jacobsen
Chair, Program Committee for AERA 2011

CALL FOR PROPOSALS

palgrave
macmillan
Educational Policy Series

PEA Colleagues:

Are you working on a book-length manuscript on educational policy? Do you have an idea that you would like to develop into a book and need a publisher? Rick Hess (AEI), Martin West (Harvard University) and Lance Fusarelli (North Carolina State University) are serving as series editors of Palgrave Macmillan's series devoted to educational policy. Please consider submitting a proposal for a book-length manuscript.

Topics Sought: Any educational policy topic, whether in K-12 or higher education. The series editors are particularly interested in manuscripts or proposals that might appeal beyond a narrow academic audience. Well-reasoned, provocative proposals buttressed by sound research and analyses are welcome. All ideological perspectives are also welcome.

Type of Books: Proposals for monographs and edited volumes are welcome.

Who Can Submit: Anyone—faculty at any level as well as doctoral students. Promising proposals from emerging researchers and scholars, including newly minted professors, are particularly encouraged.

Submission Requirements: Email any of the following: (1) 1-2 page abstract; (2) draft chapters; or (3) complete manuscript (even your dissertation) to Dr. Lance Fusarelli at lance_fusarelli@ncsu.edu. Prospective authors may also consult Palgrave's Publishing Proposal Guidelines for Authors (palgrave.com)

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 education 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

Ann Allen, Co-Editor
 Ohio State University
 301 Ramseyer Hall
 Columbus, Ohio 43210
allen.952@osu.edu
 Phone: (614) 292-0289
 Fax: (614) 292-7070

Roxanne Hughes, Managing Editor
 Florida State University
 113 Stone Building
 Tallahassee, Florida 32306
rmh05e@fsu.edu

**AERA SIG Politics of Education Association
 Financial Statement (January – August 2010)**

Description	Beginning Balance	Income	Expenditures	Ending Balance
Beginning Balance	\$7,452.05			
Membership Dues Income		\$3,980.00		
PEA Dissertation Award 2010			\$250.00	
Taylor & Francis-PEA Yearbook			\$3,456.00	
UCEA Breakfast Meeting			\$539.40	
William L. Boyd National Education Politics Workshop at AERA			\$517.17	
PEA Award plaques			307.24	
AERA SIG Management Fee 07/10-06/11			300.00	
	\$7,452.05	\$3,980.00	\$5369.81	\$6062.24

Politics of Education Association 2010-11 Appointments

Executive Board

Catherine Lugg, Rutgers University
Stacey Rutledge, Florida State University
Janelle Scott, University of California, Berkeley
Jeffrey Henig, Teachers College
Tamara Young, North Carolina State University

Dissertation Award Committee (Staggered 2 year terms)

Christopher Loss, Vanderbilt University (through April '11)
Lorraine McDonnell, University of California, Santa Barbara (through April '11)
Eric Ness, University of Georgia (Chair, through April '11)
Brendan Maxcey, IUPUI (Through April 12)
Gerardo Lopez, Indiana University (Through April 12)
Darleen Opfer, Cambridge University (Through April 12)

Editorial Team, *PEA Bulletin* (2010-12)

William Kyle Ingle, Co-editor, Bowling Green State University
Ann Allen, Co-Editor, Ohio State University
Roxanne Hughes, Managing Editor, Florida State University

Elections Committee (One year appointment, 2010-11)

Stacey Rutledge, Florida State University (Chair)
Thu Suong Nguyen, IUPUI
Wayne Lewis, University of Kentucky
Hanne Mawhinney, University of Maryland

Membership Committee (Staggered 2 year terms)

Tiina Itkonen, California State University, Channel Islands (Chair, 2009-2011)
Robert Ream, University of California, Riverside
Bonnie Fusarelli, North Carolina State University

Program Committee (One year appointment, 2010-11)

Rebecca Johnson, Michigan State University (Chair for 2011)
Betty Malen, University of Maryland
La'Tara Osborne-Lampkin, University of North Florida
Tamara Wilder, University of Michigan (Chair, beginning 2012)

Program Review Panel (One year appointment, 2010-11)

Ricardo Paredes, Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile
Ann Allen, Ohio State University
Catherine Di Martino, New York University
Dorothy Shipps, Baruch College, CUNY
Eran Tamir, Brandeis University

Publications Committee (Staggered 2 year terms)

Ana Martinez Aleman, Boston College & *Education Policy*
Elizabeth DeBray-Pelot, University of Georgia (through April 12)
Luis Huerta, Teachers College (through April 12)
Bob Johnson, University of Utah (through April '11)
Dominique Johnson, Ramapo College (through April 12)
Michael McLendon, Vanderbilt University (through April '11)
Janelle Scott, University of California, Berkeley (Chair, through April '11)
Michelle Young University of Texas, Austin (through April '11)

Scholarship & Service Awards Committee (Staggered 2 year terms)

Julia Ballenger, Stephen F. Austin State University (through April '11)
Stephen Coffin, Montclair State University (through April '11)
Patrick McGuinn, Drew University (through April '11)
Jane Clark Lindle, Clemson University, (Chair through '12)
Samantha M. Paredes Scribner, Indiana University (through 2012)

William L. Boyd National Education Politics Workshop sponsored by PEA and UCEA (One year appointment, 2010-11)

Katrina Bulkley, Montclair State University (Co-Chair, PEA representative)
Dana Mitra, Pennsylvania State University (Co-Chair, UCEA representative)

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, then you can still join or renew your PEA membership online by:

- >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 (faculty)**
- >**\$20 (student)**

Please note that all SIG memberships will *expire* at the same time the AERA membership expire—generally, at the end of the 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

Lora Cohen-Vogel (2008-2010) Florida State University
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 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)