



POLITICS OF EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

A Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association

VOLUME 29, No. 2

BULLETIN

Spring, 2005

Table of Contents

Page 1	Special Announcements
Page 1	<i>Information and Information Use for School Choice Under a Statewide Voucher Program</i> Virginia R. Weidner, Leon County Schools
Page 6	<i>Some Thoughts on the No Child Left Behind Act and a Second Term for the Bush Administration</i> Catherine A. Lugg, Rutgers University
Page 8	Of Interest...
Page 9	Message from the President
Page 9	Message from the Program Chair
Page 10	Message from the Publications Chair
Page 10	2005 Yearbook
Page 11	Call for Proposals
Page 11	Selected AERA Sessions & Individual Presentations
Page 15	PEA Officers & Chairs
Page 17	Politics of Education Association Business Meeting Agenda
Page 18	PEA Membership Application

PEA Business meeting during the AERA annual meeting

Mark your calendar -

Date: Wednesday, April 13

Time: 6:15pm - 8:15pm

Building/Room: Fairmont The Queen

Elizabeth / Richelieu

See page 17 for a meeting agenda.

Fordham University/PEA Reception

Fordham University invites PEA members to their reception AFTER the PEA Business Meeting -

Date: Wednesday, April 13

Time: 7:00 pm – 9:00 pm

**Building/Room: Marriott Montreal
Chateau Champlain, Viger, Section C**

Information and Information Use for School Choice Under a Statewide Voucher Program

**Virginia R. Weidner,*
Leon County (Florida) Schools**

Florida was the first state to have a statewide school voucher program. In fact Florida has three statewide voucher programs, the first of which is

* The author is a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership, College of Education, Florida State University. This article is based on a dissertation entitled The McKay Scholarships for Students with Disabilities: Parents' use of information and Information Sources, Florida State University. Copyright retained by author.

the Opportunity Scholarships,¹ started in 1999 as part of the state's accountability program. Before President Bush proposed a similar program as part of an early version of No Child Left Behind, these vouchers allowed students in a "failing" public school the opportunity to attend another public school or a private school using tuition vouchers. In 2000, the Florida legislature passed its second voucher program, the John M. McKay Scholarships for Students with Disabilities,² which provides tuition vouchers to parents of children with disabilities so their child can attend another public school or a private school of their choice. In 2004-2005, 14,818 of the approximately 375,000 eligible students with disabilities were participating in this program.³ The third voucher program was added in 2002. This program, the Corporate Tax Credit Scholarship Program,⁴ provides low-income families up to \$3,500 for tuition, books, and transportation to attend a religious or non-religious private school.

The McKay voucher program closely resembles the theoretical voucher programs proposed by Milton Friedman⁵ and by John Chubb and Terry Moe⁶ in that it has few restrictions. The primary restrictions are that a student must be eligible for special education services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [IDEA]⁷ and must have been in a public school the year prior to taking a scholarship. Students with disabilities cut across economic, racial, and language groups. The McKay Scholarship Program does not restrict participation based on income, nor does it require that private schools accept students without regard to their admissions policies. The amount of the vouchers is based on the state's education funding and varies based on the student's level of needed

special education services. Private schools may charge parents additional tuition and fees if the voucher amount does not cover the full costs.

Description of the study

While other voucher studies have looked at student achievement, parent satisfaction and the reasons parents give for choosing a particular school, this study is the first to look at the information and the information sources parents use when making a decision about school choice under a statewide voucher program. Parents of students using McKay Scholarships and parents of students with disabilities whose children are in a public school in Duval County Florida were surveyed. Although the return rate was small,⁸ the samples are sufficiently representative of the special education population in Florida and of the statewide McKay voucher population along several parameters (race, income, education level of parents, gender of students, and students' living arrangements) to discount selection bias when describing the trends seen in parents' use of information and information sources. Therefore, the results provide some insights into the types of information gathered by parents, into the sources parents use, and into parent satisfaction.

Selected AERA Sessions & Individual Presentations

See page 11 for a list of AERA sessions & individual presentations that may be of interest to PEA members.

¹ Florida Statutes §1002.38 F.S. 2004.

² Florida Statutes §1002.39 F.S. 2004.

³ Florida Department of Education, Choice Office (2005).

John M. McKay Scholarship Program November Cumulative Demographic Report: All districts.

⁴ Florida Statutes, §220.187 F.S. 2002).

⁵ Milton Friedman, 1955, The role of government in education. In, R.A. Solo (Ed.) Economics and the Public Interest, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

⁶ John Chubb and Terry Moe, 1990, Politics markets & America's Schools. Washington DC: The Brookings Institute

⁷ 20 U.S.C. Chapter 33 (2004).

⁸ Surveys were sent to 1,342 McKay voucher parents and 1,342 parents of students with disabilities in the Duval County public schools. The return rate was 251 or 19% of McKay surveys and 154 or 12% of public school surveys. Florida's privacy statute, §1002.22(5)(d), prohibited access to the names and addresses. Duval County agreed to print the labels and mail the surveys. A follow up mailing was not possible.

Demographics

The data in this study indicate that McKay voucher parents have higher incomes, are more educated, and are disproportionately white (non-Hispanic) compared to the public school sample, to the Duval County Schools population, and to the statewide special education population. These findings tend support to the view of voucher opponents⁹ that unrestricted vouchers will be used more often by more highly educated and more affluent parents.

On the other hand, the data do not support the argument that if private schools are allowed to use their own admission standards, they will pick only the best students leaving the public schools with the more difficult to teach students.¹⁰ Students who needed the highest levels of special education services represented a larger proportion of the McKay respondent sample than they did in the public school sample. It appears that under a voucher program for students with disabilities, private schools are willing to accept students with varying levels of needed special education services. The McKay Scholarships may be used at both secular and religious schools. In 2003-2004, Duval had 19 non-religious private schools and 19 religious private schools participating in the McKay voucher program; by February 2005, the number of religious schools participating had increased to 38 while the number of private non-religious schools remained the same. Over 43% of the McKay students in this study attended religious private schools and nearly 53% attended non-religious schools. The data further indicated that 61% of African-American and 77% of Hispanic families using the McKay Scholarship send their children to religious private schools. While only 35.5% of white (non-Hispanic) McKay students attended religious private schools.

⁹ David H. Monk, (1990). Educational Finance An Economic Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company; E. Doerr, A. J. Menendez, & J. M. Swomley. (1996). The Case Against School Vouchers. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books. J.J. Hanus, and P. W. Cookson Jr. (1996); Choosing Schools Vouchers and American Education. Washington, DC: The American University

¹⁰ Id.

Information

Parents were asked about the information they gathered prior to making their decision about school choice. Information on class size, academic quality, quality of teachers, special education programs, and curricula taught were collected by the largest percentages of respondents. Class size was the piece of information collected by the largest percentage of respondents. The types of information collected by respondents in this study reflect the various reasons given by parents in previous voucher studies for their choice of school.¹¹ Very small percentages of respondents gathered information on religious instruction, location, discipline, school safety, school size and transportation. The types of information collected were generally consistent across race/ethnicity, income, area of disability, level of parents' education, and parents' motivation to change schools. However, not all parents indicated they were able to access the information they had wanted. Fifty percent of all public school respondents and almost 13% of McKay respondents

¹¹ Jay P. Greene with D. Hall, 2001, The CEO Horizon Scholarship Program: A case study of the school voucher in the Edgewood Independent School District, San Antonio, Texas final report. Research Paper: Mathematica Policy Research Inc, Washington DC [on-line] Available: <http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/pepg>; D. J. Weinschrott and S. B. Kilgore, 1998, Evidence from the Indianapolis Voucher program. In Paul E. Peterson and Bryan C. Hassel (Eds.), Learning from School Choice, Washington DC: The Brookings Institution Press, 307-333; Jay P. Greene, William G. Howell, and Paul E. Peterson, 1998, Lessons from the Cleveland Scholarship Program. In Paul E. Peterson and Bryan C. Hassel (Eds.) Learning from School Choice, Washington DC: The Brookings Institute Press, 357-392; M. Adler, A. Petch and J. Tweedie, 1989, Parental choice and educational policy, Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press; Jay Greene and Greg Forster, 2003 Vouchers for special education students: An evaluation of Florida's McKay Scholarship Program. The Manhattan Institute: Civic Report No. 38. [On-line] Available: http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cr_38.htm; Mark Schneider, Paul Teske, Melissa Marschall, and Christine Roch, 1998, Shopping for schools: In the land of the blind, the one-eyed parent may be enough. In American Journal of Political Science, 42(3), 769-793; and Mark Schneider, 2001 Information and choice in educational privatization. In H.M Levin (ED.) Privatizing education: Can the marketplace deliver choice, efficiency, equity, and social cohesion?, Boulder CO: Westview Press, 72-102.

indicated that they were unable to get all the information they wanted. Information on academic quality, quality of teachers, special education programs, and curricula were noted as the most difficult to get. Several public school respondents noted that lack of information had discouraged them from utilizing the McKay Scholarships. One possible implication of this finding is that the lack of information can inhibit free movement among school options that could then hinder the efficient operation of an education marketplace.

Information Sources

This study identified friends/relatives, private schools, the Florida Department of Education, and the Internet as the sources that most parents used to find information. No one source stands out as the best source of information about the scholarship. However, the Internet was used nearly twice as often as any other source for information about the schools that accept the scholarship. Unlike previous research findings,¹² relatively few parents accessed information about either the scholarship or the schools from newspapers, television, churches or synagogues, visual inspections, advertisements, or community centers. This difference in sources may be due in part to the expanding accessibility to the Internet. The data also indicated that mothers who had less than a high school diploma used the Internet as a source much less frequently than did other respondents; they did, however, use co-workers and community centers more frequently. Other sources that were used by specific sub-groups were non-school professionals (e.g. social workers, psychologists, therapists, or physicians) and advocacy groups. Non-school professionals were used more often by respondents with children with high levels of needed special education services, whereas, advocacy groups¹³ were used only by respondents with children with autism.

The Internet was used by 44% of all McKay respondents to get information on the schools that accepted the scholarship. The use of the Internet

varied somewhat among the various groups of McKay respondents. Hispanic respondents, respondents with incomes less than \$25,000, respondents whose children had the highest levels of needed services and respondents who were motivated to use the voucher because they wanted their child to attend a specific private school used the Internet less frequently but still at a rate of over 30%. Respondents who reported that their mothers had less than a high school diploma used the Internet the least. Only 17% of them used the Internet to get information on the scholarship and only 5.9% to get information on the schools. This finding may be due to the respondents' lack of technological skills or their inability to access computers with Internet capabilities. These data support a growing concern of a technology gap that exists among families.¹⁴ As in previous voucher research, the data in this study indicate that parents may not do extensive information gathering before making a decision about school choice. Respondents on average used only one or two sources, with over 31% of McKay respondents indicating that the Internet was the only source they had used for gathering information. This study did not address how parents use the Internet. Because the use of the Internet can vary from looking at one site to looking at hundreds of sites, further research is needed to determine how parents use the Internet to get information about schools.

Satisfaction

Respondents using the McKay Scholarships were more satisfied with the schools their children attend than were public school respondents. They were also more satisfied with the overall information they had and with the sources they used than were public school respondents. Over 90% of McKay respondents indicated that they were satisfied with each individual piece of information they had prior to making their school choice decision, whereas only between 55% and 82% of public school respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with each individual piece of information they had prior to making their school choice decision.

¹² Adler, Petch and Tweedie, 1989; Schneider, 2001.

¹³ For example, Children and Adults with Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder [CHADD] (www.chadd.org) and Autism Society of America (www.autism-society.org).

¹⁴ Schneider, 2001.

Conclusion and Policy Implications

The data in this study provide an initial look into the information and information sources used by parents when making a school choice under a statewide voucher program. Further study needs to be done to determine what effects voucher programs have on the public school system, on private schools, and on student outcomes. Because parents do not appear to do extensive shopping for schools, additional research needs to address the reasons parents give for doing limited information gathering and to determine if the limited information is sufficient for informed choice. In addition, further study on the use of the Internet as an information dissemination tool will help states and other voucher entities develop better means of providing information to parents. The results of this study suggest that the Internet can be a viable tool to provide parents with information about school choice. A central site, maintained by the state, where parents can get access to information and on which parents can provide feedback for other parents about accuracy of the information they have accessed would be an efficient means of disseminating information. The question of assuring equitable Internet access by families with lower levels of education and income must be addressed. One possible solution might be to provide supported Internet access to parents at local schools and libraries. In addition, the state could offer an information “hotline” for parents to call and request that school specific information be sent to them. Finally, the viability of the education voucher policy approach in Florida remains uncertain. Florida’s first statewide voucher program, the Opportunity Scholarships¹⁵ has been ruled unconstitutional at both the trial court¹⁶ and District Appellate court¹⁷ levels because the it allows parents to use the vouchers in private religious schools; currently as of March 2005, the case is on appeal to the Florida Supreme Court. If Florida’s High Court upholds the lower courts’ decisions and determines that the Opportunity Scholarship vouchers violate the Florida Constitution, it follows

¹⁵ Florida Statutes, §1002.38 F.S. 2004

¹⁶ *Holmes v. Bush* 767 So.2d 668 (Fla. 2000).

¹⁷ *Bush v. Holmes*, 886 So.2d 340 (Fla. 2004)

that the McKay Scholarships, which also include religious schools, would likely be deemed unconstitutional as well. My findings suggest that removing the private religious school option under the McKay program will disproportionately affect African-American and Hispanic students voucher students. If, as a result of the prohibition, African-American and Hispanic families cannot find private schools in which to use the voucher, the racial distribution of participating students would become even more skewed in favor of white (non-Hispanic) families than it currently is, thus providing additional support to voucher opposition. Statewide voucher programs are in their infancy. Although there continues to be much to learn about vouchers’ effects on improving student achievement and on improving schools, this study provides some insights into information dissemination to parents that could enhance the effective implementation of voucher programs in the future.

Virginia R. Weidner serves as Program/Staffing Specialist of the Exceptional Student Education Department in the Leon County School District, Tallahassee, Florida.



PEA Yearbook 2005

The Politics of Education Association is pleased to announce the publication of its 2005 Yearbook, entitled *The Politics of Teacher and Administrator Preparation and Development: The Quality Controversy* coedited by Lora Cohen-Vogel and Carolyn Herrington. See Page 10 for a complete list of volume chapters and articles.



PERSPECTIVES ~

The Bulletin is pleased to introduce a new Perspectives section. Views expressed are the author's own.

Some Thoughts on the No Child Left Behind Act And a Second Term for the Bush Administration

**Catherine A. Lugg
Rutgers University**

The first Bush administration and its approach to federal education policy were marked by its signature accomplishment: The No Child Left Behind Act—the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)—in January of 2002. The move to NCLB, and away from ESEA, represented more than mere semantics. Passed by strong bi-partisan majorities in both the House and Senate, the legislation was widely hailed as a significant improvement in federal education policy that would better focus public educators' attention on academic results, particularly for low-income children.¹⁸ It seems clear that public schools will be expected to improve student test scores across demographic classifications or face increasingly stringent sanctions that may eventually include a loss of federal funding.¹⁹ Perhaps not since 1965 will the federal government play such a vigorous role in shaping educational policy at the state and even local school levels.

Since the 2002 passage of NCLB, the political and fiscal environments of the United States, and indeed the world, have been transformed. The administration is currently

¹⁸ Darling-Hammond, L., and Sykes, G. (2003, September 17). Wanted: A national teacher supply policy for education: The right way to meet the "Highly Qualified Teacher" challenge?. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 11(33). Retrieved February 16, 2005 from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n33/>.

¹⁹ Hoff, D. J. February 4, 2004. "Debate Grows on True Costs Of School Law," *Education Week*. Available online at <http://www.edweek.com/ew/ewstory.cfm?slug=21NCLBCost.h23>.

confronting severe fiscal constraints and an altered national social climate, in part due to the ongoing war in Iraq and the unresolved attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon. Domestic policies in general and education in particular, have slipped in their political importance.²⁰ Furthermore, there is evidence of national discontent with NCLB,²¹ which the incoming US Secretary of Education, Margaret Spellings, has promised to address. This article maps out the current educational politics and policy situations confronting the second Bush administration and offers some speculation of what might be in store for federal educational policy affecting US public schools for the next four years.

Fiscal policy

Since the beginning of the Bush presidency, one of the most dramatic changes in federal policy involves the federal budget. Moving from a budget surplus of \$236.4 billion in fiscal year 2000²² to a budget deficit that swelled to \$413 billion for last fiscal year alone, the US has rapidly expanded spending while redistributing the tax burden downward.²³ This radical shift in fiscal policy, coupled with unanticipated and enormous expenditures for the war in Iraq has severely constrained policy options on the domestic side, and

²⁰ Metcalf, S. January 28, 2004. "Reading between the lines," *The Nation*. Available online at: <http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20020128&c=1&s=metcalf>.

²¹ Gordon, D. T. (Ed.). (2003). *A nation reformed? American education 20 years after A Nation at Risk*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. See also Nick Anderson, "Bush's Latest Brainchild Could Be Left Behind," *Los Angeles Times*. January 4, 2005. From the World Wide Web, <http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-schools4jan04.story>. Last accessed January 4, 2005. Diana Jean Schemo, Efforts by Bush on Education Faces Obstacles in States. *New York Times*, August 18, 2004. From the World Wide Web, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/08/18/education/18record.html>. Last access on August 18, 2004

²² See Congressional Budget Office website. <http://www.cbo.gov/showdoc.cfm?index=1821&sequence=0#table1>. Last accessed on December 8, 2004.

²³ Associated Press, Bush Looking at Freezing Domestic Spending, Friday, December 17, 2004.

this includes education.²⁴ Furthermore, the recently passed Medicaid prescription drug benefit coupled with the proposed privatization of Social Security reduces the availability of funds for other venues.²⁵ Consequently, federal ventures in education would likely place the fiscal burden either on the states, on individuals, or both—a political hard sell even in the strongest economies.

No Child Left Behind?

While there has been some talk about expanding the testing mandates of NCLB to include grades 9 through 11, it seems unlikely that bipartisan support could be generated to ensure its passage²⁶. Conservative Republicans, who have long disdained any federal involvement in education, have been increasingly vocal with their criticisms²⁷. Many of their concerns focus on the enormous centralizing power NCLB has had in shaping state and local district testing and curricula policies as well as teacher certification standards. Democrats and some moderate Republicans have also objected that NCLB is under-funded, and has placed additional fiscal stress on states and local school districts as they work to comply with testing and AYP mandates²⁸. According to a report published by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), “From an economic perspective, NCLB will cost states about 10 times

as much as they receive from the federal government.”²⁹ Although appropriations vary in scope and support from state to state, NCLB is vulnerable to the charge that it is largely an unfunded federal mandate³⁰.

NCLB also widens the opening for school finance litigation, since many states have constitutional requirements that mandate a “thorough and efficient” public education for every child in the state. As of 2004, over 25 of the 50 states have had their systems of school finance challenged for various reasons in state court. Some of these revolve around funding, while others center on ensuring equity. There are still other reasons for challenges as well³¹. An unintended policy outcome is that NCLB makes states even more vulnerable to school finance litigation.³² Consequently, it seems possible that one can expect that these funding issues will continue to plague implementation of NCLB, and that the US Department of Education and/or Congress may eventually be compelled to respond by softening some of the harsher penalties and more rigid timetables.

Another set of NCLB-related issues involves educational equity. On these points, the Bush administration has espoused support, making repeated rhetorical references to the “soft bigotry of

²⁴ Peronet Despeignes, White House May Want \$100 Billion More for War, *The Chicago Sun Times*. January 4, 2005.

²⁵ Ronald Brownstein, Bush May Be Borrowing Trouble With Social Security Plan. *Los Angeles Times*. December 20, 2004. From the World Wide Web. <http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-outlook20dec20,1,613131.column?coll=la-headlines-nation>. Last accessed on December 20, 2004.

²⁶ Fusarelli, L. D. (2001). The political construction of accountability: When rhetoric meets reality. *Education and Urban Society*, 33(2), 157-169

²⁷ Toppo, G. (February 10, 2005). ‘No Child’ expansion likely to face trouble: Lawmakers object to Bush’s plan. USA Today, available online at: http://www.usatoday.com/printedition/life/20050210/bl_topline10.art.htm

²⁸ Anderson, 2005. See also Alan Greenblatt, The Left Behind Syndrome, *Governing Magazine*. September 2004.

²⁹ William J. Mathias, *The Federal No Child Left Behind Act: What will it Cost States?* Washington, DC: (American Association of School Administrators). 2004, p. 7.

³⁰ Sunderman, G. (Fall, 2003). Federal-State Relationships and the Implementation of *No Child Left Behind*—First Impressions. The PEA Bulletin. Available online at: http://www.fsu.edu/~pea/newsletters/pea_bulletin_fall_2003.pdf.

³¹ See Footnote 10

³² Mathias, p. 7. See also Jerome N. Frank Legal Services Corporation and Connecticut Voices for Children. *Early Changes, Enduring Challenges: Connecticut Educators Speak Out about the Impact of the No Child Left Behind Act*. New Haven, CT: (Yale Law School). 2004. See also R. Craig Wood, Constitutional Challenges to State Education Finance Distribution Formulas: Moving From Equity to Adequacy. *Saint Louis University Public Law Review*. Volume 23, pp. 531-564, 2004; James S. Liebman & Charles F. Sabel, A Public Laboratory Dewey Barely Imagined: The Emerging Model of School Governance and Legal Reform. *New York University Review of Law and Social Change*. Volume 28, pp. 183-304, 2003.

low expectations,”³³ but has done little to meaningfully address long-standing concerns of access to high quality public education, the achievement gap, and low educational outcomes for poor children³⁴. Supporters of NCLB note that the law mandates (eventually) equitable outcomes for all public school students, regardless of their ethnicity, race, gender, dis/ability, and class, while critics worry that coupling stringent expectations (defined as AYP and high stakes testing) with inadequate funding, amounts to ignoring issues related to an inequality of opportunity for success³⁵. It will be interesting to watch the extent to which the administration uses, or refuses, to use NCLB and its mandates to promote issues of educational equity and opportunity.

The Next Four Years

Generally speaking, it seems likely that we can expect few major changes in federal education policy during a second Bush administration. Given economic constraints, it is doubtful that there will be an increase in federal funds to support the mandate. Despite its strengths and weaknesses, NCLB is set to remain in place. While the administration will maintain strong rhetorical support for school choice and expanded religious expression within public schools, an expansion of funding for these is unlikely. For states, the chronic under-funding of NCLB will trigger a host of policy and political dilemmas, and may well ignite additional school finance litigation. Equity issues, which are highlighted by the testing requirements in NCLB, will continue to be ignored or diverted, with little improvement forthcoming.

A final note: With the appointment of Margaret Spellings as the new Secretary of Education, we can expect better relations between the Department of Education and other political constituencies, particularly on Capitol Hill.³⁶ In an

³³ Shemo, 2004.

³⁴ Glickman, C. D. (Ed.). (2004). *Letters to the next president: What we can do about the real crisis in public education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

³⁵ See Footnote 10

³⁶ Michael Dobbs, Spelling Promises to Fix No Child Left Behind Law, *Washington Post*, January 7, 2005, p A5.

era of diminished expectations, it's perhaps the best one can do.

Catherine Lugg serves as Associate Professor at the Rutgers Graduate School of Education. She is currently working on a political history of the US Christian Right and its involvement with educational politics, from 1973 to 1994.



OF INTEREST...

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

In the spring of 2004, Ben Levin accepted a professorial position at Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT) along with nomination for a Canada Research Chair in Education Leadership and Policy. Levin joined OISE/UT officially on Jan 1, 2005, but his active role in the position will be postponed for a while, as he was also appointed by the Government of Ontario as Deputy Minister of Education effective Dec 6, 2004. Levin will be responsible for leading and managing the Ministry of Education and K-12 education policy on behalf of the government. Levin states, “I did not anticipate returning to government so soon, and certainly did not envisage taking on this key role in Ontario. However I am persuaded that there is important work to be done in the Ontario Ministry and that I can help the government and the education system make progress on some very important goals.” The Ontario education system is Canada's largest with 2 million students.

Also of note, Levin's book, *Governing Education*, based on his experience as deputy minister in Manitoba from 1999 to 2002 has been published by the University of Toronto Press.

Brendan Maxcy (Ph.D., University of Texas, Austin) has accepted a position in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri, Columbia.

Enrique Aleman, Jr. (Ph.D., University of Texas, Austin) has accepted a position in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City.



**MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT:
BRUCE S. COOPER
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY**

We have had an exciting semester, with the Politics of Education Association moving ahead on so many fronts in 2004. We have been successful in PEA publications, with an issue of the *PEA Yearbook* in Educational Policy assembled and in press. Those of you who are current members in 2005 will receive this yearbook on the politics of teacher and administrator preparation edited by Lora Cohen-Vogel and Carolyn Herrington of Florida State University.

Likewise, a special PEA Yearbook issue of the *Peabody Journal of Education* that looks at the effects of No Child Left Behind will be sent to PEA members. Edited by the team of Elizabeth H. De Bray (University of Georgia), Kathryn A. McDermott (University of Massachusetts-Amherst), and Priscilla Wohlstetter (University of Southern California), this issue is entitled *Federalism Reconsidered: The Case of No Child Left Behind Act*.

Second, PEA continues to consider its role, now that it has re-established itself as a Special Interest Group (SIG) of the American Education Research Association (AERA). A PEA committee, chaired by William L. Crowson (Vanderbilt University), reviewed the work of our group and has urged PEA to focus on politics as distinguished from policy studies. One other suggestion, which is exciting, is that PEA sponsor a conference, perhaps next fall,

and in Washington, DC, where we could spend a day or two discussing and analyzing political issues in education, for example, working with groups like the US Conference of Mayors, AASA, CCSSO, and the World Bank with a vital interest in ed politics. If you are interested in planning such a conference, please let me know!

Third, the Crowson committee also had another interesting idea: what do the members think about publishing a handbook on the politics of education, and what might be the topics for discussion in this work? If you are interested in forming an editorial board, being on the board, contributing to the volume (and/or acting as editor-in-chief since these handbooks are major undertakings), please let me know. And, yes, we are looking for a publisher of a PEA Handbook on Politics of Education.

Finally, we are making progress in growing back our membership. Please do two things for us: Join or re-join PEA for this year 2005, if you have not already, and urge your friends and graduate students to come on board too.

See you in Montreal at AERA! If you have ideas or suggestions for PEA in 2005, please let us know.

**MESSAGE FROM THE
AERA PROGRAM CHAIR:
LORA COHEN-VOGEL
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY**

I am pleased to announce that the PEA SIG has a promising line-up of presentations for the upcoming AERA conference in Montreal. First, PEA will sponsor a symposium, built on one of the sections of the 2005 PEA Yearbook entitled *"The Politics of Administrator Preparation and Development:: The Quality Controversy"* The 2005 PEA Yearbook Panelists include among others Frederick Hess, Ellen Goldring, Carolyn Herrington, Martha McCarthy, and Nelda Cambron-McCabe. A second symposium, *"Federalism Reconsidered: The Case of No Child Left Behind"* will feature six articles from a forthcoming special issue of the Peabody

Journal of Education and considers various political questions about the intent and effects of No Child Left Behind.

Finally, we have a strong set of paper discussions (formerly known as roundtables) planned including Christopher Brown's *"Keep it Cheap and Local: Standards-based Accountability Reform in Wisconsin"* and a set of interlinked studies on vernacular politics, globalization, and technology.

A full list of PEA-sponsored sessions along with their scheduled dates and venues is listed in this issue of *PEA Bulletin*.

MESSAGE FROM THE
PUBLICATIONS CHAIR:

JOHN FITZ

CARDIFF UNIVERSITY, WALES

Members of the Publications Committee enjoyed the 'launch' of the 2004 PEA Yearbook in a session at AERA San Diego. Chaired and introduced by Bill Boyd co-editor of the yearbook with Bonnie Fusarelli, the session attracted a large audience to hear presentations about and to discuss aspects of the politics of the curriculum, which had some interesting dimensions in what was a presidential election year. The presentations generated a lively discussion from the floor on issues such as religion in the curriculum and the politics of literacy and mathematics.

Meeting later that week the Publications Committee discussed possible themes that might form the focus of the PEA Yearbook 2006 and 2007 and PEA edited special issue of the Peabody Journal of Education in 2007. The Committee identified three broad areas that offered opportunities to contribute to the further development of the politics of education and at the same time address issues of national and local significance – politics of the media and education, the politics of social justice and the politics of the privatization of education. Proposals from Andrea Rorrer (Univ. of Utah) and Catherine Lugg (Rutgers Univ.), *Power, Education and the Politics of Social Justice* (PEA Yearbook

2006), Cynthia Gerstl-Pepin (Univ. of Vermont) and Darleen Opfer (Ohio State Univ.), *The Politics of the Media and Education* (Peabody Journal of Education PEA special edition 2007). Katie Bulkley (Rutgers) will co-edit the 2007 yearbook on the politics of privatization. These lead in times provide a generous amount of time for editors and authors to produce material of high quality and for there to be a plenty of time fore a rigorous review process of all individual contributions.

In 2005 we have the publication of the PEA yearbook edited by Carolyn Herrington and Lora Cohen-Vogel (*The Politics of Teacher and Administrator Training: the quality controversy*) and Peabody Journal of Education edited by Elizabeth DeBray, Kathryn A. McDermott, & Priscilla Wohlstetter, (*Federalism Reconsidered: the case of the No Child Left Behind Act*). We believe these will be major contributions to debates in the politics of education and in the field of education more generally.

The committee remains anxious to receive ideas for future publications. You should be encouraged to forward idea to members of the committee for consideration when it meets at AERA in Montreal. Full proposals are not necessary at this point but should you wish to put one together guidance is given on the PEA website.

2005 YEARBOOK

The 2005 Yearbook edited by Lora Cohen-Vogel and Carolyn Herrington (Florida State University), appears as the January-March special issue of the journal EDUCATIONAL POLICY (Vol. 19, No. 1). Contributors to the issue bring diverse perspectives and methodologies to explore federal, state, district, and program-level politics surrounding the preparation and ongoing development of teachers and school leaders.

Volume chapters include the following:

- "Teacher and Leadership Preparation and Development: No Strangers to Politics" by Lora Cohen-Vogel and Carolyn Herrington (Florida State University);

- “Federal Role in Teacher Quality: “Redefinition” or Policy Alignment?” by Lora Cohen-Vogel (Florida State University);
- “In MINT Condition? The Politics of Alternative Certification and Pay Incentives for Teachers in Massachusetts” by Kathryn A. McDermott (University of Massachusetts);
- “Life in the Fast Track: How States Seek to Balance Incentives and Quality in Alternative Teacher Certification Programs” by Susan Moore Johnson, Sarah E. Birkeland, and Heather G. Peske (Harvard University);
- “Addressing Teacher Quality Through Induction, Professional Compensation, and Evaluation: The Effects on Labor-Management Relations” by Julia Koppich (J. Koppich and Associates);
- “School-Level Politics and Professional Development: Traps in Evaluating the Quality of Practicing Teachers” by Bruce S. Cooper, Patricia Ehrensals, and Matthew Bromme (Fordham University);
- “Enhancing Commitment or Tightening Control: The Function of Teacher Professional Development in an Era of Accountability” by Thomas M. Smith and Kristie J. Rowley (Vanderbilt University);
- “An Innovative Look, a Recalcitrant Reality: The Politics of Principal Preparation Reform” by Frederick M. Hess and Andrew P. Kelly (American Enterprise Institute);
- “Decertifying the Principals: The Politics of Administrator Preparation in Florida” by Carolyn D. Herrington and Barbara K. Wills (Florida State University);
- “Educating School Leaders for Social Justice” by Nelda Cambron-McCabe (Miami University) and Martha M. McCarthy (Indiana University); and “Modeling Creative and Courageous School Leadership Through District-Community-University Partnerships” by Ellen Goldring and Pearl Sims (Vanderbilt University).

CALL FOR PROPOSALS

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

with its preparation and submission. Closing date for submission is **May 15, 2005**.

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

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



SELECTED AERA SESSIONS & INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS

Compiled here is a list of AERA sessions that may interest our members. Please note that sessions could not be reviewed on the basis of quality or content; rather, these sessions and individual presentations comprise those that were generated by a subject search of the AERA program for the term "politics."

SESSIONS

Charter Schools and Progressive Educators: Toward a New Politics of School Choice

Division L-Educational Policy and Politics

Session type: Interactive Symposium

Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 10:35am - 12:05pm

Building/Room: Hilton Montreal

Bonaventure / Montreal Ballroom, Section Lachine

Discourse and Politics in Education

Division L-Educational Policy and Politics

Session type: Paper Session

Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 8:15am - 9:45am Building/Room:

Marriott Montreal

Chateau Champlain / Huronie A & B

Education Politics and Governance

Division L-Educational Policy and Politics

Session type: Paper Session
Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 8:15am - 9:45am Building/Room:
Marriott Montreal
Chateau Champlain / Maisonneuve, Section C

***Gender, Politics, and Teacher Education:
International Perspectives***

Division J-Postsecondary Education
Section 5 - Society, Culture, and Change
Session type: Symposium
Time: Wed, Apr 13 - 8:15am - 9:45am Building/Room:
InterContinental
Montreal / Saint-Laurent

***Negotiating the Politics of Color: Race, Gender and the
Pursuit of Equity***

Division G-Social Context of Education
Section 4 - Social Contexts of Educational Policy,
Politics, and Praxis
Session type: Paper Session
Time: Fri, Apr 15 - 12:25pm - 1:55pm Building/Room:
Fairmont The Queen
Elizabeth / Hochelaga 5

Politics of Education Association Business Meeting

SIG-Politics of Education
Session type: Business Meeting
Time: Wed, Apr 13 - 6:15pm - 8:15pm Building/Room:
Fairmont The Queen
Elizabeth / Richelieu

***Politics of Education Paper Discussion Sessions:
Negotiating Ideas about Education in Today's World***

SIG-Politics of Education
Session type: Paper Discussion (formerly known as
Roundtables)
Time: Thu, Apr 14 - 9:05am - 9:45am Building/Room:
Marriott Montreal
Chateau Champlain / Salle de Bal Ballroom & Foyer

***Self-Construction and the Cultural and Linguistic
Politics of Identity: Bifurcation and Border-Crossing***

Division G-Social Context of Education
Section 3 - Social Context of Multiple Languages and
Literacies
Session type: Paper Session
Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 12:25pm - 1:55pm Building/Room:
Le Centre Sheraton
Montreal / Salon 3

The Politics of Administrator Preparation and

Development: The "Quality" Controversy

SIG-Politics of Education
Session type: Symposium
Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 12:25pm - 1:55pm Building/Room:
Le Centre Sheraton
Montreal / Salon C

The Politics of Disability Discourse

SIG-Disability Studies in Education
Session type: Paper Session
Time: Thu, Apr 14 - 4:05pm - 6:05pm Building/Room:
Ritz-Carlton, Montreal /
Salon Ritz

***The Rise and Fall: The Politics and Policy
Implications of Teacher Professional Development in
California.***

Division L-Educational Policy and Politics
Session type: Symposium
Time: Wed, Apr 13 - 8:15am - 9:45am Building/Room:
Le Centre Sheraton
Montreal / Salon 3

***Whence Colleges of Education? Lessons from the
Flexner Report on Colleges of Medicine***

SIG-Fiscal Issues, Policy and Education Finance
Session type: Invited Session
Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 8:15am - 9:45am Building/Room:
Le Centre Sheraton Montreal / Salle de Bal Ouest

INDIVIDUAL PRESENTATIONS

(See AERA Conference Program for presenters' names and locations.)

***A Flight From Politics? Free Schools and the 1960s
In Session: Populism and Pluralism: Conditions and
Consequences***

Division F-History and Historiography
Time: Wed, Apr 13 - 10:35am - 11:15am

***Being Here: The Politics of an (Im)migrant Self
In Session: Immigrant Women of Color in the
Academy: Come, Walk a Mile in Our Shoes***

SIG-Research on Women and Education
Time: Wed, Apr 13 - 10:35am - 12:05pm

***Critical Thinking and the Politics of Diversion
In Session: Critical Theory in the Classroom***

Division B-Curriculum Studies
Time: Mon, Apr 11 - 3:05pm - 3:45pm
***Cultivating the Qualitative Borderlands: Seeing Anew
the Politics of Inclusivity and Change***

In Session: Counter-hegemonic Qualitative Research and Praxis for Social Justice
SIG-Qualitative Research
Time: Thu, Apr 14 - 10:35am - 12:05pm

Curriculum and the Changing Politics and Society: The Case of Indonesian Islamic Schools Curriculum (1945–2003)

In Session: Curriculum Voices as Racial Text
Division B-Curriculum Studies
Section 2 - Curriculum Theory
Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 12:25pm - 1:55pm

Decertifying the Principalsip: The Politics of Administrator Preparation in Florida

In Session: The Politics of Administrator Preparation and Development: The "Quality" Controversy
SIG-Politics of Education
Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 12:25pm - 1:55pm

Early Childhood Education and Care in England: When Pedagogy Meets Politics

In Session: Early Childhood Education in a Changing World: Homage to Sally Lubeck
SIG-Early Education and Child Development
Time: Thu, Apr 14 - 12:25pm - 1:55pm

Envisioning a New Politics in Education: Rethinking the Intersection of Technology and Education

In Session: Critical Issues in Curriculum and Cultural Studies:
"Double-Discussant" Pastiche, Decoupage, and Montage
SIG-Critical Issues in Curriculum and Cultural Studies
Time: Wed, Apr 13 - 10:35am - 11:15am

Gender Politics and Initial Teacher Education in England: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives

In Session: Gender, Politics, and Teacher Education: International Perspectives
Division J-Postsecondary Education
Section 5 - Society, Culture, and Change
Time: Wed, Apr 13 - 8:15am - 9:45am

Gender Politics and Masculine Domination in Teacher Education

In Session: Gender, Politics, and Teacher Education: International Perspectives
Division J-Postsecondary Education
Section 5 - Society, Culture, and Change
Time: Wed, Apr 13 - 8:15am - 9:45am

Gubernatorial Reactions to NCLB: Politics, Pressure, and Education

In Session: Federalism Reconsidered: The Case of No Child Left Behind
SIG-Politics of Education
Time: Fri, Apr 15 - 8:15am - 10:15am

Inclusive Education, "Backdoor Eugenics" and the Politics of Research

In Session: Disability Studies and Inclusive Education: The Challenge to Special Educational Needs Orthodoxies in Educational Research
Presidential Invited Session
Time: Fri, Apr 15 - 8:15am - 9:45am

International Politics and Local School Development: Emerging Themes from a Seven-Nation Study

In Session: Division L - Paper Discussions on International Issues in Educational Policy
Division L-Educational Policy and Politics
Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 9:05am - 9:45am

Joe L. Reed: At the Nexus of Education and Politics

In Session: Minority Educators as Cultural Brokers - Biography and History
Division F-History and Historiography
Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 10:35am - 12:05pm

Latina Politics of Physical and Ideological Liberation: Adolescent Girls in Before We Were Free

In Session: Gendered Geographies: Mapping Femininities in Young Adult Literature
SIG-Literature
Time: Thu, Apr 14 - 2:15pm - 3:45pm

Making White Right: Race and the Politics of Educational Reform

In Session: Revisiting Whiteness Studies
Division G-Social Context of Education, Section 2
Time: Fri, Apr 15 - 8:15am - 10:15am

Musical Heritage and Identity Politics in the Classroom: A Comparative Case Study of Nation Building

In Session: Diversity, Culture, and Heritage in the Music Classroom
SIG-Music Education
Time: Thu, Apr 14 - 12:25pm - 1:55pm

Parent Engagement, Politics, and Democracy: Comparing EDUCO in El Salvador and NCLB

In Session: The Parent Factor
Division L-Educational Policy and Politics
Time: Wed, Apr 13 - 8:15am - 9:45am

Politics of Place: Managing Difference and Diversity

In Session: Diversity and Desegregation
Division L-Educational Policy and Politics
Time: Thu, Apr 14 - 8:15am - 9:45am

Preventing Educator Sexual Misconduct: The Politics of Research, Policymaking and Implementation

In Session: Division L - Paper Discussions on Teacher Issues
Division L-Educational Policy and Politics
Time: Wed, Apr 13 - 1:15pm - 1:55pm

Propelling Teaching and Learning: The Politics of Leadership Academies and District-Community-University Partnerships

In Session: The Politics of Administrator Preparation and Development: The "Quality" Controversy
SIG-Politics of Education
Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 12:25pm - 1:55pm

Prove It: The Politics and Policy Implications of Evaluation and Accountability

In Session: The Rise and Fall: The Politics and Policy Implications of Teacher Professional Development in California.
Division L-Educational Policy and Politics
Time: Wed, Apr 13 - 8:15am - 9:45am

Queer Bedfellows: Identity Politics and Queerness at a Campus LGBT Center

In Session: Frameworks for Examining Sexual Orientation and Gender
Division J-Postsecondary Education
Section 5 - Society, Culture, and Change
Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 8:15am - 9:45am

Race, Gender, and the Politics of Citation

In Session: Negotiating the Politics of Color: Race, Gender and the Pursuit of Equity
Division G-Social Context of Education
Section 4 - Social Contexts of Educational Policy, Politics, and Praxis
Time: Fri, Apr 15 - 12:25pm - 1:55pm

Reinventing Politics, Citizenship and Morality: New Challenges for Curriculum and Education

In Session: Values, Reflection and Re-Thinking Curriculum
Division B-Curriculum Studies
Time: Fri, Apr 15 - 12:25pm - 1:05pm

Schooling, Subjectivation, and the Possibilities for a Performative Politics

In Session: Theoretical Manoeuvres: Limit Work and Hybridities (Foucault and Education SIG)
SIG-Foucault and Education
Time: Mon, Apr 11 - 2:15pm - 3:45pm

Table #12: Addressing and Dealing with Academic Politics

In Session: Continued Conversations with Senior Scholars on Advancing Research and Development Related to Black Education
Presidential Invited Session
Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 2:15pm - 3:45pm

Table #5: The Critical Role of Research in Politics and Policy Decisions

In Session: Continued Conversations with Senior Scholars on Advancing Research and Development Related to Black Education
Presidential Invited Session
Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 2:15pm - 3:45pm

The Myth of Free Speech and the Politics of Power

In Session: Free Speech: The Im/Possibilities for Democratic Dialogue in Education
SIG-Philosophical Studies in Education
Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 12:25pm - 1:55pm

The Politics of Differences: Intercultural Negotiation Between Canadian Teachers and Minority Parents

In Session: Linking Fathers, Families, Teachers, and Schools Together
SIG-Family, School, Community Partnerships
Time: Wed, Apr 13 - 2:15pm - 3:45pm

The Politics of Identity and Schooling: A Comparative Case Study of American Indians and Taiwan Aborigines

In Session: Research in Indigenous Settings and Its Applications
SIG-Indigenous Peoples of the Americas
Time: Thu, Apr 14 - 10:35am - 11:15am

The Politics of Latina Parent Involvement in the Age of Accountability

In Session: Voices of Tension and Contradiction: How the Texas Accountability System Influences Latina/o Participation in Schools
Division G-Social Context of Education
Section 4 - Social Contexts of Educational Policy, Politics, and Praxis
Time: Tue, Apr 12 - 10:35am - 12:05pm

The Politics of Teacher Professional Development in California

In Session: The Rise and Fall: The Politics and Policy Implications of Teacher Professional Development in California.

Division L-Educational Policy and Politics
Time: Wed, Apr 13 - 8:15am - 9:45am

This Is What Democracy Looks Like! The Politics and Pedagogy of Educating for Social Change

In Session: Education for Social Justice and Social Change

Division G-Social Context of Education
Section 4 - Social Contexts of Educational Policy, Politics, and Praxis
Time: Thu, Apr 14 - 11:25am - 12:05pm

Transforming Education and Politics? The London Labour Party, "The Shrieking Sisterhood" and City Schooling

In Session: Genealogies and Gender Scripts: Theorizing the History of Women in Education

Division F-History and Historiography
Time: Fri, Apr 15 - 2:15pm - 3:45pm

Turkish Education, the Military, and Politics: Transitions in Turkish Education After the Coup d'Etat of 1980

In Session: Through the Eyes of the Insider: Topics in Research in Africa, Caribbean and Middle East
Time: Fri, Apr 15 - 12:25pm - 1:55pm

Vernacular Politics of Identity: Cosmopolitan Civic Education Within Technospaces of Imagined Communities

In Session: Politics of Education Paper Discussion
Sessions: Negotiating Ideas about Education in Today's World
SIG-Politics of Education
Time: Thu, Apr 14 - 9:05am - 9:45am

Whistlin' Dixie: The Politics of the Federal Judiciary and U.S. Educational Policy

In Session: Perennial Problems of Educational Administration: What We Can Learn from the Past
Division F-History and Historiography
Time: Wed, Apr 13 - 12:25pm - 1:55pm

**Division L: Education Policy & Politics
Business Meeting & Panel Discussion**

**Date: Thursday, April 14
Time: 6:15pm - 8:15pm
Building/Room: Le Centre Sheraton
Montreal/ Salon B**

The Panel Discussion is entitled "Whither Federal Education Policy?", and will include Jane Hannaway (Urban Institute), Rick Hess (American Enterprise Institute), Leanna Stiefel (NYU), and others.

PEA OFFICERS

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

PEA COMMITTEE CHAIRS

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

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

Lora Cohen-Vogel, Jeffrey Brooks, and Stacey Rutledge
***Politics of Education Association Bulletin*, Co-editors**

Florida State University

113 Stone Building

Tallahassee, FL 32306

850-644-6777

cohenvog@coe.fsu.edu

jbrooks@coe.fsu.edu

rutledge@coe.fsu.edu

Kyle Ingle

***Politics of Education Association Bulletin*, Managing Editor**

Florida State University

wki02@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

**Politics of Education Association
Business Meeting
AGENDA
April 13th, 2005, 6:15 p.m.
*Montreal, AERA***

1. Introduction and Year's Events: Bruce Cooper
2. Membership and Treasurer's Report: Lance Fusarelli
3. Election of PEA Secretary: Jane Lindle, chair, Nominations Committee
4. Publications Committee: Darlene Opfer for John Fitz
5. Program Coordinator's Report and *PEA Bulletin* Report: Lora Cohen-Vogel
6. Update on the PEA FELLOWSHIP: Sandra Vergari for Patrick Wolf
7. Discussion of the PEA Book Series: Bruce Cooper and George Johnson, Editor, Information Age Publishing
8. Discussion of the Relationship with AERA and Division L: Carolyn Herrington
9. Future Plans and Ideas for our SIG: Bruce Cooper
10. Adjournment and Repair to PEA-Fordham Reception (food, drink, and fellowship) at the Marriott Chateau Hotel, Viger Room, Section C from 7-9:00 PM.

Politics of Education Association
Membership Application
(Complete only if you are not a member of
AERA)

Name (please print): _____

Title: _____

Affiliation: _____

Address: _____

Phone: () _____

Email Address: _____

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

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

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