

EDPA 614 POLITICS OF EDUCATION*
Fall Semester, 2006

Instructor: Professor Betty Malen

Course Time and Place: Monday, 4:15-7:00 PM, 0220 Benjamin Building

Consultations: By appointment; office phone 301-405-3587, email malen@umd.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION: This course is an introduction to a complex, contested field of study. As such, it begins with an overview of major streams of work that fall under the rubric of the "politics" of education, then focuses on conceptual perspectives that can be used to examine political dynamics in various organizational contexts, including schools and universities. The course provides opportunities to apply conceptual perspectives to "mini" case studies of education policymaking processes in organizational settings of particular interest to students. It includes units that address the political processes through which education policy choices are determined in governmental arenas but places special emphasis on how these processes play out at the state and local level.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES: This course seeks to help students:

a) develop a general awareness of prominent conceptual perspectives and literature bases that can be used to examine and interpret the "politics" of education in the numerous formal and informal arenas that comprise the education policy system,

b) develop a general awareness of the contested character of the concepts and contributions of various political models and empirical studies of political processes,

c) articulate and apply a foundational conceptual perspective that is a particularly fruitful way of getting at the political processes that shape the formulation, enactment, implementation and impact of education policies,

d) develop "the habit of being analytic" in their consideration of the political dimensions of education and in their responses to the political issues inherent in education settings,

e) become more familiar with the environmental forces, institutional features, policy network activities and interest group pressures that affect education policy making in governmental arenas and other organizational contexts,

f) acquire a basic understanding of the role(s) educators play (or might play) in multiple decision arenas, the resources and strategies that can be deployed to influence education policy and the aspects of leadership that may warrant special attention in efforts to exercise "political leadership."

* This course draws liberally, at times literally, on a course developed by Professor Tim Mazzoni, University of Minnesota.

MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS: This course makes several assumptions:

a) Education is fundamentally political in nature. Beyond being an avenue through which society seeks to "socialize" individuals, transmit values (including views of civic responsibility) and prepare persons for "productive roles" in their respective work places and broader communities, education is a "stage" on which social conflicts are manifest and "managed."

b) Education policy decisions are not only inescapably political but also particularly critical because they determine the distribution of benefits and burdens in educational organizations and affect the distribution of benefits and burdens in society.

c) These allocative decisions develop through processes that are based on power and characterized by bargains, negotiations, compromises and other accommodations.

d) A course that focuses on the political dimensions of education policy issues, processes and choices must consist of more than information about governmental arrangements, community contexts, interest group pressures and the like. It must provide exposure to conceptual frameworks and opportunities to develop conceptual skills, since these are among the most fundamental "skills" required by those who wish to study "politics" and by those who seek to exercise leadership in organizational settings.

e) The most fundamental "analytic skill" involves the ability to explicate an orienting framework (a set of related categories, assumptions and questions) that could be used to guide the description, analysis and interpretation of political dynamics, to articulate a "way of thinking" about, a way of understanding political interactions. A closely linked "skill" involves the ability to acquire, assess and assemble data about political dynamics and to evaluate, integrate and interpret those data in light of the logic and limits of the orienting framework.

f) An orienting framework that combines analytic categories drawn from political systems and power-influence perspectives constitutes an appropriate introduction to and foundation for the study of politics in governmental and educational organizations.

GENERAL CONTENTS, STRUCTURE AND APPROACH: The course is structured around five units. The first provides a broad overview of the field of study. The second concentrates on a conceptual framework that is a particularly helpful (and foundational) guide to the analysis of political dynamics. The third and fourth units examine political dynamics in federal, state and local arenas. The final unit confronts issues associated with the exercise of political leadership. A detailed outline of course contents will be provided at the start of each unit. As the attached general outline and tentative course calendar indicate, units are not given "equal time." Unit II is the crux of this course. Units will be addressed through a combination of readings, discussions, lectures, case applications and written assignments.

COURSE QUALIFIERS: This course is an abbreviated introduction to complex, contested concepts, not a thorough, let alone exhaustive treatment of these notions. It addresses important aspects of politics, but neglects or gives short shrift to other aspects that are arguably as important as the matters emphasized. The multiple "antecedents" of political activity and the messy

methodological challenges that confront those who seek to study politics are among the key issues that get very short-shrift. Students are encouraged to view this course as a "tip of the iceberg" exposure to the politics of education, as a springboard for further study.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS: The five course requirements are described below.

1. **Reading Assignments.** Each student is responsible for the readings noted on the syllabus and available (a) on line, (b) in print from the instructor, and (c) on reserve in the Educational Technology Support Center (ETSC) in the basement of Benjamin Building. Other readings may be assigned (or substituted) during the semester as the instructor learns more about students' interests and backgrounds. The set of readings includes classic and contemporary works that illustrate and augment ideas presented and discussed in class sessions. These selections are prioritized via required and recommended designations on the attached course schedule. The set of readings also contains case studies of political dynamics in various organizational contexts. In some readings, language choices are problematic (e.g., gender biased). While such language choices are understandable (e.g., time period when piece was written), they are not endorsed.

The menu of readings is used to provide a common information base and accommodate different learning styles. Bibliographies for the major units will be distributed in class sessions. These bibliographies are intended to make explicit the knowledge base consulted for class lectures and to serve as a reference for those who may wish to pursue some of the ideas introduced in class sessions as part of their graduate program (e.g., directed readings, seminar papers, dissertation research) or as part of their informal, individual study. These citations are not required reading for this course but they are highly recommended sources that students may wish to consult as part of their ongoing efforts to grapple with the complex political and "politicized" issues confronting education.

2. **Class Participation.** Each student is expected to participate in class sessions, through questions, critiques, illustrations, suggestions and other forms of feedback (e.g., summaries of key ideas in readings, alternative interpretations of ideas/issues, reactions to student approaches to their papers and critiques of readings and/or presentations). Participation will be assessed in terms of the quality, not the frequency of comments.

3. **Reading Reviews.** Each student is expected to complete two reviews of course related readings. The reviews can be based on course readings and/or relevant articles/chapters that students locate. Reviews of writings other than those included on the course syllabus or bibliographies distributed in class should be cleared with the instructor. These reviews are intended to help develop the habit of carefully reading, recording and synthesizing information as well as the habit of critically inspecting lines of argument and systematically searching the readings for connections, contradictions, issues and implications. More detailed instructions are provided on the attachment entitled Reading Reviews; due dates are noted on the course calendar. **All students should be informally engaged in a "review of readings" process each week as they prepare for class.** (See "Invitations & Suggestions" portion of this syllabus).

4. **Governing Board Paper.** Each student is expected to prepare a short (5-7 page)

analysis of the public meeting behavior of a governing board in education. The paper is intended to help students see how concepts addressed in class are manifest in "real-world" settings. The content of this assignment is set forth on the attachment entitled Governing Board Paper. The due date is on the course calendar. This assignment will be discussed in class. Examples of student-produced governing board papers will be provided. Re-writes are permitted and may be required.

5. Political Analysis Paper. Each student is responsible for preparing a political analysis of an education policy decision. The paper is intended to help students articulate a framework for political analysis and use that framework to guide a mini-case study of an education policy decision. Students may select, in consultation with the course instructor, the decision event they wish to examine. The content of this paper is set forth on the attachment entitled Political Analysis Paper. This assignment will be completed in installments due throughout the term, so students can receive feedback before they submit their final paper. The various due dates are noted on the course calendar. This assignment will be discussed in class; sample papers will be distributed; and, published examples of political analyses that are part of the required course readings should help students see how to carry out and communicate a case study of political dynamics. Re-writes are always permitted, even encouraged. They also may be required.

COURSE GRADES: Course assignments are weighted as follows:

- 10% Class Participation
- 20% Two Reading Reviews
- 20% Governing Board Observation Paper
- 50% Political Analysis Paper

Criteria for evaluation of these course requirements are noted on the attachments that describe each assignment and on the class participation section of the syllabus. If students have questions or concerns about the grades they receive, they should speak with the instructor, directly. Per university policy, students may appeal grades. The procedures for doing so are contained in the graduate studies handbook. The department has an academic appeal's committee that students may contact for information and assistance.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: Students are to abide by the university's code of academic integrity. Academic dishonesty, including fabrication, and plagiarism will be reported to the Student Honor Council. The text of the honor code is on the web. Please consult www.studenthonorcouncil.umd.edu/code.html.

DISABILITY-BASED ACCOMMODATIONS: Any class member who has a documented disability and wishes to discuss academic accommodations should contact the instructor as soon as possible.

RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCES: Students will not be penalized because of observances of their religious beliefs. Whenever possible, students will be given reasonable time to make up any

academic assignment that is missed due to participation in a religious observance. It is the student's responsibility to inform the instructor of absences for religious observances.

INVITATIONS, SUGGESTIONS:

a) Conversations and conferences re: the written assignments or other course-related matters can be initiated at any time throughout the semester, in class sessions or at other times.

b) In preparing for class, students are encouraged to (i) "map" the readings, to make notes regarding the purpose, thesis, major lines of argument and nature/quality of evidence used to develop the ideas; (ii) "step back" and ask what the readings say about the session topics identified on the syllabus and then (iii) "step back" again and ask how the readings relate to the course aims. Following each class, students are encouraged to re-read or otherwise review the articles/chapters to clarify ideas, clinch insights, generate additional questions, etc. If talking about the readings with others helps, consider forming an "in person," "by phone" or "on email" study group. These strategies may or may not work for everyone since people learn in different ways. Try them; modify them; invent alternative strategies.

c) In developing the written assignments, consider the following process: keep a record of ideas/insights/issues; put the ideas in outline form (sentence outline if possible, but a phrase outline can also be helpful); talk through the ideas with another person; write a draft; interrogate your script; share a draft and invite candid reaction; weigh the feedback; rewrite.

TOPICAL OUTLINE, UNIT OVERVIEWS, PROPOSED SCHEDULE

UNIT I OVERVIEW OF APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF "POLITICS"

This section introduces students to major traditions of work in the parent field of politics and its allied field, the politics of education. The aim is to give students a general understanding of the scope and nature of work that falls under the elusive, contested term "politics." More specifically, this section seeks to (a) expose students to alternative ways of examining politics, (b) encourage a basic understanding of how the approach taken in this course fits into the broad and variegated field of study known as the politics of education, (c) explore the reasons political models of organizational activity have evolved, (d) identify the conditions under which political perspectives might be especially relevant "lenses" to employ, and (e) articulate the reasons political perspectives might be especially helpful in understanding schools, colleges and universities.

9/11/06 Session 1: Introduction to the Course and the Terrain

In addition to providing an overview of course requirements, expectations, assumptions, logistics and the like, the first session will introduce students to major streams of work that fall under the rubric of the "politics of education." Students will be given some "boundary definitions" of key terms along with a general orientation to and justification for the approach to the study of politics emphasized in the course. This session sets the stage for a more in-depth treatment of these matters in the following class. Readings are noted on next page.

Readings (Required):

Easton, David (1985). "Political science in the United States, Past and present," International Political Science Review, 6 133-152.

Jervis, Robert (2002, June). "Politics, political science and specialization," PS: Political Science and Politics, 35 (2), 187-189.

Smith, R. M (2004, January). The puzzling place of race in American political science, PS: Political Science and Politics, 37 (1), 41-45.

Fischer, Frank (1990). "Organizations as political systems: The managerial bias in critical perspective," in Author, Technocracy and the politics of expertise, pp. 269-298. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Readings (Recommended, available from instructor):

Shapiro, Ian, Smith, Rogers M. & Masoud, Tarek E. (2004). Problems and methods in the study of politics. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McDonnell, Lorraine M., Timpane, P. Michael, & Benjamin, Roger (2004). Rediscovering the democratic purposes of education. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

9/18/06 Session 2: Surveying the Terrain (Multiple Models, Major Traditions), Selecting an Orienting Framework

This session will revisit the discussion of approaches to the study of "politics," provide an overview of the analytic framework emphasized in this course and elaborate the rationales for combining the political systems and power-influence perspectives into a framework for the analysis of political processes. This session will (a) concentrate on components of political systems perspectives and the reasons why an understanding of the institutional context is so critical, and (b) address the limitations of the political systems perspective, particularly as a vehicle for unpacking the play of power among diverse but interdependent actors who simultaneously compete and cooperate to influence decision outcomes. Since power is a pivotal but "primitive" concept, this session will address alternative views of power introduced in the readings and begin the more detailed description of the analytic categories that enable analysts to get at the relative power of actors.

Readings (Required, continued on next page):

Hardy, Cynthia (1987). "The contribution of political science to organizational behavior," in J. W. Lorsch (Ed.), Handbook of organizational behavior, pp. 96-106. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Baldrige, J. Victor (1983). "Organizational characteristics of colleges and universities," in J. V. Baldrige & T. Deal (Eds.), The dynamics of organizational change in education, pp. 38-59. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss (1972). "Two traditions", a one-page excerpt from her article entitled "Two traditions of political analysis," Sociological Inquiry, 42, (3-4), pp. 77-92.

Wirt, Frederick M. & Kirst, Michael J. (1972). "Systems perspective," in Authors, Political

and social foundations of education, pp. 12-20. Boston: Little Brown & Company.

Campbell, Roald F. & Mazzone, Tim L. (1976). "Conceptual framework and research methodology," in Authors, State policy making for the public schools, pp.3-13. Berkeley: McCutchan. (Read for an understanding of the analytic framework and the reasons for combining a political systems perspective with power-influence categories, not the particulars of the study).

Malen, Betty & Ogawa, Rodney T. (1988). "Professional-patron influence on site-based governance councils: A confounding case study," Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10 (4), 251-270. (Focus on definition of analytic perspective and manner in which that perspective guides the organization of the findings and the interpretation of the case).

Readings (Recommended, one available from instructor, two on reserve in ETSC):
Pfeffer, Jeffrey & Salancik, Gerald (2003). External control of organizations. Stanford University Press.

March, James G. & Olsen, Johan P. (1984). "The new institutionalism: Organizational factors in political life," The American Political Science Review, 78 (3) 734-749.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey (1981). "Understanding the role of power in decision making," and "Conditions for the use of power," in Author, Power in organizations, pp. 1-33, 67-96. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.

Unit II A FRAMEWORK FOR POLITICAL ANALYSIS

This unit will lay out the key components, central assumptions, major strengths and limitations of the eclectic framework for political analysis emphasized in this course. This framework capitalizes on two major traditions of work in political science (the systems and the behavioral). It combines these traditions into an open-ended yet manageable heuristic device that can be used to guide the analysis of political developments. The framework recognizes that "context" situates and mediates political behavior but focuses on "agency," on the mobilization of power and the resultant interplay of influence among diverse actors in organizational contexts.

9/25/06 Session 3: Political Systems and Power-Influence Perspectives

This session will review the rationales for the eclectic perspective used in this course and the key components of the political systems perspective. Following this recap, the class will move to the categories of the power-influence perspective. Readings noted on next page.

Readings (Required):

Gamson, William J. (1968). "Introduction," in Author, Power and discontent, pp. 1-18. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Geary, L. Sue (1992). "Review of the literature and explication of the conceptual perspective," pp. 9-58, in Author, The policymaking process resulting in fiscal policy for

special education in the state of Utah. Dissertation, submitted to the Department of Educational Administration, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT. (Read to see how literature bases inform the construction of a conceptual framework to examine power relations, not for an understanding of the policy issue or the decision arena that provide the "window" for examining political processes).

Allison, G. & Zelikow, P. (1999). Model III: Governmental politics. in Authors, The essence of decision. Boston: Little, Brown & Company. (This model undergirds much of the theoretical literature on politics in organizations as well as in governmental settings. Read this updated version of Allison's seminal work for an understanding of the analytic categories and questions, not for the specifics of the Cuban missile crises.

Pfeffer, J. (1992). "Managing with power," in Author, Managing with power, pp. 337-345. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

10/2/06 Session 4: Power-Influence Categories (Continued)

This session will continue to unpack the concept of power by working through the set of analytic categories that enable one to get at major aspects of this phenomenon.

Readings (Required): Review Allison, Geary, & Gamson.

Kanter, R. M. (2003). "Power failure in management circuits," in Author, On the frontiers of management, pp. 135-157. Harvard Business Review Book.

Meltsner, Arnold J. (1972, Nov/Dec). "Political feasibility and policy analysis," Public Administration Review, 32 (6), 859-867.

Morgan, Garth (1986). "Interests, conflict and power: Organizations as political systems," in Author, Images of Organizations, pp. 142-198.

Readings (Recommended, available from instructor):

Rich, Andrew (2004). Think tanks, public policy and the politics of expertise. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Friedman, Lawrence J. & McGarvie, Mark D. (2003). Charity, philanthropy and civility in American history. New York: Cambridge University Press.

10/9/06 Session 5: Power-Influence Categories (Continued) First Reading Review Due

As in previous sessions, we will be working to understand how the analytic categories help one expose and inspect patterns of political activity in organizational contexts. See next page for required readings.

Readings (Required):

Wells, Amy Stuart & Serna, Irene (1996). "The politics of culture: Understanding local political resistance to detracking in racially mixed schools," Harvard Educational Review, 66, 93-118.

Apple, Michael with Oliver, Anita (1996). "Becoming right: Education and the formation of conservative movements," in Apple, M., Cultural politics and education, pp. 55-67. New York: Teachers College Press.

10/16/06 Session 6: Power-Influence Categories (Continued)

We will continue to work through the set of analytic categories that help develop an understanding of the power-based interactions that are an integral part of political dynamics.

Readings (Required):

Sharp, Elaine B. (1999). "Introduction" and "Conclusion" in Author, Culture wars and local politics, 1-18; 220-240. Lawrence: The University of Kansas Press.

Prestine, Nona N. (1989). "The struggle for control of teacher education: A case study," Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11 (3), 285-300.

Miskel, C. Song, M. (2004). Passing reading first: Prominence and processes in an elite policy network, Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 26 (2), 89-109.

10/23/06: Session 7: Power-Influence Categories (Continued) Meet in Room 3237

We will use the categories to analyze power dynamics in various arenas.

Mazzoni, T. L. (1987). "The politics of educational choice in Minnesota," In W.L. Boyd & C. Kerchner, Politics of excellence and choice, 217-230, London: Falmer Press. (Read for understanding of various styles of play).

Hannah, Susan B. (1996). "The higher education act of 1992: Skills, constraints and the politics of higher education," Journal of Higher Education, 67, (5), 498-527.

McAdam, Doug (1996). The framing functions of movement tactics: Strategic dramaturgy in the American civil rights movement in Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy & Mayer N. Zald (Eds.) Comparative perspectives on social movements: political opportunities, mobilizing structures and cultural framings, 338-355. New York: Cambridge

University

Readings (Recommended, on reserve ETSC):

Viteritti, J. P. (2003, Summer). "Schoolyard revolutions: How research on urban school reform undermines reform," Political Science Quarterly, 118 (2), 233-257.

Readings (Recommended, available from instructor)

Bimber, Bruce (2003). Information and American democracy: Technology in the

evolution of political power. New York: Cambridge University Press.

10/30/06 Session 8: Power-Influence Categories (Continued) & Applications

This session will be devoted to completing the layout of the analytic categories and discussing the "governing board" and "political analysis" papers. In this session, we will pay particular attention to (a) how the conceptual framework guides the search for data and organizes the "findings" of the case study students will carry out, and (b) the limitations as well as the strengths of the framework, or, in different words, to what the orienting framework may conceal as well as what it may reveal. Readings are noted on the following page.

Readings (Required): Reread Geary on "power"

Dahl, Robert (1984). "Political influence," "Forms of influence," and "Similarities in political systems," in Author, Modern political analysis.

Rosenberg, G. (2004, April). "Substituting symbol for substance: What did Brown really accomplish?" PS: Political Science and Politics, 37 (2), 205-209.

Firestone, William. A. (1989, October). "Educational policy as an ecology of games," Educational Researcher, pp. 18-24.

Malen, Betty (2005). "Revisiting policy implementation as a political phenomenon: The case of reconstitution policies," in M. Honig (Ed.) New directions in policy implementation: Confronting complexity, pp. 83-104. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

(Recommended, on reserve, ETSC):

Pfeffer, Jeffrey (1980). "Assessing power in organizations," in Author, Power in organizations, pp. 35-66. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.

Gamson, William J. (1968). "Influence in Use," and "Influence in Repose," in Author, Power and discontent, pp. 59-90, and 93-108. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

11/6/06 Session 9: Applications/Assessments of the Framework, Second Review Due

We will illustrate and evaluate the utility of the analytic framework.

Readings (Required, continued on next page):

Bolman, Lee G. & Deal, Terrence E. (1993). "Power, conflict and coalitions," and "The manager as politician," in Authors, Reframing organizations, pp. 183-239. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kingdon, John W. (1984). Agendas, alternatives and public policies. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. Summarized in Malen, Betty (1987). "Essay review: Agendas, alternatives and public policies, by John W. Kingdon. Boston: Little, Brown, 1984, in Educational Administration Quarterly, 23, 96-106.

Malen, Betty (2001). "Generating interest in interest groups," in H. Mawhinney & C.

Lugg (Eds.), The 2000 Politics of Education Association Special Issue on Interest Groups in United States Education, Educational Policy, 15 (1), 168-186.

McLendon, M. K. (2003). "The politics of higher education: Toward an expanded research agenda," Educational Policy, 17 (1), 165-191.

Readings (Recommended, available from instructor):

Swain, Carol (2002). The new white nationalism in America: Its challenge to integration. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zimmerman, John (2002). Whose America? Culture wars in the public schools. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

11/13/06 Session 10: Recaps, Applications, Assessments of the "Framework for Political Analysis"

This session will be devoted to examining how others have described, adapted or extended key concepts and how key concepts can be used to examine political developments captured under the rubric of the "new institutionalism." Opportunities to address issues related to the governing board and political analysis papers will be provided.

Readings (Required):

Review Allison, Baldrige, Melsner, & Fischer

Rowan, Brian & Miskel, Cecil (1999). "Institutional theory and the study of educational organizations," pp. 359-383. In J. Murphy & K. Seashore-Louis (Eds.), Handbook of Research in Educational Administration, Washington, DC: AERA.

Any one of the following:

Sipple, J. W. (1999, Autumn). "Institutional constraints on business involvement in K-12 education policy," American Educational Research Journal, 36 (3), 447-488.

Ogawa, Rodney T. (1994). "The institutional sources of educational reform: The case of school-based management," American Educational Research Journal, 31 (3), 519-548.

Malen, Betty, Mc Andrew, Rebecca & Muncey, Donna (2005). Legitimizing privatization: The politics of Sylvan support centers in the Baltimore public school system in Wayne Hoy & Cecil Miskel (Eds.) Educational leadership and reform, 213-232. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

UNIT III: POLITICAL PROCESSES AT THE STATE LEVEL

This unit draws on concepts from the previous unit and studies of political processes to examine how politics may play out in state arenas. The federal government has a long-standing but relatively erratic involvement in education. This unit provides an overview of federal involvement, then focuses the reasons state governments became more assertive in the domain of education during

the 1970's and remain key actors in education even in the current context of relatively heavy federal involvement in education in legislative and judicial venues. The unit highlights patterns of politics at the state level, discusses "explanations" of these patterns, and considers strategies for exercising influence in this arena.

11/20/06 Session 11: Understanding Federal Involvement and State Activism in Education First Installment, Political Analysis Paper Due

States were often cast as the "weak link" in the federal-state-local system in the 1950's and 1960's, but they have intensified their involvement in education and have become prominent if not dominant actors in the federal-state-local "triangle" of governmental units that "make education policy". This session reviews reasons for that shift and uses the framework we've set out to analyze this arena and to identify genres of strategies that might be deployed to influence developments in these arenas.

Readings (Required):

Mazzoni, Tim L. (1995). "State policy making and school reform: Influences and influentials," in J. Scribner & D.Layton (Eds.), The study of educational politics, pp. 53-73.

Mazzoni, Tim L. (1991). "Analyzing state school policymaking: An arena model," Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 13 (2), 115-138.

McLendon, Michael (2003). Setting the governmental agenda for state decentralization of higher education, Journal of Higher Education, 74 (5), 479-515.

Readings (Recommended, on reserve, ETSC):

Fuhrman, Susan H. (1993). "The politics of coherence," and "Can policy lead the way?" in Author (Ed.), Designing Coherent Education Policy, pp. 1-34; 313-322. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Abrams, Douglas M. (1987). "Political competition and cooperation between public and higher education agencies of state government," Journal of Educational Finance, 369-390.

deGive, Marilyn L. & Olswang, Steven G. (1999). "The making of a branch campus system: A statewide strategy of coalition building," Review of Higher Education, 22 (3), 287-313.

Fowler, Frances C. (1994). "Education reform comes to Ohio: An application of Mazzoni's arena models," Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 16 (3), 335-350.

11/27/06 Session 12: State Education Politics, Continued Dr. J. Edward Andrews, Guest (to be confirmed)

This session draws on case studies to extend our understanding of the politics surrounding state education policy decisions and interventions. Hopefully Dr. J. Edward Andrews will be able to attend this session as a guest presenter. Dr. Andrews has held positions as visiting professor at the

University of Maryland-College Park, vice-president and president of the Maryland State Board of Education, superintendent of Montgomery County School District and special assistant to the superintendent of the Baltimore City Schools. If he can be here, the session will be a unique opportunity to interact with an individual who has been very involved in education policymaking, to gain insights about how school leaders may respond to the political dimensions of their role and to see how educators might influence state education policymaking.

Readings (Required):

Malen, B. & Muncey, D. (2000). "Creating `a new set of givens'? The impact of state activism on site autonomy," in N.D. Theobald & B. Malen (Eds.). Balancing local control and state responsibility for k-12 education. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Cornbleth, Catherine & Waugh, Dexter (1993, October). "The great speckled bird: Education policy-in-the-making," Educational Researcher, 22 (7), 31-37.

Honig, B, & Waugh, D. & Cornbleth, C. (1995, Aug/Sept). "An exchange of views on 'The Great Speckled Bird'", Educational Researcher, 24 (6) 22-17.

One of the two:

Orr, Marion (2005). "Baltimore: The limits of mayoral control," in J. R. Henig & W. C. Rich (Eds.) Mayors in the middle, pp. 27-58. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Orr, Marion (1998). "The challenge of school reform in Baltimore: Race, jobs and politics," in C. N. Stone (Ed.) Changing Urban Education, pp. 93-117. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Readings (Recommended, on reserve, ETSC):

Lippincott, Ronald C. & Thomas, Larry, W. (1993). "Maryland: The struggle for power in the midst of change, complexity, and institutional constraints," in R. J. Hrebener & C. S. Thomas (Eds.), Interest group politics in the northeastern states, pp. 131-165. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

UNIT IV: UNDERSTANDING POLITICAL DYNAMICS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

Although federal and state governments have become active, influential forces, local units still have incentive and opportunity to make or "remake" education policies, particularly during the implementation stages. This unit "zooms in" on local contexts to see how politics may "play out" in smaller organizational arenas through the formal actions of authorized governing boards or special committees and through the informal exchanges that occur in the seemingly routine, "ordinary" day-to-day interactions that are part and parcel of organizational activity.

**12/04/06 Session 13: Understanding/Influencing Political Dynamics at the District Level
Dr. Carol Parham, Guest (to be confirmed) Second Installment, Political Analysis
Paper Due**

The local school district is a long-standing but controversial governance arena. Some argue that local districts are out-moded, that school boards are essentially irrelevant or hopelessly non-

functional; that other governance structures such as site-based councils or state-wide "open-enrollment" arrangements would be more effective ways to structure schools. Others argue that local districts and their governing agents are an integral part of efforts to balance state and local interests and a critical avenue for democratic, responsive governance.

This session looks at contrasting views of politics at the district level and their implications for influencing education issues and policy choices. As the former superintendent of the Anne Arundel County Public Schools and a professor of practice in our department, Dr. Parham is well-situated to lead our discussion of politics at the district level.

Readings (Required): Review Orr reading.

Jones, Cheryl L. & Hill, Connie (1998). "Strategy and tactics in subsystem protection: The politics of education reform in Montgomery County, Maryland," in C. N. Stone (Ed.), Changing Urban Education, pp. 139-160.

Henig, Jeffrey R. & Rich, Wilbur, C. (2004). "Mayor-centrism in context" (pp. 3-24) and Henig, Jeffrey R. "Washington, DC: Race, issue definition, and school board restructuring," (pp. 191-218) in J. R. Henig and W. C. Rich (Eds.) Mayors in the middle. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tallerico, Marilyn (1992). "The dynamics of superintendent-school board relationships," Urban Education, 24, 215-231.

Readings (Recommended, on reserve, ETSC):

Chambers, S. (2002-2003, Winter). "Urban education reform and minority political empowerment," Political Science Quarterly, 117 (4), 643-665.

Shippo, Dorothy (2003, Winter). Pulling together: Civic Capacity and urban school reform, American Educational Research Journal, 40 (4) 841-878.

Burlingame, Martin (1988). "The politics of education and educational policy: The local level," in N. Boyan (Ed.), The handbook of research on educational administration, pp. 439-450. New York: Longman.

Readings (Recommended, available from instructor, continued on next page):

Marsh, Julie (2002). Democratic dilemmas: Joint work, education politics and community. Unpublished dissertation, Stanford University.

Tallerico, M. (2000). Accessing the superintendency: The unwritten rules. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Readings (Recommended, available from instructor)

The book series on the politics of education reform in urban areas includes studies of Baltimore and Washington, DC as well as other cities. The citations for that series are

on the local district politics bibliography distributed in class. For a critical review of that research, along with other prominent research, see the article by Joseph Viteritti in the Political Science Quarterly, vol 118, no.2., 2003, available from the instructor.

12/11/06 Session 14: Understanding and Influencing Political Dynamics in Organizations

Educators have been reluctant to admit that schools, colleges and universities are political systems, that interactions in these settings are every bit as "political" as those in governmental arenas. There is a growing body of evidence to support the theoretical expectation that educational organizations are inescapably, if not always visibly "political" and that the denial of "politics" is, itself, a political strategy that fosters an image of being "above" politics. Ironically, another tendency is to label most any disconcerting development or "dysfunctional" dynamic in organizations as "politics." Thus it seems politics is never-present and ever-present. This session tries to sort through the issues associated with efforts to understand the "everyday" politics of organizational life, particularly in school settings.

Readings (Required):

Review Baldrige

Marcus, L. (1999, Fall). The micropolitics of planning, The Review of Higher Education, 23 (1), 45-64.

Eckel, P. (2000, Fall). The role of shared governance in institutional hard decisions, The Review of Higher Education, 24 (1), 15-39.

Malen, Betty (1994). "The micropolitics of education: mapping the multiple dimensions of power relations in school politics," in J. Scribner & D. Layton (Eds.), The Study of Educational Politics, pp. 147-167. New York: Falmer Press.

Muncey, Donna & McQuillan, Patrick (1998). "A comparative look at school-wide change" in Authors, Reform and Resistance in Schools & Classrooms, pp. 148-164. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Readings (Recommended on reserve, ETSC):

Hackman, Judith Dozier (1985). "Power and centrality in the allocation of resources in colleges and universities," Administrative Science Quarterly, 30 (1), 61-77.

Gitlin, Andrew & Margonis, Frank (1995). "The political aspect of reform: Teacher resistance as good sense," American Journal of Education, 103, 377-405.

UNIT V: UNDERSTANDING AND EXERCISING POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

This unit examines the intersection of "politics" and "leadership." Viewing political leadership as what Burns terms, "a special form" of power-based interactions, this unit focuses on key issues confronting individuals who wish to exert responsible social influence in governmental and other education-related contexts.

12/18/06 Session 15, Part 1: Getting Beyond "Raw" Power: Exploring the Characteristics and the Responsibilities of Political Leadership

Units to date, have illustrated the complex nature of political dynamics and the various ways actors may acquire power and exercise influence for good or ill. This session draws on this work but puts the focus on what it means to exercise political leadership. What distinguishes political leadership from other types of power-based interactions? How might political leadership be identified? developed? exercised in the multiple "micro" and "macro" arenas that constitute the education system? Readings noted on next page.

Readings (Required):

Review Baldrige, Bolman & Deal, Hardy, Morgan, and Malen's essay review of Kingdon's book with an eye toward the implications of these writings for "leadership."

Burns, James MacGregor (1978). "Prologue: The crises of leadership," "Leadership and Collective Purpose, Leadership as Causation, Leadership and Change" and "Leadership as Practical Influence," in Author, Leadership, pp. 1-5, 425-443, 444-462.

ASPA Task Force Report (2004). American democracy in an age of rising inequality, Perspectives on Politics, @ (4), 651-666.

Session 15, Part 2: Appraising the "Framework for Political Analysis," Evaluating the Course, Highlighting Options for Further Study; Final Installment of Political Analysis Paper and Governing Board Paper Due

This portion of the class "steps back" to appraise the approach emphasized in this course. Is it a sensible, useful way of thinking about the "politics of education?" Can it enhance one's understanding of political dynamics and generate insights for action? Does it offer a set of "transferable tools" that could be used to uncover, interpret and affect political dynamics in various educational contexts? These sorts of issues will be given "center-stage" status now that students have been using the approach in the development of their case studies. This portion of our final meeting will be devoted to a discussion of the course and a formal assessment of it; an overview of options students might consider should they wish to pursue work in "policy studies," and individual conferences, as needed, to arrange for completion of student initiated or instructor-required re-writes of course assignments.

If students wish, and if the proposed arrangement does not constitute an imposition on students, the final class session will be held at my home in Annapolis. If any student is inconvenienced or would be unable to attend class at that site, we will meet on campus.

REVIEWS OF READINGS

Purpose: These reviews are intended to help students analyze and synthesize readings; discover connections or contradictions; and identify issues and implications embedded in readings.

Content/Format: three, 2-3 typed pages that provide reviews of readings selected from the required or recommended selections noted on the syllabus, from bibliographies distributed in class, or from articles/chapters students have located and "cleared" with the instructor. Reviews should have two major divisions:

- 1) Synopsis of article or chapter that identifies the purpose (what the piece is trying to do), the basis of the writing (what data sources/methods or combinations of methods are drawn upon to construct the piece); the major ideas and the supporting lines of argument and evidence, and
- 2) Response to article that provides critical commentary on adequacy of lines of argument and/or analytic observations such as connections between main ideas of article and ideas discussed in class or addressed in other readings; implications of article or insights regarding how article triggers questions, generates insights, has "utility" (or reasons article does not, in your judgement, make a contribution to your understanding of politics generally, or education politics more specifically)

Evaluation: 20% of course grade; Emphasis of evaluation is on accuracy of the synopsis and logic of the review. Each review is expected to demonstrate coherent organization and reasoning, succinct but sensible development of key ideas and appropriate use of the English language.

GOVERNING BOARD OBSERVATION PAPER

Purpose: This paper asks students to apply a narrow set of course concepts to the analysis of a public governing board meeting (e.g., a local school board, a school site council, a faculty senate, a higher education coordinating council, a state school board, a legislative committee). Students may describe how a particular concept is manifest or "test" a generalization from the readings.

Content/Format: 5-7 typed pages; four major divisions

- 1) Short summary of meeting (e.g., type of board, date of meeting, major agenda items/issues)
- 2) Statement of focus of observation (e.g., use of information, type/extent of citizen participation, presence of symptoms of group think; examples of particular political strategies)
- 3) Analysis of meeting in terms of focus of observation
- 4) Implications of analysis for understanding politics and influencing boards

Evaluation: 20% of course grade; Emphasis of evaluation is on the systematic application of a set of categories or generalizations and insights that can be gleaned about political processes and ways to exert influence in them. The paper is also expected to demonstrate coherent organization and reasoning, use of observational data to support analysis, and appropriate use of the English language.

Note: Students should attach a copy of the governing board agenda to the paper.

POLITICAL ANALYSIS PAPER

Purpose: This paper asks students to apply the framework for political analysis presented in class to a particular decision event. In short, the paper examines, from a power-influence perspective, x's decision to do y, ___'s decision to ___.

Data Base: Field-based information (e.g., gathered through interviews, augmented by documents and printed materials where possible), on the processes through which an important, education policy decision was made. Suggestions for acquiring and analyzing field data will be presented in class.*

Content/Format: 20-30 typed pages; 5 major sections

- 1) Introduction -- clear, concise, early statement of purpose and identification of decision event
- 2) Explication of analytic framework -- the major categories and underlying assumptions of framework that guides data collection and analysis of decision event
- 3) Description/assessment of data base --(e.g., profile of informants interviewed, procedures to collect/analyze data, limitations of data base)
- 4) Major findings/interpretations -- the relevant players, their goals, resources, influence strategies, impact on decision outcome
- 5) Conclusions and Implications -- the major insights acquired from case study, discussed in light of course concepts and related readings and discussed in light of insights regarding the manner in which actors can influence education policy decisions.

Evaluation: 50% of final course grade; Emphasis in the evaluation will be on the systematic application of the analytic categories. The paper should also demonstrate coherent organization, cogent reasoning, explicit use of data to support interpretations and conclusions; capacity to "tether" findings of the case to course concepts and related literatures; and appropriate use of the English language. Field notes must be submitted with the paper.

Note:*Getting the Facts, by Jerome Murphy, may be helpful particularly if this assignment is your first field research experience. Check the library or see the instructor if you wish to consult this reference on conducting field research.