

EDPL 620
EDUCATION POLICY ANALYSIS*
Fall Semester, 2004

Instructor: Professor Betty Malen, 2110(c) Benjamin Building
Course Time and Place: Monday, 4:15 - 7:00 PM, 2102 Benjamin Building
Office Hours: By appointment: office phone 301-405-3587, email malen@wam.umd.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION: This course is an introduction to a set of diverse, discipline-based conceptual perspectives (or analytic frameworks) that can be used to uncover and interpret policy purposes, processes, contents and outcomes. The perspectives were selected because they (a) undergird much of the literature in education policy, (b) provide a foundation for seeing how both applications and critiques of these perspectives have precipitated the development of additional, alternative frameworks, and (c) offer insights regarding "avenues for influencing policy," a quality particularly important for those who wish to exercise leadership in educational settings. The course considers the power and limits of policy and ways people in different positions in various organizations might influence policy.

For students wishing to concentrate their graduate studies on education policy, the course provides a foundation for further course work, independent reading and research in education policy and in a closely allied field, educational leadership. Since policy is one of the major vehicles for resolving critical issues and influencing organizations, the study of policy is inextricably linked to leadership. The course offers students the opportunity to develop a multi-faceted picture of educational policy and a general sense of ways to influence it.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES: The course seeks to:

1. Introduce a variety of conceptual perspectives and literature bases that can be used to examine policy purposes, processes, contents and outcomes;
2. Provide opportunities to explicitly articulate and systematically apply these perspectives to "case" examples of policy in action within different arenas (e.g., K-12 institutions, higher education institutions, governmental agencies);
3. Develop an understanding of the power and limits of policy as a lever for influencing/improving educational organizations;
4. Identify "avenues for influencing policy;"
5. Stimulate interest in further study of education policy and awareness of the complex, interdisciplinary, at times controversial nature of education policy analysis.

*Draws on course developed with Mike Knapp, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

GENERAL CONTENTS, STRUCTURE, APPROACH: The course is organized around three topical units: (1) conceptions of the nature, power, and limits of policy; (2) analysis of policy and policymaking from different perspectives; and (3) identification of strategies for integrating

perspectives and influencing policy. The units will be explored through a combination of readings, discussions, lectures, case applications, and written assignments.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS: There are three course requirements:

1. **Reading Assignments.** Each student is responsible for all required readings specified on the syllabus and other readings which may be assigned during the semester (when the instructor learns more about students interests/backgrounds).

Readings include major excerpts from the book Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies by John Kingdon, available at the UMCP bookstore and in the UMCP library. Readings also include articles and papers assembled in a course packet available through Beljean and on reserve in the Benjamin Building's Curriculum Lab. The course packet contains "classic" and "contemporary" readings that illustrate and augment concepts presented and discussed in class sessions. These selections are prioritized (i.e., required and recommended designations on the attached course calendar). In addition, the packet contains examples of published policy cases and unpublished, student-produced policy cases.

A "menu" of readings is used to both provide a common information base and accommodate different learning styles. A more detailed description of the readings and general suggestions for approaching them will be distributed, along with specific study guides for each week's set of readings. In some readings, language choices are problematic (e.g., gender biased). While such language choices are understandable (e.g., given time period when the piece was written), they are not appropriate.

Throughout the semester, "mini" policy cases and more "popular press" policy documents will be distributed to illustrate various ideas emphasized in the course, to expose students to the range of writings that fall under the rubric of "policy studies," and to provide opportunities to use diverse perspectives to analyze prominent policy documents and related developments.

2. **Class Participation.** Each student is expected to participate in course discussions and activities through questions, critiques, illustrations, suggestions and other forms of feedback (e.g., alternative interpretations of ideas/issues, reactions to student approaches to their policy papers and critiques of their arguments/interpretations).

3. **Policy Analysis Paper.** Each student is expected to develop a written analysis of a policy "case." Students are encouraged to select, in consultation with the instructor, a salient policy, one they are curious about, can secure information about and can analyze carefully and even-handedly. The "case" analysis will be done in an iterative fashion, with installments handed in to the instructor for feedback throughout the semester. Installments will generally be short (e.g., 8-12 pp.). Altogether, the final version of the case analysis will be approximately equivalent to a 35-50 page term paper. The installments and their "due" dates are briefly described on the following page. Detailed instructions for each installment will be handed out in class before installments are due. With the author's permission, students' policy analyses may be shared with, or distributed to, other students in the class.

Installment 1: Description of the Policy Case (5-10 pp). Due 9/29/04.

This piece will describe a policy in a particular setting. At a minimum, the installment should (a) identify the policy, its stated purpose and formal provisions, and the institutional setting in which it operates; (b) characterize the policy using concepts from the readings (e.g., domain, type), (c) provide a brief synopsis of the "origins" of the policy, (e.g., how/when/why it was proposed/enacted/implemented; the impetus for it, sentiments surrounding it); (d) delimit the stage(s) in the process and note the time frame on which the analysis will focus; (e) identify the key actors (individuals, organizations) shaping the policy and major events occurring within the context, concentrating on those most related to the "stage" and "time-frame" focus of the case, and (f) acknowledge, in the script or in an explanatory note, the information base used to develop the policy case (e.g., documents, brochures, reports, your own observations as an observer or participant, informal interviews you have or might conduct). There is often some extant data that can be helpful in describing aspects of the policy's purposes, provisions and "origins," as well as aspects of the policy context. Note what you have.

Installment 2: First Portion of the Case Analysis (Revised description of policy case noted above and analysis from a rational perspective) (15-20 pp). Due 10/20/04.

This installment is equivalent to the first third or so of the term paper. It includes three parts: (1) An introduction to the whole project paper (that is, the multi-perspective analysis of a policy case); (2) a revised case description; and (3) an analysis of the case from a rational perspective. The analysis section will lay out key components of a rational framework derived from the readings and apply these ideas to the case.

Installment 3: Analysis of the Case from an Organizational or Political Perspective (8-10 pp). Due 11/17/04.

In this installment, students will examine the case with a second set of conceptual lenses, drawn from organizational or political perspectives. The organization and content of this installment will parallel the "rational analysis" section included in Installment 2.

Installment 4: Completed Case Analysis (Installments 2 and 3, analysis of case from one additional perspective and a conclusion section) (35-50 pp). Due 12/15/04.

The completed case includes the earlier installments in revised form, a "new" section (in which the case is examined from a perspective not yet deployed) and a conclusion which offers an integrated interpretation of the case (drawing on all perspectives used in the paper), discusses the strengths/limits/implications of the paper and assesses the "utility" of a multiple perspectives approach to policy analysis.

STUDENT ASSESSMENTS, GRADES: Course grades will be based on instructor assessments of class participation (20%) and written assignments (80%). Participation grades will be based on the quality rather than the number of comments or questions; on evidence of informed/insightful contributions to the issues being addressed. Paper assessments will be based on the following criteria: systematic application of the conceptual frameworks, coherent organization, cogent

reasoning, capacity to "tether" the paper to readings; use of information to support interpretations, appropriate use of the English language. "Re-writes" are permitted and encouraged. In some cases, rewrites may be required. If students have questions or concerns about the grades they receive, they should speak with the instructor, directly. Per university policy, students may also 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: All students are to abide by the university's code of academic integrity. Academic dishonesty, including cheating, fabrication, and plagiarism will be reported to the Student Honor Council. The full text of the honor code is on the web (www.inform.umd.edu/Campus Info/Departments/jpo/codeacinteg.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 as soon as possible of any intended 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, make notes regarding the purpose, thesis, major lines of argument and 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 (e.g., what they say about the nature of policy). Following each class, students are encouraged to re-read or otherwise review the articles/chapters to clarify ideas, "clinch" insights, generate additional questions, etc. As the study guides suggest, "mapping" readings is part of the "homework" for class sessions; "revisiting" readings is built-in to several sessions. 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. Try them; modify them; invent alternatives.

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.

COURSE QUALIFIERS: The course is an introduction to, not an in-depth treatment of policy analysis. The topics illustrate but they do not exhaust the full range of issues that could (and arguably should) be examined. The topics included are complicated and controversial; they

warrant more attention than can be given in a single semester, 3 credit course. Research methods (beyond the concern for the relationship between evidence and inference and the caution to keep the strength of the claims made in line with the strength of the evidence considered) get very short shrift.

TOPICAL OUTLINE AND COURSE CALENDAR

Unit I: CONCEPTIONS OF THE NATURE, POWER, AND LIMITS OF "POLICY"

This section of the course seeks to clarify key terms (policy and policymaking) and related concepts, such as policymaking systems, stages, levels, and arenas; policy types, domains, and instruments. In addition, questions will be raised about the degree to which policies can influence events within educational institutions. In so doing, the course will set the stage for a more detailed examination (in Unit II) of policy and policymaking from a variety of conceptual perspectives, rooted in the disciplines of economics, sociology, political science, philosophy and other fields of study.

September 1: Introduction to the Course

In addition to providing an overview of course units, requirements, assumptions, "logistics" and the like, the first session will begin to familiarize students with a conceptual vocabulary for talking about policy and policymaking in education (or in any realm of public policy). Students will be introduced to competing definitions of policy, along with alternative ways of characterizing policies and depicting stages in the policymaking process. Students will be given some "boundary definitions" of key terms and concepts. This introduction will start a conversation about terms and concepts that will continue in the following class. Students will be given criteria to apply in selecting their policy cases as well as sample policy cases that cover a wide range of domestic and international issues and focus on developments at various levels of the policy system.

September 8: Clarifying Vocabulary and "Using" the Vocabulary to Describe a Policy Case

This session seeks to (1) decode more systematically key terms used in discussing policy, (2) illustrate how those terms can help "lay out" a "policy case," and (3) begin to explore the underlying debate regarding the power and limits of policy, the actual and potential influences of policy on educational institutions, and the different views about the prospects for "policy" becoming a potent (or impotent) vehicle for addressing educational "problems."

Readings (Required, continued on next page)

Kingdon, J. (1995). Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies, pp. 1-4, 15-89.

Fowler, F. C. (2000). Defining policy; Synopsis of types of policies, pp. 9-13; 239-245; and 249-255. In Author, Policy studies for educational leaders. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

*Elmore, R.C. & Sykes, G. (1992). Curriculum policy, pp. 185-195. In P.W. Jackson (Ed), Handbook of Research on Curriculum. New York: MacMillan.

*McLaughlin, M.W. (1987). Learning from experience: Lessons from policy

implementation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9: 171-178 (also required in EDPL 788s Policy design/implementation).

*McLaughlin, M.W., (1990). The Rand Change Agent Study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. Educational Researcher, 19: 11-15 (required in EDPL 788s Policy design/implementation).

Readings (Required, any one of the following)

Garron, Chris (2000). Taking from the rich to give to the poor, taking from the white to give to the black: South Africa's pursuit of equity through its national policy of teacher redeployment. pp. 1-20.

Hershey, Molly (2004). Gates' foundation small schools initiative.

Lewis, Cassandra. (2003). A multiple perspectives analysis of the 1988 restructuring of Maryland higher education.

Phillips-Patrick, Marti (1995). Working backwards: When courts create post facto policy: Desegregation mandates, anti-discrimination law and the Banneker scholarship program at the University of Maryland at College Park, pp. 1-9.

Walters, Kirk (2003). Policy on hold: An examination of the issues surrounding MCPS' decision not to implement a revised grading policy.

Readings (Optional, on reserve):

Schneider, A. & Ingram, H. (1990 Behavioral assumptions of policy tools. Journal of Politics, 52, 510-529 (required EDPL 788s/Policy design and implementation).

Mitchell, D., & Encarnation, J. (1984). Alternative state policy mechanisms for influencing state performance. Educational Researcher, 13: 4-11.

**September 15: Unpacking the "Impact" Debate and Developing the Policy Case
Dr. Chris Garron, Guest**

This session revisits the "impact" debate (introduced in the previous sessions) and raises questions about the intent, design, coordination, implementation and effects of policy on individuals and institutions. The class will arrive at a series of hypotheses about why policies do and do not produce "promised" results. This session also provides opportunities to raise issues related to developing the policy case students will submit. **Students should bring a 1-2 page summary of the stated aims/formal provisions of the policy they will study.**

Readings (Required, continued on next page): Review last week's readings, with an eye toward the effects policy may produce and the reasons why policy "succeeds" or "fails." Consider the different criteria/standards for judging whether a policy works" and the various reasons for the mixed reviews of policy offered in (or implied in) the readings. Also read

*Rothstein, R. (2002). *Out of balance: Our understanding of how schools affect society and how society affects schools*. Chicago, IL: Spencer Foundation.

*Boyd, W. L. (1988). Policy analysis, education policy and management: Through a glass darkly. In N. Boyan (Ed) Handbook of Research on Educational Administration, pp. 501-522. New York: Longman.

*Smith, S. R. & Ingram, H. (2002). Rethinking policy analysis: Citizens, community and the restructuring of public service, The Good Society, 11, (1), 55-60.

Readings (Optional, on reserve):

Glaser, N. (1988). Education, training, and poverty: What worked. In Author, The Limits of Social Policy, pp. 59-85. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rothstein, R. (2004). Class and schools: Using social, economic, and education reform to close the black-white achievement gap. Washington, D. C.: Economic Policy Institute.

September 22: Unpacking the Process Dimensions and Using the Readings as Tools to Develop the Policy Case

This session will focus on concepts that may be particularly useful for describing and interpreting policy processes. In addition, we will address issues associated with the development of the policy case (Installment #1), particularly those issues related to how students might use the course concepts/readings to help "layout" the policy case. Students should be prepared to discuss key components of their policy case and to indicate how they can draw upon concepts from class readings to construct their cases.

Required readings: Review the policy case sections of Garron, Hershey, Phillips-Patrick, Lewis and Walters; read Kingdon, Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies, pp. 90-244.

UNIT II: POLICY ANALYSIS: ALTERNATIVE PERSPECTIVES

In this part of the course, students will be introduced to five perspectives for analyzing and interpreting policy. A common set of analytical categories -- regarding the purposes, processes, outcomes, "theories of action" and "underlying assumptions" of policy -- will be used to describe and contrast the five perspectives. Classes will be devoted to (1) presenting the key elements of each perspective, (2) discussing and practicing ways to apply the perspective to one or more cases, (3) identifying what the perspective does and doesn't illuminate, and (4) discussing students' evolving case-analysis projects.

September 29: Overview of "Multiple Perspectives" Approach to Policy Analysis, and Rational Perspectives on Policy

This session will (1) discuss the over-arching framework used to organize the discussion of alternative perspectives, and (2) introduce rational perspectives. Rational perspectives treat policy

as a purposeful course of action aimed at solving an identified problem. Analysts viewing policy from this perspective focus on the means-ends relationships between policy and its stated outcomes. Students will focus on how problems are defined and how alternatives are assessed in terms of costs, benefits, and prospects for solving the "problem".

Readings (Required):

Review Kingdon, pp. 90-115 and read

*Malen, B., & Knapp, M. (1997). "Rethinking the multiple perspectives approach to education policy analysis: Implications for policy-practice connections," Journal of Education Policy,12, concentrate on first 7 pages.

*Allison G. & Zelikow, P. (1999). Introduction and Model I: In authors, The Essence of Decision, second edition. Boston: Little, Brown & Co, pp.1-26.

*Kerr, D. (1976). Models for rational policy choice: Maximizing, satisficing, and contextual optimizing. In Author, Educational Policy, pp. 106-126. New York: Davis McKay & Co.

*Lindblom, C. (1959). The science of muddling through. Public Administration Review, 14: 79-88.

*Rick, A. & Weaver, R. K. (1999). Advocates and analysts: Think tanks and the politicization of expertise, in A. J. Cigler & B. A. Loomis, (Eds.) Interest group politics, pp. 235-253.

Readings (Required, one of the two):

*Malen, B., Croninger, R., Muncey, D. & Jones, D. (2002). Reconstituting schools: Testing the theory of action,Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis,24 113- 132.

*Bull, B.L. (1987). Confronting reform in teacher education: One state's experience. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9:25-40.

Readings (Optional, on reserve):

Smith, M. S. & O'Day, J. (1990). "Systemic school reform," in S. F. Fuhrman & B. Malen (Eds) The politics of curriculum and testing, pp. 233-267. New York: Falmer.

October 6: Organizational Perspectives on Policy

These perspectives treat policy as the invocation of organizational habits. Motivated by the desire to ensure the organization's stability and survival, policy actors resurrect familiar routines and "attach" them to new "problems." Rather than resulting from conscious problem solving processes (as rational perspectives assume), analysts working with this perspective concentrate on organizational traditions, routines and standard operating procedures. Students will be introduced to the various ways in which organizational propensities may supersede and even substitute for the purposeful actions of organizational members. **Readings on next page.**

Readings (Required):

Review Kingdon, pp. 116-144, and read

*Malen & Knapp (1997). Multiple perspectives article, organizational perspectives section.

*Allison, G. & Zelikow, P. (1999). Model II: Organizational process, pp. 143-196.

*Weatherly, R., & Lipsky, M. (1977). Street-level bureaucrats and institutional innovation: Implementing special education reform. Harvard Education Review, 47: 171-197 (also required in EDPL 788s Policy design/implementation).

*Shepard, L. (1991). Readiness testing in local school districts: An analysis of backdoor policies. In S. Fuhrman & B. Malen (Eds.), The Politics of Curriculum and Testing. New York & London: Falmer Press.

Readings (Optional, on reserve):

Knapp, M. S., et al. (1991). Cumulative effects of federal educational policies on schools and districts. In A. Odden (Ed.), Educational Policy Implementation. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

October 13: "Working" the Rational/Organizational Lenses

Kirk Walters, Guest

This session will provide opportunities for students to practice articulating the key tenets of these perspectives and using them to examine policy cases. Students should come prepared to discuss how these perspectives fit (or fail to fit) the cases they are working on in their papers. Students should also be prepared to discuss the application of these perspectives in Garron, Hershey, Lewis, Phillips-Patrick and Walters.

Readings: Student papers, relevant sections (policy case, analysis from rational perspective and analysis from organizational perspective in Phillips-Patrick and Walters).

October 20: Political Perspectives on Policy

Policy may be understood as an effort to regulate conflicts among the various parties and interests involved in organizational decisions. Rather than focusing upon rational problem-solving processes or organizational routines, the analyst concentrates on the interplay of influence among competing actors, who bargain, negotiate, compromise and otherwise accommodate conflicts stemming from diverse views and values, vested interests, unequal power relations and the inevitable competition for scarce resources.

Readings (Required, continued on next page): Review Kingdon, pp. 145-164 and read

*Malen & Knapp (1997). Multiple perspectives article, political perspectives section.

*Allison, G. & Zelikow, P. (1999) Model III: Governmental politics, pp. 255-324.

*Baldrige, J.V. (1983). Organizational characteristics of colleges and universities. In Baldrige, J.V., & Deal, T. (Eds.), The Dynamics of Organizational Change in Education. pp. 38-59. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Readings (Required, one of the two):

*Malen, B. (1994). Enacting site based management: A political utilities analysis. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1, 249-267.

*Hearn, J., (1989). The paradox of growth in federal aid for college students, 1965-1988. In Handbook of Theory and Research in Higher Education, Vol. IX (pp. 94-153). Bronx, NY: Agathon Press.

Readings (Optional, on reserve):

Chambers, S. (2002-2003). Urban education reform and minority political empowerment. Political Science Quarterly, 117 (4), 643-655 (required EDPL 614 Politics of education).

Murphy, J. (1971). Title I of ESEA: The politics of implementing federal educational reform. Harvard Education Review, 41:35-63 (required in EDPL 788s Policy design/implementation).

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 (required, EDPL 614 Politics of education).

October 27: Analyzing Policy from Multiple Perspectives

In this class, we step back from the discussion of particular perspectives to (1) understand how more than one perspective can be used to make sense of policy, and (2) practice using various perspectives on particular cases.

Readings (Required):

*Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. Educational Researcher, 19: 3-13.

*Ogawa, R. T., et.al. (2003). The substantive and symbolic consequences of a district's standards-based curriculum, American Educational Research Journal, 40, (1), 147-176.

*Hearn, J., (1989). The paradox of growth in federal aid for college students, 1965-1988. In Handbook of Theory and Research in Higher Education, Vol. IX (pp. 94-153). Bronx, NY: Agathon Press.

*Allison, G. & Zelikow, P. (1999). Conclusion, pp. 379-407.

*Garron, Lewis, Phillips-Patrick, Walters.

Readings (Optional):

Curtis, Kim (1998). A multiple-perspective analysis on school desegregation in Prince George's County. Unpublished paper. College Park, MD: University of Maryland.

Eick, Caroline (2002). The Washington DC juvenile curfew policy. Unpublished paper. College Park, MD: University of Maryland-College Park.

Griffin, Kim (2002). How does proposition 209 look through different lenses? Unpublished paper. College Park, MD: University of Maryland-College Park.

Nonymous, A. (1992). Policy on alcohol and other drugs: A nearby community college's response to a federal mandate. Unpublished paper. Seattle, WA: University of Washington.

Pigza, Jennifer (2002). Federal work-study policy and service requirements: A multiple perspective analysis. Unpublished paper. College Park, MD: University of Maryland-College Park.

Rathburn, A. (2003). Maryland's "Bridge for Excellence in Public Schools's Act: Policy case on the mandate of universal full-day kindergarten.

Rorison, B. (2002). National revolution, local resistance: A policy analysis of the revision of the math curriculum in Bayside County. Unpublished paper. College Park, MD: University of Maryland-College Park.

Stewart, Nicole (2003). School desegregation/choice in Charlotte-Mecklenberg. Unpublished paper. College Park, MD: University of Maryland-College Park.

Vest, J. (2002). Title IV financial aid eligibility for distance education institutions: An analysis of the US Department of Education's distance education demonstration program. Unpublished paper. College Park, MD: University of Maryland-College Park.

Students have generated a rich reservoir of instructive papers on a wide range of topics. Feel free to consult other examples that may be of greater topical interest.

November 3: Symbolic Perspectives on Policy

Policy may be understood as symbolic action--ie, the attempt to create "images" of social conditions and institutional actions that may or may not be associated with actual circumstances or events. Here the analyst focuses on actors'attempts to construct symbols which legitimate the institutions, celebrate key values and virtues, represent the facade of action, motivate or mobilize action, or otherwise shape perceptions of and responses to social problems and policy options.

Readings (Required):

*Malen & Knapp article, symbolic perspectives section.

*Stein, S. (2004). Introduction and Policy as cultural construct, in Author, The culture of education policy, ix-25. New York: Teachers College Press.

*Henig, J. R. (2004). Washington D.C.: Race, issue definition and school board restructuring, in J. R. Henig & W. C. Rich (Eds). Mayors in the middle, 191-218.

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

*Airasian, P. W. (1988). Symbolic validation: The case of state mandated, high-stakes testing. Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 301-313.

Readings (Optional, on reserve)

Schneider, A. & Ingram, H. (1993). Social construction of target populations: Implications for politics and policy, American Political Science Review, 67, 334-347 (required for EDPL 788s Policy design/implementation).

Senese, G. (1986). Self-determination and American Indian education: An illusion of control. Educational Theory, 153-164.

Yanow, D. (1996). Symbolic relationship: Language, objects, and acts as artifacts, in Author, How does a policy mean?. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Edelman, M. (1977). Chronic problems, banal language, and contradictory beliefs. In Author, Political Language. New York: Academic Press.

*Cobb, R.W., & Elder, C. D. (1983). Symbol utilization and conflict expansion; functions of symbols, in Authors, Participation in American Politics. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

November 10: "Working" the Political/Symbolic Lenses **Cassandra Lewis, Guest**

This session will provide opportunities for students to practice articulating the key tenets of these perspectives and using them to examine policy cases. Students should come prepared to discuss how these perspectives fit (or fail to fit) their cases as well as the cases in the Garron, Lewis and Walters papers.

Readings: Relevant sections of Garron, Lewis and Walters.

November 17: Normative Perspectives on Policy

In addition to the various lenses that have been used to "view" policy, various "normative" perspectives can also be applied. While there are many versions of normative perspectives, the approach depicted here focuses on policy as an authoritative allocation of values. Accordingly, the analyst may wish to identify the explicit and implicit values embedded in policy, and the likely consequences of these policies for fundamental values such as equity, quality, efficiency, or

choice in educational institutions. In this class, students will be introduced to the key elements of this approach to policy analysis and will practice applying them to case materials.

Readings (Required):

*Malen & Knapp article, normative perspectives section.

*Phillips-Patrick, section on normative perspectives

*Green, T. (1994). Policy questions, Educational Policy Analysis Archives, 2, (7), 1-3, to be distributed.

*Kahne, J. (1996). The constraining culture of educational policy analysis, in Author, Reframing Educational Policy, New York: Teachers College Press.

*Levin, H. (2002). A comprehensive framework for evaluating educational vouchers, Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24, 159-174.

Readings (Optional, on reserve)

Vitteritti, J. P. (2003). Schoolyard revolutions: How research on urban reform undermines reform, Political Science Quarterly, 18 (2), 233-257 (required EDPL 614 Politics of education).

November 24: No class, Thanksgiving

Unit III: INTEGRATING PERSPECTIVES AND INFLUENCING POLICY

No one perspective captures all aspects of a policy in action; together, they help the analyst--and the policy actor--make sense of policy and policymaking. Based on a fuller understanding of what policy is and does, the analyst and policymaker are in a position to imagine various ways to constructively shape and influence policies in action. In this part of the course, we will address these sorts of issues, by discussing how the five perspectives, taken together, offer a rich picture of policies in action and hold implications for attempts to influence policies.

December 1: Integrating Multiple Perspectives on Policy: How Do They "Relate" and Combine to "Explain" Policy? What Do They Say About Influencing Policy? and,

This class brings the five perspectives together, by examining how they overlap, complement and compete. We will focus on how the five perspectives help explain policy cases and help illuminate the debate about the power and limits of policy. Drawing on all five perspectives, students will identify the possibilities and limitations of policy as a force in educational institutions, including the multiple purposes policy may serve, the multiple "effects" it may produce, the varied criteria used to determine whether policy "works" and the various reasons for its "effects." Given a rich, realistic picture of policy's reach and influence, students will then interpret what they have learned for those engaged in policymaking (not necessarily in a formal policymaking role). Thus the class shifts focus from questions of policy's influence on events to notions of policy actors' influence on policies. In addition, this session considers if and how we might use policy analyses (of various sorts) to foster learning (individual and/or organizational)

and engender improvements in educational organizations and related contexts. **Students should be prepared to identify key "insights" from their in progress policy cases.**

Readings (Required):

Review Allison & Zelikow; Malen & Knapp article; Kingdon.

*Sabatier, P. A. (1991). Toward better theories of the policy process. PS. Political Science and Politics, 24, 144-155.

***Students should be ready to talk about how various perspectives are (or are not) illuminating their policy cases and how multiple perspectives might be used to generate insights regarding strategies for influencing policy.

Readings (Optional):

*Sabatier, P. A. (1988). An advocacy coalition framework of policy change and the role of policy-oriented learning therein. Policy Sciences, 21, 129-168.

*Review Kingdon, pp. 196-244.

*Jenkins-Smith, H. C. (1988). Analytical debates and policy learning: Analysis and change in the federal bureaucracy. Policy Sciences, 21, 169-211.

December 8: Appraising a "Multiple Perspectives" Approach; Evaluating the Course - Highlighting Options for Further Study

This session "steps back" to appraise the approach emphasized in this course. Is it a "useful" approach? for whom? Can it generate more robust theories? expose influence strategies? engender "learning"? These and other issues embedded in the approach and "touched" upon in class sessions will be given "center-stage" billing. A major portion of this 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 required re-writes of student papers. If students wish, 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, in our "regular" room.

December 15: No class session. Final papers due.