



POLITICS OF EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

A Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association

VOLUME 30, No. 1

BULLETIN

Fall, 2005

TABLE of CONTENTS

Page 1	<i>Learning from Experience: New York City's Small High Schools</i> Patrice Iatarola, Florida State University
Page 2	Message from the President
Page 6	Perspectives~ <i>High School Reform: The Downside of Scaling Up</i> David C. Bloomfield, Brooklyn College, CUNY
Page 9	PEA-USCM Doctoral Fellow Chosen & Message from Fellow
Page 12	Message from the Treasurer
Page 13	Call for Nominations: Outstanding Dissertation Award in the Politics of Education
Pages 14 & 15	Nomination & Application Forms: Outstanding Dissertation Award in the Politics of Education
Page 16	PEA Membership Application

OF INTEREST...

Please send updates on your publications, agency reports, grants, and promotions to Kyle Ingle, Managing Editor at wki02@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

Congratulations to Dr. Carolyn Herrington (formerly of Florida State University) who has been named Dean of the College of Education at the University of Missouri, Columbia.

Feature ~

LEARNING FROM EXPERIENCE: NEW YORK CITY'S SMALL HIGH SCHOOLS

Patrice Iatarola
Florida State University

The nation's attention over the past few years has been intensely focused on elementary and middle school and the reforms undertaken in association with the implementation of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). The policy debate, however, is now shifting to include secondary education and the state of the nation's high schools. For example, President Bush has called for a national high school initiative that will extend NCLB's testing, accountability and teacher quality components to the high school level and the National Governors Association and Achieve, Inc. have convened the National Education Summit on High Schools bringing together the governors of 45 states, corporate executives and educational leaders to focus on issues related to high schools.¹ Although it

¹ *Education Reform, No Child Left Behind*. (2005). from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/education/>. Achieve Inc. (2005). *2005 National Education Summit on High Schools*, from <http://www.achieve.org/achieve.nsf/2005Summit?OpenForm> Achieve, Inc. is a nonprofit organization established after the 1996 summit and has been a sponsor of the past three summits, including the 2005 high school summit. As a result of the summit and the subsequent calls for standardizing and more accurately reporting graduation rates by Education Trust,

is questionable as to whether Congress will support the President's initiative through legislative action and funding, concern over high schools is not likely to dissipate anytime soon as high schools are a linchpin to reforms at the elementary, middle school and post-secondary levels.²

While a number of reforms are available to address the challenges public high schools are facing, one stands out in terms of the attention and resources it has garnered – small learning communities. Over the past decade, the Gates Foundation has invested over \$700 million for high school initiatives, including \$590 million (80%) on reforms in which small schools are either the centerpiece or essential component of the reform (i.e., early-college high school programs).³ Likewise, the U.S. Department of Education awarded grants totaling \$140 million as part of its Smaller Learning Communities initiative from 2001 to 2002, with an additional \$477 million appropriated for 2002-2004.⁴ At the forefront of the small schools movement, the New York City Department of Education has nearly doubled the number of its high schools over the past decade. The city's efforts are intended to transform the system of secondary education across the district with the goal of creating 200 small high schools.⁵

the governors have agreed to adopt a common metric for graduation rates.

² Lugg, C. A. (2005, Spring). And a Second Term for the Bush Administration. *Politics of Education Association Bulletin*, 29, 6-8. Robelen, E. W. (2005, June 15). House Panel Turns Down Bush's High School Agenda. *Education Week*.

³ There is no single enrollment number or cut-off that defines or constitutes a "small" school. For example, the federal government through its *Small Learning Communities* program limits the number of students to 300, New York City's Gates funded efforts sets an upper limit of 500 students and research suggests other limits as well. Moreover, local policy may establish an entirely different limit. In New York City, prior to the most recent efforts, local policy set an upper-bound on student enrollment in small schools at 600.

⁴ U.S. Department of Education. (2005). *Small Learning Communities Program, Funding Status*, from <http://www.ed.gov/programs/slep/funding.html>

⁵ Supported by \$100 million in funding from the Gates foundation and additional resources from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and Open Society Institute.

Despite accumulated research, some questions remain as to the effectiveness, as well as cost-effectiveness, of small schools. Moreover, conspicuously absent from policy debate and research are questions relating more broadly to the effect that small schools have on a district as a whole: Do small schools change the educational landscape for schools and students and, if so, in what ways? What are the implications of such reforms for all students in terms of segregation, outcomes and costs? **(Continued on Page 3)**

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT:

BRUCE S. COOPER
FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

We are starting another exciting, promising year in the more than 33-year history of the Politics of Education Association (PEA), and we're glad that you're part of these developments. So many people have shared in this work, and they deserve our sincerest thanks for the time, leadership and creativity. Together, PEA has achieved some ten key accomplishments over the past year.

First, we thank our hardworking Treasurer and Membership Chair, Lance Fusarelli (North Carolina State University) for keeping the books, and helping rebuild the PEA membership, up now to nearly 200 strong. If you need to rejoin or join for the first time, please complete the Membership Form in this Bulletin. With your dues, you will receive the PEA Yearbooks.

Second, we recognize the work of Lora Cohen-Vogel (Florida State University), our Association's Secretary. In creating and maintaining the PEA list-serve and website (<http://www.fsu.edu/~pea>), she has preserved the integrity of our membership, spread the good word about PEA, and produced the world's most gorgeous Bulletin, our own. With her FSU colleague, Stacey Rutledge, Lora edits the Bulletin which now hosts a Features and Perspective section. This Bulletin is themed, presenting an early

(Continued on Page 10)

Feature~ *Learning From Experience...*
(Continued from page 2)

Background

New York City, with its focus on small school reform, provides fertile ground to examine these questions. The district was among the first to turn to small schools as a solution to the failure of traditional high schools to serve the needs of an increasingly diverse population of students.

Three distinct waves of small school creation are evident in New York City over the past four decades. The first wave began in the late 1960s with the creation of alternative and experimental small schools, serving students who did not succeed in traditional high school settings. The schools were alternative not only with respect to size, but also in terms of organization, curriculum and instruction. The second wave of small schools in the mid-1990s emerged as a more broadly conceptualized reform and included second-chance and college-preparatory schools. During this second wave, forty small schools were created in New York City.⁶ The third and current wave is far more expansive than the previous two and is intended as a system-wide reform, transforming secondary public education across the city by closing or transforming large high schools that no longer serve the needs of students. Since 2002, 75 small schools have been created as part of the New Century High Schools initiative that will ultimately create 200 small high schools.

While other large urban school systems have embraced small schools, some of which also have a rich history of small schools reform, the scale of New York City's efforts is unprecedented. With the popularity of small schools and the associated expense, does the research base on small schools actually support such an investment of resources?

Research on small schools does not provide overwhelming evidence that small schools are more

⁶ Stiefel, L., Berne, R., Iatarola, P., & Fruchter, N. (2000). High School Size: Effects on Budgets and Performance in New York City. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(Spring), 27-39.

effective in terms of improving student achievement or, even, more cost-effective than larger schools. There are a number of research summaries, including an excellent one produced for the U.S. Department of Education, that review the empirical research on small schools and describe the variety of educational strategies that fall under the umbrella of small learning communities, for example schools-within-schools.⁷

Small schools, according to the summaries, are better than larger schools with respect to student outcomes, participation in extracurricular activities, attendance and student attitudes. A number of the studies reviewed, however, are not methodologically rigorous or are case studies that are difficult to generalize beyond the case or very similar small schools.⁸ Moreover, the most rigorous study of student outcomes finds that the optimal school size for all students on average is between 600-900 students.⁹ This optimal size is actually larger than the size promoted by most of the current initiatives.

Given the intense competition for scarce resources, particularly in urban districts, costs as well as outcomes are important to consider. Theoretically, larger schools will have lower costs per pupil than smaller schools as economies of scale are derived from, for example, spreading administrative costs over a greater number of students, more effective use of the physical plant, and better division of

⁷ Fowler Jr., W. J. (1992). *What Do We Know About School Size? - What Should We Know?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.; Cotton, K. (1996). *School Size, School Climate, and Student Performance*, from <http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/10/c020.html>; Raywid, M. A. (1999). *Current Literature on Small Schools*. *ERIC Digest*. (No. ED4250-49). Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.; Page, L., et al. (2002). *National Evaluation of Smaller Learning Communities: Literature Review*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

⁸ Page, L., et al. (2002). *National Evaluation of Smaller Learning Communities: Literature Review*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

⁹ Lee, V. E., & Smith, J. B. (1997). High School Size: Which Works Best and for Whom? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 19(Autumn), 205-227.

labor and greater specialization.¹⁰ It is unclear, however, whether economies of scale continue to accrue in schools larger than 900 or 1500.¹¹ Considering costs and outcomes, small high schools cost about the same as large high schools on a per graduate basis.¹² There have been no studies that have assessed the long-term benefits of small schools, for example, in terms of college-going rates or labor market outcomes.

All told, small schools seem to have potential for improving student achievement or improving factors related to student achievement, such as attendance rates, but the body of evidence is not yet strong enough to know for sure whether or not small schools work. Moreover, notably absent from the research on small schools is the impact that such changes have not only for those who are participating in the reforms but also on schools and students throughout the system.

New York City

Exploring the implications of small schools for all students in the system in terms of segregation, outcomes and costs poses an enormous methodological challenge to researchers. This article reports on the first stage of research that will ultimately estimate the cost-effectiveness of small high schools in New York City.¹³ In 1993, New York City had 122 high schools. By 2003, as the high school population grew from 265,885 to 286,552 (a 7.8% increase), the number of high schools almost doubled to 237. Over this same time span, the average school size in terms of

¹⁰ Stiefel, L., Berne, R., Iatarola, P., & Fruchter, N. (2000). High School Size: Effects on Budgets and Performance in New York City. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(Spring), 27-39.

¹¹ Cohn, E. (1968). Economies of Scale in Iowa High School Operations. *Journal of Human Resources*, 9, 408-414; Riew, J. (1966). Economies of Scale in High School Operation. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 48, 433-440.

¹² Stiefel, L., Berne, R., Iatarola, P., & Fruchter, N. (2000). High School Size: Effects on Budgets and Performance in New York City. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(Spring), 27-39.

¹³ This report draws on research currently being conducted by Leanna Stiefel, Amy Schwartz, Patrice Iatarola and Colin Chellman that is funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

enrollment went from 2,179 in 1993 to 1,209 in 2003.

Yet, over a third of the schools are still larger than the average of 1,209 and these larger schools enroll over 75% of New York City's public high school students. Thus, to the extent that small schools do offer benefits to students, an overwhelming majority of the students attending high school in New York will not reap them.

With the addition of over 100 high schools during the past decade, public schools in New York City are changing in terms of student demographics. In 1993, African American and Hispanic students represented a majority of the student population (41% and 33%, respectively) with White (17%) and Asian (9%) students being in the minority in the average school.¹⁴ By 2003, the percentage of African American students had decreased while the percentage of Hispanic students increased. Each now represents 39% of the student population in the average school. In the average school, the percentage of Asian students increased to 10%. The most dramatic change, though, is the five percentage point drop in white students.

One might expect to see enrollment shifts in terms of racial composition at the school level as a result of changes in the student population across the district. The student demographic mix system-wide did change, but not in the same manner as evidenced within the average school. For example, in the average school the percent of African American students decreased by two percentage points, but system-wide the decrease was three percentage points. While the percentage of Asian students in the average school increased by one percentage point, the Asian student population increased by four percentage points. The change in the student population of white students, a two

¹⁴ The "average school" is the statistical mean or average school whereby the mean is not weighted by the number of students in a school. Thus, for example, a school with 300 students carries the same weight in the calculation as a school with 2,000 students. Alternatively, a pupil weighted mean would more heavily weight the larger school with the resulting average reflecting that of the system and not the school.

percentage point decrease, is less than the five percentage point decrease evidenced in the average school. In effect, what these differences between average school and student population suggest is that increasingly there is sorting across schools.

Another way to test whether the patterns and level of segregation in New York City schools over the past decade have changed is by calculating the dissimilarity index (or similar indices). The dissimilarity index measures the percent of students that would have to move from one school in which they are over-represented to one in which they are under-represented. In 1993, 58% of African American, Asian, and Hispanic students would have to move to a school where they were under-represented in order to achieve a racial/ethnic balance. The percentage drops to 55 by 2003, suggesting that the racial/ethnic distribution of students across schools may be improving. This is not the case, however, for limited English proficient (LEP) and non-LEP students. LEP students are increasingly segregated from English proficient students. The same holds true for recent-immigrant students and their non-immigrant peers.

Still another way to examine segregation is to describe how schools look from the perspective of the average student of a particular racial/ethnic group and their exposure to students of other racial/ethnic groups.¹⁵ In 1993, the average white student in New York City attended a high school with 60% African American, Asian and Hispanic students. By 2003, the number was 62%. Though slight, the increase in white student exposure to students of color represents an improvement nonetheless. Looking more closely at the data, however, we see that white students are increasingly exposed to Asian students and less exposed to African American students. Whites' exposure to Hispanic students remained stable over the same time period.

¹⁵ The exposure index, as its name suggests, measures the exposure of students of one race/ethnicity (e.g., white) to students of other races/ethnicities. A value of 0 would mean that white students are totally segregated and are not exposed to students of other races/ethnicities. The maximum value of the exposure index equals, for example, the percent of non-white students in the district.

Implications

Overall, our analysis shows that the NYC school system is changing in terms of both the size of schools and their racial/ethnic composition. Whether or not small schools are a causal factor for the changes in composition and segregation cannot be determined solely on the basis of descriptive analyses. Yet, the findings do suggest that educators and policymakers should no longer ignore the implications that small school reform may have on schools and students system-wide.

Extending the analysis beyond school composition and segregation to disentangle the effect of small schools on student outcomes and school costs is an even greater challenge. Such analyses are necessary given the popularity of and investments in small school reform. While New York City's current initiative is unprecedented, the potential implications for all students, including the 75% attending larger high schools, commands further exploration of the effectiveness and costs of small schools.

Patrice Iatarola is an assistant professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Florida State University.

POSITION ANNOUNCEMENT

One Assistant Professor & One Associate/Full Professor of Educational Leadership *North Carolina State University*

The College of Education at North Carolina State University invites applications for two nine-month, tenure-track positions in Educational Leadership. Applicants should be qualified to teach in one or more of the following areas: leadership, school reform, and school improvement. Review of applications will begin November 1, 2005, and will continue until the positions are filled. For a full position description, go to: <http://www.higheredjobs.com/faculty/details.cfm?JobCode=175143211>

PERSPECTIVES ~

HIGH SCHOOL REFORM: THE DOWNSIDE OF SCALING-UP

David C. Bloomfield
Brooklyn College, CUNY

In scaling-up small high schools, New York City Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg is betting his re-election hopes in part on a successful transition away from large comprehensive high schools. The good news is that small schools are getting their first large-scale test as a way out of urban high school failure. The bad news is that Bloomberg's implementation strategy seems to be doing more harm than good for the vast majority of city students attending large high schools and, perhaps, creating a reaction that will give small schools a bad name despite their promise.

As the National Governors Association and others call for widespread high school reform, New York's is a cautionary tale of scaling-up without adequate planning and lack of focus on systemic consequences. When the state legislature established mayoral control of the city's public schools in 2001, Bloomberg explicitly connected his re-election efforts to education reform. In a series of bold moves, he announced a radical reorganization of the system's administrative structure, an end to social promotion in elementary and middle schools, a unified curriculum policy, and the restructuring of failing large high schools into new themed mini-schools. No question exists that a new high school strategy was needed with graduation rates in many schools under 50% and only 16% of students graduating in 4 years with a high-standard New York State Regents diploma.

The Case for Small Schools

The literature on small schools is positive. In addition to treatises by movement founders like

TheodoreSizer¹⁶ and Deborah Meier¹⁷, a preliminary body of research supports the effectiveness of small learning communities in improving student engagement, positive student-teacher interaction, increased time on task, and high teacher morale.³ Graduation rates also appear to gain.⁴ It is possible that these effects are the result of generally smaller class size in small schools⁵ but, if small schools accomplish this task, there is reason to support methodical transition of large failing schools to smaller entities. (Of course, transition from any failing environment to one with more promise makes sense, whether the new school is large or small.)

With grants in excess of \$100 million from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Bloomberg and his hand picked Schools Chancellor, Joel Klein, have embarked on an ambitious mission to open over 150 new high schools over 5 years. Many of these schools are being carved out of existing comprehensive schools with enrollments in excess of 3,000 students. To accomplish this, the large school is eliminated (with the happy collateral benefit of end-running designation of failure under No Child Left Behind) and replaced by up to 7 new small schools within the same building (which restarts the NCLB clock for each).

¹⁶ See, e.g., most recently, The Red Pencil: Convictions from Experience in Education by Theodore R.Sizer (Yale Univ. Press, 2004)

¹⁷ See, e.g., In Schools We Trust: Creating Communities of Learning in an Era of Testing and Standardization by Deborah Meier (Beacon, 2002)

³ WestEd, Rethinking High School: Five Profiles of Innovative Models for Student Success (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2005) and WestEd, Rethinking High School: An Introduction to New York City's Experience (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2005); Ready, Douglas D., et al., "Educational Equity and School Structure: School Size, Overcrowding, and Schools-Within-Schools," Teachers College Record, vol. 106, no. 10 (October, 2004)

⁴ Leanna Stiefel, et al., The Effects of Size of Student Body on School Costs and Performance in New York City High Schools (New York University, April, 1998)

⁵ Deutsch, Francine M., "How Small Classes Benefit High School Students," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, vol. 87 (June, 2003)

Systematic Impacts

But while this early literature is largely positive, it may not be predictive of the scaled-up Bloomberg version. Mini-schools in larger buildings have notoriously difficult relations with other programs in the same facility.⁶ Pioneers often succeed through passion, vision, and Herculean drive that successors lack. Able, self-nominated principals were available when small schools were a rarity but the national principal shortage will have a major impact as Bloomberg seeks to open dozens of schools even before leadership is identified. Accountability for over 100 new schools further strains administrative staff and depletes the ranks of school-based supervisors. Already observers are noting signs of trouble, including staff turnover, inexperienced leadership, failure to address student learning needs, and security issues. In the end, the sheer magnitude of Bloomberg's commitment to small schools without an adequate research base seems a huge short-term political bet (with students as the ante) on a promising yet untested reform.

Even these arguments over the effectiveness of small schools do not tell the whole story. Like a 3-card monte player in pre-Disney Times Square, Bloomberg's re-election spiel only draws attention to small schools, creating a favorable impression of innovation. But a look at his other cards shows a significant downside. By partially emptying large schools and transferring thousands of displaced students -- often the most at-risk -- to other, already overcrowded schools, Bloomberg has harmed more students than he's helped.

Overcrowding

The system-wide impact is not on the side of reform. The multiplier created by reducing enrollment and establishing small schools in a dozen or more buildings impacts deleteriously on tens of thousands of the system's students. When a large, failing high school is restructured and total building enrollment is reduced, the "extra" students numbering as many as 1,000 are left to transfer to other large schools of 3,000 or more. This adds to

⁶ See, Gootman, Elissa, "Dismissal of School's Security Manager Points to Problems With Mayor's Crackdown Efforts," *New York Times*, January 11, 2005

already severe overcrowding in the receiving schools. When Prospect Heights High School in Brooklyn was emptied, enrollment plunged from 1,748 in 2001 to 791 in 2003-04. Similar stories occurred at Roosevelt and Taft High Schools in the Bronx, Bushwick and Erasmus Hall High Schools in Brooklyn, and George Washington and Seward Park High Schools in Manhattan. According to the *New York Times*, "In the last two years [the period of Bloomberg's small school initiative], enrollment has soared at big schools like Samuel J. Tilden in Brooklyn, up 22 percent; Norman Thomas in Manhattan, up 26 percent; and DeWitt Clinton in the Bronx, up 21 percent, while high school enrollment citywide has grown only slightly."⁷

The effect on remaining large high schools that receive most of these students has been disastrous. According to its principal, Lehman High School in the Bronx went from 3,700 students in 2003 to 4,205 in 2004, and is projected to increase to 4,601 in 2005 with an additional 300 students in a mini-school within the building. Students at Lehman with I.E.P.s increased 50% between 2003 and 2004 because of the system's failure to include these students proportionately in the new schools.

Even older small high schools created by previous Chancellors have suffered. A principal of one stated that these schools had seen a sizable increase in enrollment, especially among students with learning disabilities who have not found places in the restructured schools. Many new students arriving as a result of other schools' closure have not acculturated to the older small schools, leading to deterioration in school climate and challenges to maintaining former attendance and graduation rates.

Safety

According to data supplied by the city teachers union, because of nearby school reorganizations Walton High School in the Bronx increased its enrollment by 439 last year and the number of violent incidents increased by 125% over the previous year. At Midwood, a well-regarded high

⁷Herszenhorn, David, "In Push for Small Schools, Other Schools Suffer," *New York Times*, January 14, 2005

school in Brooklyn, enrollment increased by 260 and reported incidents increased 123%. Manhattan's prestigious A. Phillip Randolph High School witnessed a tripling of suspensions this school year, 117 through January, as new students from restructured high schools streamed into the building, leading to severe overcrowding.

While it is surprisingly difficult to link a single school closing to a corresponding increase at a single other school (factors of student mobility, high school admissions practices, and multiple school reorganizations cloud the data), there is no doubt that severe overcrowding of large high schools and older small schools has occurred with little attention from the Chancellor while he concentrated on his new small schools efforts.⁸

The negative impacts of this precipitous scaling up are even more extensive than overcrowding and safety. The strategy drains other schools of leadership, funding, and high performing students.

Cannibalizing School Leadership

If you were a good assistant principal in a large high school of 3,000 students or more and Chancellor Klein offered you tens of thousands of dollars more to become the principal of a 125 student school (most small schools start with an entering class of fewer), what would you do? In this way, dozens of effective administrators are being lured away from jobs serving thousands for jobs serving hundreds, even as far too many schools of all types find themselves with inexperienced administrators at the helm. Again, the math doesn't add up.

Funding Inequities

Funding, too, favors new small schools. A study by the city's Independent Budget Office found that per capita instructional funding for large schools of all types is greater than for small schools "not only because they have more students, but also because so many large schools are high schools and the per capita funding formula for high schools is greater

⁸ See "Overcrowded Schools," letter from Chancellor Joel Klein, *New York Times*, January 29, 2005 responding to Herszenhorn, *supra*.

than for elementary and middle schools."⁹ But, the IBO found, small schools gained though disproportionate increases in overhead funding for non-classroom personnel such as principals, librarians, and guidance counselors.

The Independent Budget Office concluded that, "while a percentage point decline in the overhead allocation for large schools appears modest, for schools with more than 1,200 students the dollar loss averaged over \$92,000 – roughly the cost of an assistant principal."¹⁰ Funding for small high schools received the largest budget allocations while large elementary schools received the smallest.

Student Selection

Cherry-picking by small schools is also a problem for larger schools. While many small schools are nominally "unscreened" (though many others require tests, auditions, or portfolios), the widespread use of interviews and other application strategies limit the pool to at least the strongly motivated. Similarly, small schools' institutional constraints concerning education of students with disabilities, English language learners, students seeking technical training, and the like translate into a more favorable instructional demographic.

An analysis of fall 2004 enrollment data for 278 academic high schools (excluding competitive schools such as Stuyvesant High School and the Bronx High School of Science) led New York Public Radio Station WNYC to conclude that, "special education and English language learners are, in fact, over-represented in the city's most violent and failing schools. At the same time, special ed kids are missing out on one of the city's leading education reforms – the creation of new small schools."¹¹ The data indicate that special

⁹ Madrick, Martina, "Go Figure: How a Bigger Education Budget Became Less Money for Schools," *Inside the Budget*, no. 134 (New York City Independent Budget Office, October 26, 2004); see Andratta, David, "Small Schools Beat Big Ones in Battle for Bucks," *The New York Post*, October 27, 2004

¹⁰ Madrick, *supra*.

¹¹ Fertig, Beth, "Neediest Students Crowd Worst Schools: WNYC Investigation," WNYC, New York Public Radio, March 14, 2005

education students are only half as likely as other students to attend small high schools.¹²

Scaling Up Solutions

The issue is not small schools vs. large schools. A slower, better-planned transition would avoid many of these problems. Lack of adequate funds for new school space is the biggest obstacle to a smoother transition. If new schools occupied new facilities, the problem of displaced students would be largely resolved but Bloomberg's rush to add programs has increased the problem. Similarly, if new leadership was given time to develop, the system would not be forced to cannibalize large schools for small school principals. If small schools were better planned and required to address the learning needs of more challenging populations such as students with disabilities and English language learners, the remaining schools would not have to do more with less.

For a Mayor seen as a non-ideological tactician, more interested in "what works" than political correctness, his monomania for small schools seems particularly ill considered. Some big schools fail, as do small ones. No one believes that only size matters. In addition, the sheer size of New York's public school system means that most students will continue to attend large schools. But rather than rigorously monitoring school quality so that all students are helped by his reforms, the startups seem to be given a free ride while larger schools are ever more burdened. If the Mayor ran on a platform of better schools of every size, there would not be the kind of educational triage that damages the reputations of large and small schools alike.

David C. Bloomfield is a professor and head of the graduate program in Educational Leadership at Brooklyn College, CUNY and former Vice President of the Citywide Council on High Schools in New York.



¹² Ibid.

PEA-USCM Doctoral Fellow Chosen

The Grants/Fellowships Committee is pleased to announce that on June 26, 2005, Danielle LeSure began her one-year term as a PEA-US Conference of Mayors Doctoral Fellow. Ms. LeSure is a fourth-year Ph.D. student in Education Policy at Michigan State University, working closely with Dr. David Plank, Dr. Christopher Dunbar, Jr., and Dr. Gary Sykes. Previously she interned at the Michigan Governor's Office as an assistant to Sue Carnell, Governor Granholm's Education Policy Advisor.

Under the terms of the fellowship, Ms. LeSure will be assisting Dr. Fritz Edelstein of the U.S. Conference of Mayors (USCM) in conducting research and hosting conferences on topics of concern to USCM, including the implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act and the newly re-authorized Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. She is also working on foundation grant research in the area of mayoral leadership and involvement in education with support from the Gates, Carnegie, and Broad foundations. The PEA and USCM plan to award additional Doctoral Fellowships in the future, funding permitted. The next round of fellowship competitions is likely to take place early in 2006. Watch the PEA Listserv for nomination opportunities.

PEA-USCM DOCTORAL FELLOW:

DANIELLE LESURE
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

As the current PEA-USCM Education Fellow, I have become aware of the developing role of mayors in education. With most of my previous experiences at the state level, this fellowship provides opportunities to find connections between federal, state, and local education initiatives. In as little as four weeks, I have seen how acclaimed scholars find their voice in a crowded environment of educational reform and become scholar-activists, communicating objectives beyond the realm of academia and encouraging change based on sound research.

As an educational policy doctoral student, I enjoy working under the guidance of Dr. Fritz Edelstein with his commitment to and passion for education reform at the mayoral level. Consequently, I continue to embrace a holistic view of education that recognizes the role of families and communities in the development of students. Through USCM's *Improving America's Schools: The Critical Importance of Mayoral Involvement*, an initiative made possible by the *Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation*, I continue to develop my research skills in survey analysis and play an integral role in the planning of a national education summit for mayors to explore the challenges in addressing educational concerns at the city level, particularly those relating to redesigning high schools. In addition to the Gates Foundation grant, I am also working on grants sponsored by the *Carnegie Corporation of New York* and the *Broad Foundation*. They both entail conducting research on the various policy strategies and challenges as it relates to increasing mayoral involvement in education reform, particularly for urban communities.

With brown bag lunches at George Washington University, hearings on Capital Hill, and workshops sponsored by organizations such as the American Education Research Association and the Institute for Educational Leadership, my work schedule has been filled with numerous networking opportunities that I am using to enhance the development of my dissertation proposal and to create opportunities to publish. I have found DC to be rich in resources with a spirit of optimism that persists in the hearts of scholars involved in the policy process. Throughout my career I have lived by Mahatma Gandhi's saying "we must become the change we want to see." I can honestly say there is no better place to achieve this than DC!

Message from the President **(Continued from Page 2)**

empirical look at the New York City small schools initiative as well as a perspective piece by a policy insider. The former is authored by our colleague Patrice Iatarola of Florida State University; the latter by David Bloomfield of Brooklyn College, CUNY. We thank them for their excellent contributions.

Third, we recognize the work of John Fitz (University of Cardiff) and his hardworking committee [Lisa Cuerars, Sage; Alfred Hess, Northwestern; Gerardo Lopez, Indiana; V. Darleen Opfer, Ohio State; Marion Orr, Brown; Catherine Lugg, Rutgers; Phil Altbach, Education Policy] for selecting the editors of two of our upcoming publications - our yearbook, published simultaneously as an issue of *Education Policy*, and a special issue of the *Peabody Journal of Education*, respectively. A proposal from Andrea Rorrer (Univ. of Utah) and Catherine Lugg (Rutgers Univ.) has been approved entitled "Power, Education and the Politics of Social Justice" (PEA Yearbook 2006), and Katrina Bulkley (Rutgers Univ.) will edit the 2007 yearbook on the politics of privatization. Cynthia Gerstl-Pepin (Univ. of Vermont) and Darleen Opfer (Ohio State Univ.) will co-edit the 2007 special PEA edition of the *Peabody Journal of Education* on the politics of the media and education.

We applaud the publication of the 2005 PEA Yearbook edited by Lora Cohen-Vogel and Carolyn Herrington (The Politics of Teacher and Administrator Training: The Quality Controversy) and the special edition of the *Peabody Journal of Education* edited by Elizabeth DeBray (Georgia) and Kathryn A. McDermott (U.Mass), & Priscilla Wohlstetter (USC), entitled *Federalism Reconsidered: The Case of the No Child Left Behind Act*. I believe these will be major contributions to debates in the politics of education subfield and in educational policy, more generally.

Fourth, we'd like to commend Patrick Wolf (Georgetown Univ.) and Fritz Edelstein of the US

Conference of Mayors, plus the Committee on PEA Grants and Fellowships, established by PEA's former president, Kenneth Wong (Vanderbilt Univ.). The committee includes Lora Cohen-Vogel (FSU), Sandra Vergari (SUNY-Albany), Kathryn A. McDermott (U. Mass), and me. Janie Lindle (Clemson Univ.), too, has been a great help in networking with associations that might support our fellowships. We appreciate the opportunity to support and select our first PEA Fellow, Danielle LeSure (Michigan State University), who has taken up her new post in Washington, DC with the US Conference of Mayors (see comments by LeSure inside).

Fifth, we are working hard to compile a PEA Handbook, tentatively titled UNDERSTANDING THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION: A HANDBOOK OF THEORY AND APPLICATION. Lance Fusarelli (NC State) and James Cibulka (University of Kentucky) are working with me in finding contributors to this handbook, which will then be submitted to AERA and Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers for review and possible publication.

Sixth, we're working to hold a national conference next summer in Washington, DC, on developments in educational politics. Patrick Wolf, with support of his Dean at Georgetown University, is coordinating a Planning Committee composed of Mary Futrell and Carolyn Brown at George Washington University, and Hanne Mawhinney at University of Maryland, among others. Further, we are please to have support for this conference from Carolyn Herrington, the new Dean of Education at the University of Missouri-Columbia. We welcome ideas for co-sponsors, participants, visits, and panels.

Seventh, we strive to define and strengthen our relationship with AERA and particularly with Division L: Politics and Policy. Carolyn Herrington, Division L Vice President, has worked closely with us to share ideas and efforts, and we thank her for her work. If you have ideas for building our Special Interest Group (SIG), within AERA and outside it, please pass them along to me (bscooperph@aol.com).

Eighth, we are currently seeking nominations for the PEA awards, including the Stephen K. Bailey Award for a contribution to scholarship and theory; the Roald Campbell Award for linking research and practice; the David Colton Award for service to the field and to PEA; and the Outstanding Dissertation Award. Dorothy Shipps (Teachers College) chairs the Awards Committee, which includes Doug Mitchell (University of California, Riverside), Hanne Mawhinney, (University of Maryland), James Cibulka (University of Kentucky), Eric Freeman (Georgia State University) and Bonnie Fusarelli (North Carolina State University). Please consider nominating your students for the dissertation award for work completed between 2003 and 2005 (see attached nomination and application forms).

Ninth, we are offered a book series in the area of educational politics by Information Age Publishing (George Johnson, CEO). We would like to publish some outstanding dissertations as part of the PEA Book Series. Other books manuscripts will be considered too, by the PEA Publications Committee headed by John Fitz and by George Johnson at Information Age Publishing.

Last, but hardly least, PEA is planning a process for exploring and improving the teaching of the politics of education. This work begins with a session, chaired by Katie (University of Massachusetts) at AERA in 2006 in San Francisco where researchers and scholars will demonstrate the best teaching techniques. Further, this committee will collect course syllabi, reading lists, course assignments, materials, scenarios, etc. and make them available to members. So if you have ideas on how to teach our subject of education politics better, and would like to participate in PEA's efforts in this direction, please let me know soon.

The 2005-2006 academic year is sure to offer even more opportunities for PEA, its members, and our field. So don't just sit there, get involved. We hope that you and your students will benefit from the many Politics of Education Association programs and activities.



MESSAGE FROM THE TREASURER:

LANCE FUSARELLI
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

Everyone who paid their 2005 dues directly to me has received the 2005 Yearbook and special issue of the Peabody Journal of Education. Unfortunately, members who joined the PEA SIG through AERA in 2005 have not received their 2005 Yearbooks or the Peabody issue because AERA Central has not yet sent me any membership lists for the 2005 calendar year. I have placed multiple calls into AERA and the SIG Executive Committee and have been promised the membership lists within a month (I am supposed to receive quarterly updates). So, for those members who have not received their 2005 books, please be patient. I hope to receive the updated membership list soon and hope to send out all the Yearbooks not long after fall classes begin. If you have any questions about your membership status, please email me at fusarelli@hotmail.com



PEA OFFICERS

Bruce S. Cooper	President
Lora Cohen-Vogel	Secretary
Lance Fusarelli	Treasurer

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 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
rutledge@coe.fsu.edu

Kyle Ingle
Politics of Education Association Bulletin,
Managing Editor
Florida State University
wki02@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

Please see the Call for Nominations for the PEA Dissertation Award on the Next Page.

The Outstanding Dissertation Award in the Politics of Education

A call for nominations for the award for the best dissertation(s) in the politics of education.

This call covers two years (2003-2005). It is designed to foster and support graduate student research and publication on political processes and outcomes in organized education grades preK-16, from the United States and abroad. One aim is to highlight and reward scholars studying political issues in education, as distinct from the interdisciplinary, frequently time-bound and prescriptive approaches taken by policy studies.

The PEA Awards Committee welcomes any nominated dissertation that addresses the politics of education, including, but not limited to, those that focus on questions of democracy, voice, governance, inequality/equality, power, authority, political accountability, interest group interactions, coalitions and agency at any level of analysis (federal/national, state/provincial, local). Acceptable methods include but are not limited to comparative political analysis, case-study analyses of broad trends and reform efforts, qualitative studies, political history and biography, primary and secondary data analysis.

The Award: A \$250 cash award (\$200 if two winners), and the Outstanding Dissertation Award winner may be offered the opportunity to publish his or her dissertation under the sponsorship of the PEA. This assumes that the dissertation, with editorial changes, is publishable as a book. If, in the judgment of the awards committee, a winning dissertation is publishable, the award winner will also receive editorial and stylistic suggestions prior to publication. In addition, all finalists will receive a one-year honorary membership to the Politics of Education Association.

The Review Process: Completed nominations received by November 1, 2005 will be reviewed by the PEA Dissertation Award Committee. Up to four finalists will be selected for further consideration in December 2005. Finalists will be asked to submit three complete hard copies of the dissertation to the chair of the PEA Awards Committee for review by committee members. Depending on the quality of the dissertations submitted, the committee will grant up to two awards for an Outstanding Dissertation in the Politics of Education. Finalists and winners will be announced at the annual PEA meeting at the regularly scheduled AERA meeting in April 2006.

Eligibility and Application Process: Dissertations from students who have officially graduated with either an Ed.D. or a Ph.D. in political science or education between June 30, 2003, and July 1, 2005, are eligible for nomination.

The nomination process involves submitting a two-page (400 word maximum) abstract of the dissertation, which clarifies the topic, methods, finding and conclusions, as well as a completed application form (attached to this call) and a letter of nomination from the dissertation sponsor (form for sponsor is also attached below). The sponsor's letter of nomination should include a half page describing why the dissertation is exemplary, its contribution to the politics of education and verification that the doctoral degree was granted between June 30, 2003, and July 1, 2005. No incomplete nominations will be considered.

Completed applications are to be emailed by midnight October 31, 2005 to PEAawards@tc.columbia.edu. Emailed applications will receive a brief confirmation of receipt.

If necessary, applications may be mailed to the address below. However, snail mail nominations will not receive a confirmation of receipt.

Dorothy Shipps, Chair
PEA Dissertation Awards, ORL, Box 189
Teachers College, Columbia University
525 West 120th Street
New York, NY 10027

NOMINATION FORM FOR FACULTY-SPONSOR
PEA-Outstanding Dissertation Award
2003-2005

Dear Faculty Sponsor,

Please fill out this form and email it to PEAawards@tc.columbia.edu along with the student application form and the student's 400-word abstract of the dissertation. All student nominees for this award should have officially completed the Dissertation between June 30, 2003 and July 1, 2005. You may nominate more than one student for the award, but each nominee must be accompanied by a complete package including a separate abstract and student application form.

Faculty Sponsor Information (please note if your title or address is different now than when you sponsored this dissertation)

Name:

University Affiliation:

Street Address:

Street Address 2:

City, State, Zip:

Country:

Sponsor's email:

STUDENT NOMINEE

Name:

DISSERTATION INFORMATION

Full Title of Nominated Dissertation:

Date of Defense:

Date of Conferral of Degree:

Please attach a statement (between 2-5 paragraphs) describing:

- 1) what makes this student's dissertation exemplary and*
- 2) its overall contribution to the field of the politics of education.*

Nomination Statement (type your statement directly into the field below):

**THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
APPLICATION FORM 2003-2005
OUTSTANDING DISSERTATION IN THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION**

*Please remember to include a two-page (400 word maximum) abstract of the dissertation, which clarifies the topic, methods, finding and conclusions, and a letter of nomination from the dissertation sponsor **with your completed application form** (mailing instructions below).*

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Name:

Street Address:

Street Address 2:

City, State, Zip:

Country:

Email:

DISSERTATION INFORMATION

Title of Dissertation:

Sponsor/Mentor/Primary Faculty Advisor Contact Information

Name:

Street Address:

Street Address 2:

City, State, Zip:

Country:

Sponsor's email:

Committee Member/Reader Information

Member/Reader #1:

Member/Reader #2:

Member/Reader #3:

Member/Reader #4:

Member/Reader #5:

Date of Defense:

PROGRAM INFORMATION

Date of Conferral of Degree:

Location of Program:

Degree Awarded:

Email completed applications no later than midnight **October 31, 2005** to **Dorothy Shippo, Chair PEA Awards Committee** at PEAawards@tc.columbia.edu. Emailed applications will receive a brief confirmation of receipt. If necessary, applications may be mailed to the address below. (*Snail mail nominations will not receive a confirmation of receipt.*)

Dorothy Shippo

PEA Dissertation Awards Chair

Teachers College, Columbia University

525 West 120th Street (ORL, BOX 189)

New York, NY 10027

**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 \$30 for full, one-year membership

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