



A Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association

VOLUME 42, No. 1

BULLETIN

Fall 2017

*The Rise of Privatization in School District
Facilities Programs*
Marialena Rivera¹

Funding for local public school facilities is determined by the nuances of variable state policies (Duncombe & Wang, 2009; Filardo, 2016). In many states, policymakers have devised and perpetuated school finance systems that result in inequitable facilities funding across school districts, with implications for low-income students and students of color (Filardo, Vincent, Sung, & Stein, 2006). School finance is typically bifurcated into operational and capital funding (Timar, 2006). Many states' finance policies focus on the operations side of the budget, which covers recurring costs of education including teachers, administrators, books, materials, utilities and cleaning, rather than the capital side of the budget, which covers assets with a multi-year life, such as new construction of buildings, facility additions, and the purchase of equipment (Filardo, 2010).

(Continued on Page 4)

¹ Marialena Rivera (Ph.D., University of California-Berkeley, 2016) is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Counseling, Leadership, Adult Education & School Psychology at Texas State University. Her dissertation, *Inequity and Privatization in School District Facilities Financing: A Mixed Methods Study*, was supported by a Social Science Research Council Dissertation Proposal Development Fellowship and by a University of California Dissertation-Year Fellowship (Chaired by Janelle T. Scott, with committee members Tina M. Trujillo and Robert Reich), and was the recipient of the 2017 Politics of Education Association's Outstanding Dissertation Award. Marialena has articles forthcoming from this research and studies educational politics and policy, leadership, college access, and school finance with a focus on social context and equity.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

W. KYLE INGLE
UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

**Succession Planning and Management—Leading
PEA in 2018 and Beyond...**

Last year at about this time, I was writing my first chair's report for the *PEA Bulletin*. Now I am nearing the end of my two-year term and it is time to think about who will lead the Politics of Education Association next. As you likely know, elections are held in advance of AERA and the terms begin at the conclusion of the Annual meeting. In my weekly listserv emails to our membership, I have regularly highlighted that we have a number of officer positions coming up for election. These include Chair, Treasurer, and At-Large Board members. **Slating will close November 20, 2017 with elections occurring in mid-January.** So my question for you and our fellow PEA members is: Who is willing to step up and assume these roles? Are you concerned about the time constraints and balancing other responsibilities (research, teaching, other service, home, etc.)? I suspect so. I was concerned too, but let me help to allay some of these concerns. Succession planning and management is defined as "any effort designed to ensure the continued effective performance of an organization, division, department, or workgroup by making provision for the development, replacement, and strategic application of key people over time" (Rothwell,

2005, p. 10). These processes can be both formal and informal. Rothwell asserts that when succession planning and management involves well-planned and formalized practices, it becomes a *succession planning and management program*—one that is “a deliberate and systematic effort by an organization to ensure leadership continuity in key positions, retain and develop intellectual and knowledge capital for the future, and encourage individual advancement” (p. 10).

It is possible to have both formal and informal processes. In terms of formal strategies, I took advantage of what AERA provides. Knowing the results of the election in advance of AERA 2016 in Washington DC, I was invited to attend one of a number of SIG leadership training sessions that were planned during the annual meeting. I attended one and learned quite a bit. I was provided access to online information that were available by accessing AERA’s web resources. I had questions along the way, but I found the AERA staff devoted to SIGs have been very helpful and responsive. There are formal resources and training available if one knows about them and willing to take advantage of them.

Then there was the informal succession planning and management strategies. Former PEA Chairs Lora Cohen-Vogel, Catherine Lugg, Bonnie Fusarelli, and Tamara Young were always willing to help me out if I had questions. Trust me, I had them too. Please know that once my term is up, I will be more than happy to do the same, and I know that our other outgoing officers would be willing to do the same as well. I think that one of the key strategies of a SIG chair is to recruit and appoint willing volunteers to serve as committee members and committee chairs. I have been blessed to have some really effective ones over the past year or so. I have found the experience as PEA Chair to be quite fulfilling. I have been honored to serve in this role and even thought about running again—that is until I referred to our by-laws and realized that “Individuals shall not be eligible to be nominated to succeed themselves in the same office” (PEA By-laws, Article 6, Section 6).

So, please consider running. Those of us in educational leadership and policy know that

leadership matters to organizational outcomes, but you need individuals willing and able to assume these roles. To that end, Dr. Huriya Jabbar, PEA Secretary serves as the Chair of the Slate Committee, so please contact her if you are interested in running for one of these positions or nominating someone. Dr. Jabbar can be reached via email at jabbar@austin.utexas.edu. Please make sure to review the Duties and Responsibilities of Leadership in PEA from our AERA SIG Bylaws. These are available at our [PEA website](#). Feel free to contact me or another board member if you have questions. I think you will find individuals willing to answer these questions and willing to help.

PEA Breakfast Meeting at UCEA 2017 Conference in Denver

UCEA 2017 in Denver is fast approaching. Our annual Breakfast Meeting is scheduled for 7:00 am to 7:50 am on Friday, November 17 in the Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel (Floor I.M. PEI Tower - Second Level - Tower Court A). After a light breakfast social, and brief updates, our invited speaker will be Dr. Madeline Mavrogordato. Dr. Mavrogordato is an Assistant Professor of K-12 Educational Administration at Michigan State University. Her research addresses issues surrounding school reform and improvement for disadvantaged student populations. She utilizes both quantitative and qualitative methods to investigate how the social context of education, educational policies, and school leadership shape educational outcomes for underserved students, particularly immigrants and English language learners. She will be discussing her recently published study, “Eliendo Escuelas: English Learners and Access to School Choice”. The manuscript, co-authored with Dr. Julie Harris, appears in the 2017 Politics of Education Association special issue of *Educational Policy*.

Many thanks to Dr. Katherine Mansfield, PEA Treasurer at Virginia Commonwealth University, for budgeting the money for our business meeting/breakfast and placing the order. Please join us at this event if you are attending the UCEA meeting in Denver. We would love to see you.

2017 Special Editions and Beyond...

Speaking of special editions, all of you should have

received the 2017 special edition of *Peabody Journal of Education*, which had as its theme, “The Politics of New Policy Network Governance and Counter-Networks: Actions and Reactions in State Education Policy Arenas”. This special edition was ably edited by Catherine Marshall, Mark Johnson, and Ariel Tichnor-Wagner. The 2017 Politics of Education Association Special Issue of *Educational Policy* had as its theme, “The Politics of Immigration and Education.” Its guest editors were Rand Quinn, Megan Hopkins, and Lisa García Bedolla. We thank the guest editors, the contributing authors, and the peer-reviewers for their contributions to these two excellent special editions and very timely indeed. It is high quality research, such as which appears in these most recent special editions, that attracted and retained my interest in PEA from graduate school to the present day.

Stay tuned because the 2018 special issue of *Educational Policy* is slated for publication in March 2018. Its theme will be the politics of unions and collective bargaining in education. The Publications Committee has been very busy recently vetting proposal for the upcoming 2019 special issues. These decisions have been made and the guest editors notified. As always, thanks for the hard work of the Publications Committee for reviewing what were very competitive proposals. I was recently talking with a colleague about the Politics of Education. As part of this conversation, I mentioned our arrangements with *Educational Policy* and the *Peabody Journal of Education*. This colleague was quite impressed with our existing arrangements with these high caliber venues for educational research. Indeed, PEA is very fortunate to have strong and long-lasting relationships with two such powerful journals and ones that we, as an organization, are committed to maintaining.

PEA Membership

AERA characterizes a healthy SIG as one that garners strong annual meeting proposal submissions and acceptance rates; has initiatives for mentoring graduate students and emerging scholars, initiates membership recruitment and retention strategies (AERA wants a minimum of 75 members); ensures leadership capacity development; and advances the knowledge base and dissemination of research in

our field. If you consider what PEA does now and has done throughout its nearly 60-year history, I would characterize us as very healthy. As of my writing of this report, I am pleased to report that PEA’s membership is strong at 234 members. In my aforementioned recent conversations with a colleague about PEA, I was asked about the cost of membership in this SIG—\$40.00 regular membership per year; \$20.00 student membership per year. Think about what we provide our members—the Boyd Workshop, annual publications, opportunities for the development of our organization, its members, and our research. I think it is dues that are well spent, and I hope you agree with me.

SIG Communications

Many thanks to Dr. Andrew Saultz of Miami University of Ohio and Dr. Chris Curran of the University of Maryland, Baltimore County for serving as Co-Editors of the very document you are currently reading. These individuals have developed opportunities to proliferate information about the valuable research that you are doing, opportunities to feature the work of promising politics of education graduate students, share news and opportunities, and so on... The co-editors and I encourage you to submit essays, news, and information of interest to our members.

As Chair and controller of list-serve access, I have remained largely consistent in limiting emails to Fridays of each week. As stated in my weekly list-serve emails, please forward any announcements, such as job postings, recent publications, calls for proposals, conferences, to me at william.ingle@louisville.edu. I hope that these weekly emails have been useful to you.

In closing, I hope that your 2017-2018 academic year has been a positive one thus far.

-Kyle Ingle

References

Politics of Education Association. (2011). American Educational Research Association
Special Interest Group: Politics of Education Bylaws. Retrieved from <http://www.politicsofeducation.org/about.html>

Rothwell, W. J. (2005). *Effective succession planning: Ensuring leadership continuity and building talent from within*. (3rd Ed). New York: American Management Association.

TABLE of CONTENTS

Page 1	<i>The Rise of Privatization in School District Facilities Programs</i> Marialena Rivera
Page 1	Message from the President
Page 11	Dissertation Award Committee Report
Page 11	2018 William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop
Page 13	Publications Report
Page 14	Treasurer's Report
Page 15	Member News
Page 16	UCEA Conference Listings
Page 21	Recognition of 2017 Workshop Mentors and Volunteers

“The Rise of Privatization”

(Rivera, continued from page 1)

In California, a series of initiatives, legislation, ideological shifts, and judicial decisions have shaped the state's school finance system (Brunner, 2006; Timar, 2006). Though recent school finance reforms, including the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) in 2013, have focused relatively more attention on equity outcomes, California is an example of the persistence of inequitable *facilities* funding despite recent policy reforms on the operations side of the budget. Under California's School Facility Program (SFP), the state distributes facilities matching funds to school districts on a first-come, first-served basis and is meant to provide either 50% of costs for new construction or 60% of costs for modernization through competitive, per pupil project grants (Vincent, 2014). The SFP has been both lauded for its role in improving California school facilities as well as criticized for its shortcomings and unintended consequences (Naqvi, 2015; Vincent, 2012). Since California established the SFP in 1998, the state has generated \$35.4 billion in construction bonds, and local school districts have gained more than \$80 billion in voter authorization for general obligation

(GO) bonds to fund school facilities (Vincent & Gross, 2015).

The details of the basic bond process differ depending on the state and the level (state versus local), though typically, government entities issue bonds when they need to borrow money from investors for infrastructure or other projects. Generally, school districts hold an election to gain voter authorization to sell bonds, which underwriters then sell to investors. School districts repay the debt, with interest, from taxes levied on the property of individuals living within the municipal boundaries. The California Public Policy Center estimates that California school districts have \$49.7 billion in total outstanding bond debt (Fletcher, 2012). Policies limit the amount school districts can raise based on their local assessed valuation (property wealth), resulting in funding disparities between districts (Naqvi, 2015; Vincent, 2012). At the time this study was conducted, California's governor had expressed through his annual budget message and public statements that local school districts should bear the primary responsibility for constructing and modernizing school facilities moving forward, with the state playing only a minimal equity role in targeted circumstances, citing growing state debt for his reluctance to continue providing bond-backed state matching funds.

During the pilot study for this dissertation project, school district leaders around the state expressed their concern that diminishing state matching funds could limit their ability to provide adequate and equitable facilities for their students. The list of concerned stakeholders also included the Coalition for Adequate School Housing (CASH), a membership organization for public and private sector professionals engaged in the school facilities industry. CASH, along with the California Building Industry Association, created a campaign committee called Californians for Quality Schools and collected enough signatures to place a \$9 billion school construction bond on the November 2016 ballot, which passed after this study was completed. CASH's initiative was unprecedented because it represented a coalition of public and private actors in the school facilities industry using the initiative process to circumvent the governor to maintain state facilities spending.

Situating Privatization in Facilities Programs in the Broader Neoliberal Context

In order to obtain facilities funding, school district leaders deal with politically, socially, and economically charged issues, including tax policies, state spending, and public elections. It is now common for school districts to engage with a team of financial consultants and contractors to help them through the facilities financing process. Team members can include financial advisors, underwriters, district counsel, bond counsel, disclosure counsel, polling firms, political consultants, architects, ratings agencies, and sometimes credit enhancement agencies (Harrington, Hartenstein, & Field, 2005). Each of these contracts represents a transfer of public dollars to the private sector. School districts, like other local government entities, have long contracted with private organizations, with varied consequences, for a range of educational and financial services including: whole school management, testing and data analysis, teacher evaluation and professional development, academic programming, and a variety of consulting activities (Bulkley, Henig & Levin, 2010; Burch, 2009; Scott & DiMartino, 2009). However, state policies over the last few decades have significantly facilitated a growth in private sector contracting for the provision of core educational services (Bulkley & Burch, 2011; McDonnell, 2013). Privatization in educational facilities financing is less documented and less understood.

Many scholars have connected the emergence of educational privatization to the global rise of neoliberalism in education and other sectors (Apple, 2006; Harvey, 2012; Lipman, 2011). Lipman (2011) defined neoliberalism as “an ensemble of economic and social policies, forms of governance, and discourses and ideologies that promote individual self-interest, unrestricted flows of capital, deep reductions in the cost of labor, and sharp retrenchment of the public sphere” (p. 6). Both the governor’s proposal to shrink the state’s role in funding school facilities, as well as CASH’s private sector led bond initiative response, fit within the neoliberal narrative.

Casual observers might consider educational privatization’s most obvious instantiations to be vouchers, charter schools, and private management of school systems. This assessment of privatization

misses the robust and growing private sector involvement in school facilities programs. The process of funding educational facilities has far-reaching implications for the school children that enter schools daily and the community stakeholders that repay bond debt, and there is a rich empirical opportunity to understand this aspect of educational privatization, which, to date, remains relatively underexplored by policy scholars. Therefore, this study asked:

1. How have education finance policies shaped the system of school district facilities financing over time?
2. What sociopolitical dynamics influence outcomes related to how districts interact with private organizations in the facilities financing process?
3. What are school districts’ experiences with school district facilities programs and policies?

Conceptual Framework and Methodology

This University of California Dissertation-Year Fellowship funded and Institutional Review Board approved study’s conceptual framework utilized the dual lenses of critical policy analysis and fiscal sociology. To examine how California’s education finance policies have shaped the current system of school district facilities financing over time, I drew from the field of critical policy analysis, which allowed for the examination of policy origins and assumptions, treating educational privatization as nested in larger neoliberal thinking (Burch, 2009). For example, to analyze the constellation of private consultants and contractors that profit from involvement in the school facilities industry in California, I applied Scott and DiMartino’s (2009) privatization typology. To understand the sociopolitical factors that influence how districts interact with private organizations in the bond process, I employed fiscal sociology, which acknowledges the importance of context in the study of taxation, public debt, and state spending (Martin, Mehrotra & Prasad, 2009). Finally, to examine how school districts’ experiences with facilities financing programs and policies varied, I used critical policy analysis to examine second layer policies, including regulations, guidance, and budgets (Burch, 2009), as well as fiscal sociology, which attends to the consequences of fiscal policies for political, social, and cultural life (Martin, Mehrotra & Prasad, 2009).

This study utilized a mixed-methods

approach to empirical inquiry, incorporating historical policy document analysis (RQ1), quantitative descriptive and regression analysis (RQ2), and case study analysis of two California districts with active bond programs (RQ3). The methods were informed by an extensive pilot study funded by the Social Science Research Council's Dissertation Proposal Development Fellowship in the summer of 2013. The pilot study included 60 preliminary interviews with state officials, school district personnel, and private contractors as well as a preliminary analysis of quantitative bond transaction data. Data collection for this dissertation research was completed during the winter, spring, and early summer of 2015. As Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014) explained with regard mixed-methods research, "During analysis, [qualitative data] can help by validating, interpreting, clarifying, and illustrating quantitative findings, as well as through strengthening and revising theory" (p. 43). Given that this study examined an area in which there was little empirical work, I supplemented the broad statewide trends and relationships the quantitative analysis revealed (RQ2) with qualitative components to understand, in depth, why the rise of privatization in school facilities programs has occurred (RQ1) and how it has affected school districts (RQ3).

The qualitative stages of the study were informed by document analysis, observations, and interviews. For RQ1, I reviewed sections of the California government and education codes, relevant bills and propositions, state-conducted analyses and commissioned reports, and relevant Securities and Exchange Commission and MSRB regulations. For RQ3, documents included school district facilities financing official statements, bond oversight committee documents, and other relevant financial and planning documents. I also analyzed organization websites. Interview data included an additional 60 interviews with policymakers, school district leaders and staff, and private financial consultants. I used reputational and snowball sampling techniques (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014; Small, 2009).

To ensure that analysis procedures were rooted in the conceptual framework and the research questions, I used three primary analysis tools: 1) topical coding, 2) conceptual framing outlining, and 3) data displays (Miles, Huberman, &

Saldaña, 2014). I began with a provisional "start list" of deductive codes, and through repeated interactions with the data, added inductive codes (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Throughout the analysis process, I used tactics to verify findings, including recoding early transcripts through the process of "extension" (Lincoln & Guba, as cited in Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 62), as well as paying attention to exceptions and "negative" findings (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996), and memoing.

For the quantitative portion of the study (RQ2), I merged datasets from the California Debt and Investment Advisory Commission (CDIAC) (variables on California municipal debt transactions since 1984), the Public Policy Institute of California (variables on school district and community characteristics), and CalMuni (assessed valuation data for selected California school districts). I first generated descriptive statistics regarding trends in costs of issuance, or the amount paid in interest and fees to private organizations. I also described how the market of various types of contractors has grown and developed over time, noting which individual private firms are most active. I then conducted regression analysis to examine whether sociopolitical factors were associated with outcomes related to school district costs of issuance.

Findings

Historical policy document analysis and interviews (RQ1) revealed a neoliberal policy environment that has contributed to the rise in privatization in the school facilities industry. Despite formal statements from state policymakers and policy reports specifying state responsibilities to *all* children and the importance of quality, equitable schools, this analysis found that the ways in which facilities policies have been implemented have not led to equitable outcomes. Policies allow districts with higher assessed valuation (AV) to raise more money through their bond sales, and while a district can waive its bonding capacity limits, Proposition 39 tax rate limitations affect school districts' abilities to issue bonds. Also, because a school district's credit rating affects the interest rate taxpayers will pay on its bonds, the system of credit ratings inequitably impacts districts with blemished financial pasts. Furthermore, state law requires local voters to authorize tax increases to fund school facilities, resulting in a system where

conservative or otherwise tax-averse areas are less likely to pass bonds, limiting certain school districts' abilities to improve their school buildings. The state has provided limited technical assistance to help districts equitably navigate the facilities financing process. Document analysis guided organizational mapping revealed that, despite the SFP's attempts to streamline the process of funding school facilities, school districts must interact with many government agencies to plan, finance, and construct their facilities. Respondents described how the neoliberal notion of competition is evident throughout the facilities financing process as the SFP has required school districts to essentially compete for insufficient state funding over time in a first-come, first-served system that emphasizes the capacity variations between school districts. This has cultivated a system where school districts hire financial consultants and contractors to help them run bond programs and obtain state matching funds. While school district leaders are responsible for overseeing facilities programs, respondents agreed that some leaders, especially those in elementary, rural, and low-income districts, lack the expertise to effectively manage their facilities programs. An industry expert described why school district leaders hire private consultants, saying, "That's not my full-time job. I'm running the school district... I rely upon these people who have the expertise." A financial consultant agreed, saying, "This is an extremely difficult and complicated process, and I think experts in our areas and various areas are needed."

Quantitative analysis (RQ2) indicated that the field of private financial consultants involved in school district facilities financing has changed and grown over time, with a few firms dominating the underwriting, financial advising, and bond counsel markets. Over the last thirty years, school districts have paid significant quantities of money—approximately \$1.98 billion for just the 48% of debt deals reporting non-zero costs of issuance to CDIAC—in fees to private organizations to provide financial expertise and services for debt transactions. The actual dollar amount that districts have paid to private consultants and contractors for their expertise is likely much higher. Costs of issuance varied by a number of factors, including type of debt issued, district size, type of school district, and district AV. The regression analysis

looking at 2010-2011 bonds found that measures of wealth were associated with total costs of issuance per student in school district facilities transactions. Median household income was statistically significantly negatively related to costs of issuance per student, with lower income districts paying higher fees.

Qualitative case study analysis (RQ3) revealed how state policies and rising privatization affected two California school districts' facilities programs. State policies tying facilities funding to local property values constrained both districts. One former school board member described, "If you're in a poor community, your AV is going to be like 1/10th... You can't do anything. This means that a lot of needs go unmet." Respondents in one district described how the state's policy requiring districts to provide charter schools with "reasonably equivalent" facilities constrained the district's facilities program, while respondents in the other district connected accusations of pay-to-play with policies prohibiting districts from using public money for bond campaigns. Interview data indicated that district capacity and leadership expertise shaped the districts' relationships with private actors. While one districts' facilities program was board driven, primarily by one leader who took the initiative to become a facilities expert, the other district suffered from frequent leadership turnover and relied heavily on the expertise of consultants in ways that affected district governance. For example, the superintendent allowed private facilities consultants to serve on district policy committees. Respondents tended to agree that problems in the industry were connected to particular "bad apple" consultants, and the majority of complaints were related to financial advisory firms. Private consultants were also described as providing credibility and political cover for board members when making difficult facilities decisions.

Implications for Policymakers, Practitioners, and Researchers

Using the theoretical lenses of fiscal sociology and critical policy analysis, this study's potential significance lies in its ability to contribute to the conversation on how state policies have facilitated privatization in the financing of educational facilities and its effects. I conclude with

implications for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers.

The governor's critique of the current SFP as inequitable was correct, though research indicates that a larger state role in facilities funding, rather than a smaller role, can increase funding equity across a state (Duncombe & Wang, 2009; Filardo, 2016). California policymakers have begun responding to problems with bond financing, such as the recent regulation of capital appreciation bonds, and are now primed to rethink facilities finance. While policy recommendations to enhance the equity of facilities outcomes are outside the scope of this article, policy recommendations to address the findings discussed here include building on current public and quasi-governmental programs to increase financial capacity and expertise at the local level, improving the regulations of financial advisors, making the system of credit ratings more equitable, ending pay-to-play with campaign finance reform, and developing additional local tools for raising facilities dollars.

This research also has the potential to assist practitioners engaging in the facilities financing process by explaining how the system developed, how other actors in the system approach their policy roles, and how their own district and community characteristics might impact the costs of issuing debt. Findings from this study validate the concerns of scholars engaged in critical policy analysis of neoliberal education policies, and their implications for practitioners and other district stakeholders. As Scott and DiMartino (2009) suggested, practitioners should be aware of the variation in the field of private consultants, noting that some consultants are primarily profit-seekers or competitors. Furthermore, this study extends scholars' findings of private actors increasingly taking on governance responsibilities on the operations side of the budget (Hursh, 2016; Lipman, 2011; Trujillo, 2014), to the capital side of the budget. Respondents described how school boards make million-dollar decisions based on the advice of private financial consultants who often lack oversight or democratic accountability, leaving school district leaders accountable for financial decisions they might not understand. Practitioners, in particular school district leaders, would be wise to increase their expertise of school facilities finance to better oversee their bond programs. Findings from this

study have the potential not only to help practitioners prepare to issue debt, but also to prevent them from making costly mistakes when issuing bonds to fund and modernize school facilities. As this study confirms, the system exists in its current form only because of previous policy decisions. This is meant to be empowering because if we acknowledge the system as socially constructed, we can imagine reorganizing the system to improve equity. Practitioners can use findings from this study to advocate for more equitable policies.

For researchers, there are many opportunities to extend this work. This study reveals that a growing sector of private actors is profiting from contracting with school districts to support America's school facilities, a taxpayer supported, multi-billion-dollar industry, and there are indications that these private actors are increasingly taking on governance responsibilities and engaging in private-sector policy setting. However, as Trujillo (2014) summarized when looking at the literature on private educational intermediaries, the literature is still missing analyses that explore ideological tensions in reforms and research on what motivates private actors to advance specific reforms. In the current neoliberal policy context, it is useful to address the ways in which institutions and individuals contribute to the privatization of core educational functions formerly provided by public organizations. Examining education facilities financing reveals important insights about how policies facilitating privatization develop and are layered onto an already inequitable educational system and points to opportunities to improve equitable access to facilities for students and to strengthen democratic accountability. Given the rapid expansion of private engagement in public education more broadly, the passionate debate it often engenders about the purposes of public schooling, and the recent focus on school finance equity in California and across the country, this is a timely and important topic to explore that has long-term equity implications for students and other community stakeholders.

References

Apple, M. W. (2006). Understanding and interrupting neoliberalism and

- neoconservatism in education. *Pedagogies*, 1(1), 21-26.
- Brunner, E. J. (2006). *Financing school facilities in California: Report of the Governor's Committee on Education Excellence*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, Institute for Research on Education Policy and Practice. Retrieved from [https://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/6-Brunner\(3-07\).pdf](https://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/6-Brunner(3-07).pdf)
- Bulkley, K. E., & Burch, P. (2011). The changing nature of private engagement in public education: For-profit and nonprofit organizations and educational reform. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 86(3), 236-251.
- Bulkley, K. E., Henig, J., & Levin, H. (Eds.). (2010). *Between public and private: Politics, governance, and the new portfolio models for urban school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Burch, P. (2009). *Hidden markets: The new education privatization*. Routledge.
- California Debt & Investment Advisory Commission. (2013 & 2015). *California K-12 school district debt* [Data file]. Retrieved from <http://www.treasurer.ca.gov/cdiac/debtdata/entity.asp>
- Coffey, A. J., & Atkinson, P. A. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies*. SAGE Publications, Incorporated.
- Duncombe, W., & Wang, W. (2009). School facilities funding and capital-outlay distribution in the states. *Journal Of Education Finance*, 34(3), 324-350.
- Filardo, M. (2010). *State capital spending on PK-12 school facilities*. Washington, DC: 21st Century School Fund.
- Filardo, M. (2016). *State of our schools: America's K-12 facilities 2016*. Washington, D.C.: 21st Century School Fund.
- Filardo, M. W., Vincent, J. M., Sung, P., & Stein, T. (2006). *Growth and disparity: A decade of US public school construction*. Washington, DC: 21st Century School Fund.
- Fletcher, W. D. (2012). *The California budget crisis: Causes and recommendations*. Retrieved from the California Public Policy Center website: <http://californiapolicycenter.org/>
- Harrington, G., Hartenstein, J., & Field, D. (2005). *The XYZs of California school district debt financing* (3rd ed.). California: Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP. Retrieved from <https://www.orrick.com/Events-and-Publications/Documents/1151.pdf>
- Harvey, J. (2012). Privatization: A drain on public schools. *Educational Leadership*, 69(4), 48-53.
- Hursh, D. W. (2016). *The end of public schools: The corporate reform agenda to privatize education*. Routledge.
- Lipman, P. (2011). *The new political economy of urban education: Neoliberalism, race, and the right to the city*. Routledge.
- Martin, I. W., Mehrotra, A. K., & Prasad, M. (2009). *The new fiscal sociology: Taxation in comparative and historical perspective*. Cambridge University Press.
- McDonnell, L. M. (2013). Educational accountability and policy feedback. *Educational Policy*, 27(2), 170-189.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. SAGE Publications, Incorporated.
- Naqvi, J. (2015). *The 2015-16 Budget: Rethinking how the State funds schools facilities*. Sacramento, CA: Legislative Analyst's Office. Retrieved from <http://www.lao.ca.gov/reports/2015/budget/school-facilities/school-facilities-021715.pdf>
- Scott, J., & DiMartino, C. (2009). Public education under new management: A typology of educational privatization applied to New York City's restructuring. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 84(3), 432-452.
- Small, M. L. (2009). How many cases do I need? On science and the logic of case selection in field-based research. *Ethnography*, 10(1), 5-38.
- Timar, T. (2006). *How California funds k-12 education: Report of the Governor's Committee on Education Excellence*. Palo

Alto, CA: Stanford University, Institute for Research on Education Policy and Practice. Retrieved from [https://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/2-Timar\(3-07\).pdf](https://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/2-Timar(3-07).pdf)

Trujillo, T. (2014). The modern cult of efficiency: Intermediary organizations and the new scientific management. *Educational Policy*, 28(2), 207-232.

Vincent, J. M. (2012). *California's K-12 educational infrastructure investments: Leveraging the state's role for quality school facilities in sustainable communities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Center for Cities + Schools. Retrieved from <http://citiesandschools.berkeley.edu/reports/CCS2012CAK12facilities.pdf>

Vincent, J. (2014). *State funding for K-12 school facilities: A survey of the states*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Center for Cities + Schools. Retrieved from http://citiesandschools.berkeley.edu/reports/Vincent_2014_State_K12%20fac_funding_final.pdf

Vincent, J. M., & Gross, L. S. (2015). *Guided by principles: Shaping the state of California's role in K-12 public school facility funding*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Center for Cities + Schools. Retrieved from http://citiesandschools.berkeley.edu/uploads/2015_Guided_by_Principles.pdf

UCEA PEA Breakfast and Meeting

Date: Friday, November 17th
Time: 7:00 am – 7:50 am
Place: Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel
Floor I.M. PEI Tower
Second Level
Tower Court A

The University Council for Educational Administration

Annual Conference
November 15-19, 2017
Denver, CO

Conference Theme:
Echando Pa'lante: School Leaders (Up)rising as Advocates and (Up)lifting Student Voices

American Educational Research Association

Annual Conference
April 13-17, 2018
New York City, NY

Conference Theme:
The Dreams, Possibilities, and Necessity of Public Education

DISSERTATION AWARD COMMITTEE REPORT

REBECCA JACOBSEN
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS-2018 POLITICS OF EDUCATION OUTSTANDING DISSERTATION AWARD

This call is for the 2018 award for the best dissertation in the politics of education. 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 approaches taken by policy studies.

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

The Award: A \$250 cash award, editorial and stylistic suggestions for publication from the PEA Dissertation Award Committee, and recognition at the annual business meeting of PEA held at the annual meeting of AERA and the opportunity to have their work featured in the *Politics of Education Association Bulletin*, an official publication of the Politics of Education Association (PEA) and is published two times per year.

The Review Process: Completed nominations received by midnight December 1, 2017 will be reviewed by the PEA Dissertation Award Committee. Four to six finalists will be selected for

further consideration by January 2018. Finalists and winners will be announced in the spring *PEA Bulletin* and honored at the annual PEA business meeting at the regularly scheduled AERA meeting in 2018.

Eligibility and Application Process: Dissertations from students who have successfully defended a dissertation for either an Ed. D. or a Ph.D. in political science or education between June 30, 2016, and July 1, 2017, are eligible for nomination.

The nomination process involves submitting a scholar application form, including a four-six page (1,200 word maximum) abstract of the dissertation, which describes the topic and any conceptual underpinnings, details the methods of data collection and analysis, and briefly describes the findings and the conclusions. In addition, a letter of support from the dissertation sponsor is required. The sponsor's letter of support should describe why the dissertation is exemplary and assess its contribution to the politics of education field. It also verifies that the doctoral degree was earned between June 30, 2016 and July 1, 2017. No incomplete nominations will be considered.

Completed applications and nomination forms are to be emailed by midnight December 1, 2017 to Dr. Rebecca Jacobsen at rjacobs@msu.edu. Emailed applications will receive a brief confirmation of receipt.

2018 WILLIAM L. BOYD NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL POLITICS WORKSHOP: A CALL FOR PARTICIPANTS

We invite graduate students and recent doctoral graduates to a special 2 1/2-hour workshop. The William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop, scheduled on the first afternoon of the AERA annual meeting, will give emerging scholars (students and new academics/researchers) the opportunity to learn about current and promising research in the

politics of education field and interact with leading politics of education scholars.

Sponsors: Special thanks to the sponsoring organizations that make this event possible:

- The Politics of Education Association
- University Council for Educational Administration
- AERA Division L
- The Great Lakes Center for Education Research and Practice

[Registration—Emerging Scholars](#) [CLICK HERE](#)

Or navigate to

<http://tinyurl.com/boydstudent2018>

When/Where: The workshop will take place on Friday, April 13th 2018, from 3:30-6:00pm (EST) at a location close to the AERA conference hotels.

Eligibility: Students with an interest in educational politics and currently enrolled in graduate schools in the U.S. or abroad are welcome to attend as are educational researchers who earned their doctoral degrees after March 1, 2017. There is no fee to attend, but space is limited. Applicants whose research interests are not clearly tied to education politics will not be accepted. The opportunity to submit an application will end January 19, 2018 at 5:00pm (EST) or when we reach maximum capacity.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Lauren P. Bailes at lbbailes@udel.edu or Dr. Dana Mitra at dmitra@psu.edu.

Call for Mentors

The Politics of Education Association and the University Council for Educational Administration invite its members to serve as mentors to current doctoral students and/or recent doctoral graduates. The Boyd Workshop aims to connect doctoral students and recent graduates with mentors in order to share their expertise and experiences in the discipline. **Please note that volunteering will require attendance at a 2 1/2 hour workshop held on the first afternoon of AERA's annual meeting in New York City, NY.** If you are

interested in serving as a mentor, please complete the electronic form found at the link below—even if you have served as a mentor at previous Boyd Workshops. Doing so confirms your willingness to serve as a mentor in NYC in 2018.

To register as a mentor, click [here](#)

Or navigate to

<http://tinyurl.com/boydmentor2018>

We thank you for your willingness to serve as a mentor. If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Lauren P. Bailes at lbbailes@udel.edu or Dr. Dana Mitra at dmitra@psu.edu.



PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

KATRINA BULKLEY, CHAIR
MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY

CATHERINE DIMARTINO, CO-CHAIR
ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY

On behalf of the PEA Publications Committee, I am happy to announce a number of forthcoming journal special issues. The 2018 PEA Yearbook, published as a special issue of *Educational Policy*, will be edited by W. Kyle Ingle, Ben Pogodzinski and Casey George. The theme of the issue will be, "The Politics of Unions and Collective Bargaining in Education." The 2019 PEA Yearbook will be edited by Sarah Diem, Michelle D. Young, and Carrie Sampson. The theme of the issue will be, "Where Critical Policy Meets the Politics of Education." The 2019 special issue of the *Peabody Journal of Education* will be edited by Oscar Jimenez-Castellanos, Patricia Lopez, and Marielena Rivera. The theme of the issue will be, "The Politics of K-12 Local Control Funding and Accountability for Latino and ELL students: Lessons Learned from California."

As a reminder to our membership, the PEA Yearbook is an annual publication, typically published as the January issue of *Educational Policy*. On an **every other year** basis (published in odd-numbered years), the *Peabody Journal of Education* (PJE) publishes an issue dedicated to the politics of education subfield. Please note if you are interested in submitting proposals for the 2020 PEA Yearbook published in *Educational Policy*, the deadline is June 15, 2018. For further inquiries or requests for sample proposals, please contact Katrina Bulkley, Publications Committee Co-Chair, at bulkleyk@montclair.edu.

Committee Members:

Katrina Bulkley, Montclair State University
Catherine DiMartino, St. John's University
Sarah Diem, University of Missouri
Huriya Jabbar, University of Texas at Austin

Catherine Lugg, Rutgers University
Douglas Wiczorek, Iowa State University
Rachel White, Michigan State University
Kacy Martin, Michigan State University



POLITICS OF EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

PEA EXECUTIVE BOARD

W. Kyle Ingle	President
Katherine Mansfield	Treasurer
Huriya Jabbar	Secretary
Elizabeth DeBray	At-Large Member
Stacey Rutledge	At-Large Member



TREASURER REPORT

**KATHERINE CUMINGS MANSFIELD
VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY**

First, we would like to take this opportunity to thank again our sponsors for last spring's William L. Boyd Politics of Education Workshop: Steve Boyd (individual contribution), Michelle Young (Executive Director of UCEA), Lora Cohen-Vogel (Vice President of AERA Division L), and Dan Quinn (Director of the Great Lakes Center for Education Research and Practice). We are so thankful for your generosity. Without folks like you, we could not continue this meaningful mentoring opportunity for graduate students and junior scholars of educational politics, policy, and leadership.

Second, as of August, our membership is up to 234 from 190 members last March. Of those 234 members, 72 are new to PEA! This means we added about 25 NEW members since our last Boyd Workshop. Let's keep the momentum going! I am also happy to report that our lapsed memberships have declined from 159 in March to 137 as of August 2017. These are great indicators of a healthy organization. Nevertheless, we are optimistic that, as we get closer to AERA registration, our loyal members will renew their memberships and pay their dues. If your membership has lapsed, please renew today! Thanks!

AERA SIG Politics of Education Association Financial Statement

ACTIVITY POSTED JANUARY-AUGUST 2017	BEGINNING BALANCE	TRANSACTION AMOUNT	ENDING BALANCE
AUGUST 2017 STATEMENT	\$11,286.55		
Contribution Income		\$400.00	
Membership Dues Income		\$3,480.00	
Sponsorship: Great Lakes Center for Education Research and Practice, Dan Quinn		\$500.00	
RCL SIG852 Award cost 08/17		(\$60.00)	
M.Rivera SIG852DisAwd 04/17		(\$250.00)	
07/17-06/18 SIG management fee		(\$300.00)	
Postage: PEA/EP Yearbook 2017 (annual)		(\$2,147.00)	
UCEA 2016 Breakfast		(\$1,314.40)	
AERA 2017 Bus Mtng refreshments		(\$837.89)	
Boyd Workshop 2017 refreshments		(\$1,316.68)	
			\$8,779.55
ACTIVITY COMPLETE BUT NOT YET POSTED OR PROJECTED ACTIVITY (AUG-DEC 2017)	\$8,779.55		
Sponsorship: Division L, Lora Cohen-Vogel		\$1,000.00	
Sponsorship: UCEA, Michelle Young		\$1,000.00	
Sponsorship: Steve Boyd		\$1,000.00	
Breakfast for bus meeting UCEA 2017		(\$1,295)	
Room for Boyd Workshop APRIL 2018		(\$400.00)	
Revenue from memberships Aug-Dec 2017		\$1,500	
TOTAL "OUT"		(\$1,695)	
TOTAL "IN"		\$4,500	
			\$11,584.55 PROJECTED BALANCE

MEMBER NEWS

UPDATES SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS

F. Chris Curran, UMBC School of Public Policy, recently published:

Curran, F.C. (2017). Estimating the relationship between preschool attendance and kindergarten science achievement: Implications for early science achievement gaps. *Education Finance and Policy*. Online First.

Curran, F.C. (2017). The law, policy, and portrayal of zero tolerance school discipline: Examining prevalence and characteristics across levels of governance and school districts. *Educational Policy*. Online First.

Mary L. Derrington, University of Tennessee, recently published: Derrington, M.L., & Campbell, J.W. (2017). Teacher evaluation policy tools: Principals' selective use in instructional leadership. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2017.1326143>

Lance Fusarelli, North Carolina State University, recently published: Saultz, A., Fusarelli, L.D., & McEachin, A. (2017). The Every Student Succeeds Act, the decline of the federal role in education policy, and the curbing of executive authority. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 47(3), 426-444.

Madeline Mavrogordato, Michigan State University, recently published:

Mavrogordato, M., Goldring, E. & Smrekar, C. (2017). Charter school principals' autonomy in the context of state accountability. In M.A. Gawlik & D.L. Bickmore (Eds.), *Unexplored conditions of charter school principals: An examination of the issues and challenges for leaders* (pp. 1-22). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Mavrogordato, M. & Harris, J. (2017). Eligiendo escuelas: English learners and access to school choice. *Educational Policy*, 31(6), 801-829.

Mavrogordato, M. & White, R. (2017). Reclassification variation: How policy implementation guides the process of exiting students from English learner status. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 39(2), 281-310.

Rebecca S. Natow, Hofstra University, recently began a new position as an assistant professor of educational leadership and policy at Hofstra University.

Amanda Potterton, University of Kentucky, recently began a new position as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies in the College of Education at the University of Kentucky. She also recently published:

Powers, J. M., & Potterton, A. U. (2017). The case against private schooling. In R. Fox & N. Buchanan (Eds.), *School choice: A handbook for researchers, practitioners, policymakers and journalists* (pp. 131-148). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Kathleen Provinzano, Drexel University, recently began a new role as a tenure-track assistant professor of Educational Leadership and Administration at Drexel University.

She was also a recent recipient (Co-PI) of a Pennsylvania Department of Education grant focused on enhancing the instructional leadership capacity of teachers interested in serving as principals in the early grades.

Lynch, W. (PI), Provinzano, K. (Co-PI), Haslip, M., & Grant, A. (Co-PI). (2016, October). *Pennsylvania Principal Preparation PreK-4 Leadership Consortium*. Pennsylvania Department of Education Eligible Partnerships Postsecondary Grant. (\$600,000, funded)

In other news, she recently coauthored the following publication: McHenry-Sorber, E., & Provinzano, K. (2016). Confronting rapid change: Exploring the practices of educational leaders in a rural boomtown. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*. 1-27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2016.1232833>

Marialena, Rivera, Texas State University, received the AERA Division L: Education Policy and Politics - Outstanding Dissertation Award and the PEA Dissertation of the Year Award.

Rachel White, University of Southern California Rossier School of Education, received the Association of Education Finance and Policy (AEFP) 2017 New Scholar Award and is now serving as a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Southern California Rossier School of Education.

UCEA CONFERENCE SESSIONS RELATED TO THE POLITICS OF EDUCATION

The following list details UCEA conference sessions that included the term “politics”, “policy”, or “ESSA” in their title:

071. Resisting and Disrupting White Supremacist Politics: From White Educational Policy Toward Black Political Empowerment Innovative Session / Mini-Workshop 3:20 to 4:30 pm Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Terrace Level -

107. Politics of Education Association Breakfast and Meeting Meeting 7:00 to 7:50 am Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Second Level - Tower Court A

161. Lessons in Political Savviness From the Layton Archives of the Politics of Education Association Symposium 1:30 to 2:40 pm Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Terrace Level - Terrace

242. Cultural Politics of Undocumented Immigrants: Dilemmas for School Leaders Critical Conversation and Networking Session 12:20 to 1:30 pm Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Terrace Level - Biltmore

226. General Session IV: UCEA Presidential Address: April Peters-Hawkins Reclaiming our Time: Thoughts on Enacting Elements of Moral Leadership in the Current Political Climate

Saturday, November 18 9:20 to 10:50 am
I.M. PEI Tower - Second Level - Grand Ballroom I

015. GSS Session 2 - Educational Policy and Social Justice Graduate Student Summit Paper Session 1:10 to 2:15 pm Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Second Level - Tower Court B

029. GSS Session 16 - Teachers' Response to Educational Policy Graduate Student Summit Paper Session 3:40 to 4:45 pm Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Second Level - Tower Court D

4:55 to 6:00 pm Graduate Student Summit Roundtable: Graduate Student Roundtable Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Second Level - Windows 033-1. GSS Roundtable G - Reviewing and Assessing Educational Policy Implementation

033-3. GSS Roundtable I - Using Quantitative Methods in Research on Educational Leadership and Policy

080. Countering the Policy Discourse Paper Session 3:20 to 4:30 pm Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Second Level - Tower Court B

113. Social and Emotional Learning: Research, Policy, Practice, and Implications for Leadership Preparation Critical Conversation and Networking Session 8:00 to 9:10 am Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Terrace Level - Biltmore

116. Policy, Evaluation, and Improvement Within Leadership Preparation Programs Paper Session 8:00 to 9:10 am Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Terrace Level - Columbine

134. Developing Policy Advocates With Youth, Leaders, and Community Paper Session 10:50 to 12:00 pm Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Second Level - Tower Court A

150. Student Voice and Engagement for Community and Policy Advocacy Paper Session 12:10 to 1:20 pm Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Second Level - Tower Court C

167. Politicizing the Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act Special Session 1:30 to 2:40 pm Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Second Level - Windows

176. ESSA and the Critical Discourse of Public Education Paper Session 2:50 to 4:00 pm Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Second Level - Tower Court A

213. A Dialogue on Whiteness and White Racism in Educational Leadership and Policy Critical Conversation and Networking Session 8:00 to 9:10 am

228. (Re)Engaging Policy Process: Valuing and Learning From Youth Voices Critical Conversation and Networking Session 11:00 am to 12:10 pm Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Terrace Level - Biltmore

244. Leading for Systemic Change: Honoring LGBTIQ Voices Through Policy Reform Symposium 12:20 to 1:30 pm Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Mezzanine Level - Colorado

283. Youth Policy Presentations: Cocreating, Collaborating, and Intergenerational Learning as an Approach to Action Civics Innovative Session / Mini-Workshop 4:20 to 5:30 pm Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Terrace Level - Beverly

145. ESSA Roundtable: What is Your State's Plan for School Leadership? A CrossState Analysis of ESSA Special Session 12:10 to 1:20 pm Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel: I.M. PEI Tower - Majestic Level - Majestic Ballroom

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

Andrew Saultz, Co-Editor
Miami University
304B McGuffey Hall
Oxford, OH 45056
saultzam@miamioh.edu
Phone: (513) 529-6839

F. Chris Curran, Co-Editor
UMBC School of Public Policy
1000 Hilltop Circle
Baltimore, MD 21227
curranfc@umbc.edu
Phone: (615) 337-6854

Meet the PEA Bulletin Editors

Andrew Saultz, PhD, is an Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership at Miami University. His research focuses on the interdependence of political science and public policy theories on educational accountability strategy and how federal mandated program changes are interpreted by, a broad range of actors including policymakers, educators, educational leaders, parents and citizens. His recent work has appeared in *Educational Researcher*, *Teachers College Record*, and *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*. Prior to joining the faculty at MU, he completed his PhD in Educational Policy from Michigan State University. He has experience as a high school social studies teacher and a school board member.

F. Chris Curran, PhD, is an Assistant Professor of Public Policy at the UMBC School of Public Policy. His work focuses on examining policies and practices that can improve the educational outcomes of traditionally disadvantaged groups of students. In particular, he conducts work in the areas of school discipline and safety, early elementary education, and teacher labor markets. His recent work has appeared in *Educational Researcher*, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, and *AERA Open*. Prior to joining the faculty at UMBC, he completed his PhD in Leadership and Policy Studies with a doctoral minor in quantitative methods at Vanderbilt University. He has experience as a middle school science teacher and department chair.

Become a member of the Politics of Education Association

Membership Benefits

In addition to its presence on the AERA program, PEA membership provides members with an electronic *PEA Bulletin* (the Association's newsletter), recent publications, and information about upcoming conferences, books, articles, and events related to the politics of education. Members also receive the special double issue of *Educational Policy* (January/March) which serves as the annual yearbook of the Politics of Education Association and a biennial special issue of the *Peabody Journal of Education*. The association also maintains its own web site <http://www.politicsofeducation.org> ; offers course materials for teaching courses related to the Politics of Education, POETS (Politics of Education Teachers Services); sponsors timely presentations from senior scholars and political insiders; and provides mentoring for new faculty and graduate students.

Join PEA

Since the Politics of Education Association is a special interest group (SIG) of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), you can join PEA when applying for a new AERA membership or renewing your AERA membership.

If it is not time to renew your AERA membership, then you can still join or renew your PEA membership online by:

- >Go to AERA homepage <http://www.aera.net>
- >Login
- >On the left toolbar select ***Member Homepage***
- >Under Profile and Member Benefits, select ***SIG Memberships***
- >Above SIG Memberships, select ***Purchase Additional SIG Memberships***
- >**\$40 (faculty)**
- >**\$20 (student)**

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

The Politics of Education Association (PEA) was formed in 1969 as the Politics of Education Society. In 1978, it became the Politics of Education Association, as part of AERA. Interest in educational policy and politics expanded so that in 1987, the Association successfully called for the formation of a new division within the American Educational Research Association. Today, that division is known as Division L: Policy and Politics. The Politics of Education Association continues as a Special Interest Group affiliated with the American Educational Research Association

Past Presidents of PEA

Tamara Young (2014-2016) North Carolina State University
Bonnie Fusarelli (2012-2014) North Carolina State University
Catherine Lugg (2010-2012) Rutgers University
Lora Cohen-Vogel (2008-2010) Florida State University (currently at University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill)
Bruce Cooper (2004-2008) Fordham University
Kenneth Wong (2002-2004) Vanderbilt University (currently at Brown University)
Hanne Mawhinney (2000-2002) University of Maryland, College Park
William Firestone (1998-2000) Rutgers University
Jane Clark Lindle: (1996-1998) University of Kentucky (currently at Clemson University)
Robert Wimpelberg (1994-1996) University of New Orleans (now University of Houston)
Betty Malen (1992-1994) University of Washington (now University of Maryland, College Park)
Catherine Marshall (1990-1992) Vanderbilt University (currently at University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill)
William Lowe Boyd (1988-1990) Pennsylvania State University
Michael Kirst (1986-1988) Stanford University
Jay D. Scribner (1984-1986) Temple University (now University of Texas-Austin)
Douglas Mitchell (1982-1984) University of California, Riverside
James G. Cibulka (1980-1982) University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (currently at NCATE)

Past Chairs of PEA

Donald H. Layton (1978-1980) SUNY-Albany
David K. Wiles (1976-1978) Miami University (later SUNY at Albany)
David K. Wiles (1975-1976) Miami University (later SUNY at Albany) (completed LaNoue's 1st term)
George LaNoue (1974-1975 -- stepped down after one year) Teachers College (currently at University of Maryland, Baltimore County)
Michael W. Kirst (1972-1974) Stanford University
Mike M. Milstein (1970-1972) SUNY-Buffalo (later University of New Mexico)
David L. Colton (First President; 1969-1970) Washington University; (retired from University of New Mexico)



**Many Thanks to our 2017 William L. Boyd National Education Politics Workshop
Mentors:**

Audrey Addi-Raccah
Vonzell Agosto
Osagie Amayo
Danna Beaty
Ira Bogotch
Alex Bowers
Curtis Brewer
Warletta Brookins
Jeffrey Brooks
Bradley Carpenter
Hope Casto
Lora Cohen-Vogel
Robert Cooper
Bret Cormier
Chris Curran
Arnold Danzig
Sarah Diem
Catherine DiMartino
Shaun Dougherty
Ibrahim Duyar
Kara Finnigan
Pedro Flores Crespo
Dan Gibton
Rick Ginsberg
Michael Gottfried
Marilyn Grady
Dorothy Hines-Datiri
Rodney Hopson
William Ingle
Claire Jacobson
Oscar Jimenez-Castellanos

Bob Johnson, Jr.
Nathan Jones
Susan Kahn
Sean Kelly
La'Tara Lampkin
Janie Clark Lindle
Patricia Lopez
Christopher Lubienski
Douglas Luke
Betty Malen
Katherine Mansfield
Madeline Mavrogordato
Carlos McCray
Carol Mullen
Heather Olson Beal
April Peters-Hawkins
Donald Peurach
Morgan Polikoff
Elena Polush
Jeanne Powers
Courtney Preston
Jayson Richardson
Carolyn Riehl
Cristobal Rodriguez
R. Anthony Rolle
Sarah Ryan
Sharon Saez
Andrew Saultz
Kathryn Schiller
Linda Skrla
Daniel Spikes

Anna Sun
Maria Tatto
Julian Vasquez Heilig
Douglas Wiczorek
Sheri Williams
Camille Wilson
Sue Winton
Sarah Woulfin
Michelle Young