

**EDLR 6313**  
**Educational Policy and Politics**  
**Fall, 2016**  
**12:30-3:00 pm**  
**Wednesdays**  
**Rm# TBA**

Instructor: Jennie M. Weiner  
Office hours: by appointment  
Office Phone: TBD  
Cell Phone: (213) 399-5345  
Fax: (860) 486-4028  
Email: [jennie.weiner@uconn.edu](mailto:jennie.weiner@uconn.edu)

Office Address:  
242c Gentry  
Neag School of Education  
University of Connecticut  
249 Glenbrook Road, Unit 2093  
Storrs, CT 06269-2093

### **Course Overview**

*Educational Policy and Politics* is designed to develop students' understanding of policy in general and the policy process in particular. This course presents students with a range of theoretical frameworks to understand policy and the policy process--from problem definition to policy formulation, adoption, and implementation.

Micro and macro perspectives on the education policy process will be explored. Macro perspectives deal with institutional and structural aspects of the policy process. Micro theories of policy, in contrast, emphasize the interaction between human actors and their environment in specific contexts.

Major theoretical perspectives will be discussed, including the multiple streams or garbage can model, street-level bureaucracy, cognition framing, transformation of intentions, micropolitics, institutional isomorphism, and symbolic uses of politics. These theoretical perspectives will expand students' knowledge and understanding of the policy process and will provide a repertoire of analytic frameworks to better understand policy. By the end of the semester, students will conduct a project in which they analyze a policy of interest using one of the theoretical frameworks from the course. The final product will directly support students' doctoral capstone.

### **Course Objectives**

Students in this course will:

- Develop a working understanding of several theoretical frameworks related to the policy process.
- Develop the skills to apply these policy frameworks to education policies and practices, with a particular emphasis on school improvement.
- Assess the formulation and implementation of the policy process in terms of broader social, political, economic, and historical forces.
- Engage in an investigation and analysis of a policy related to there are of interest using a theoretical lens from the policy field.
- Develop the habits of mind for thoughtful and informed judgment in complex situations.
- Develop the ability to apply general concepts and knowledge to specific problems of practice.

- Improve their writing and ability to engage productively in a critical friends group.

### **Course Organization**

This course is designed as a seminar where students **lead a substantial portion of the discussion**. In particular, students choose a class session at the beginning of the semester and, with a partner, are responsible for leading discussion on the theoretical framework(s) assigned to that session.

The second portion of each class session will be dedicated to applying the theoretical framework to better understand a current policy issue. These discussions will be instructor facilitated; however, there a number of sessions in which students will choose the focus of these discussions.

### **Course Requirements, Assignments and Grading**

The overarching objective of this course is for each participant to develop a deeper understanding of education policy and become more adept at thinking and writing analytically. To accomplish these goals, students must read attentively, participate in class, and put strong efforts into class assignments. We are also a community of learners and, as such, the class will be structured in ways to encourage students to provide critical support and feedback to one another.

If a student wishes to know the instructor’s assessment of his/her participation and understanding of readings, he or she is encouraged to seek a conference for that purpose. The instructor will notify any student about whom there is a concern (performing below a B level).

**Quality Participation.** This includes regular participation in class and, potentially, online discussions. This means posing thoughtful questions and offer analytic comments that are grounded in the readings and your professional experiences. Quality participation also involves facilitating an insightful and analytic discussion based on the week’s theoretical constructs in one class session. For this task, you will work with a partner, and with me, to plan and carry out the facilitation. Last, in order to participate, you have to be present. Please make every effort to be at every class. Notify me in advance if you cannot attend. (30%)

**Analytic Memos.** Each class, you will write an analytic memo that analyzes the key ideas in the readings for that class session. Critically assess and analyze the frameworks and/or findings/conclusions discussed in the readings. You should further identify connections to practice. Memos are argumentative in nature and hence should have a clear thesis statement and evidence to support this thesis. **THIS IS NOT A REFLECTION OR SYNOPSIS OF THE READING.** Memos are limited to **one single-spaced page** only and should not spend more than one-two sentences summarizing the reading. Memos will be graded on a √-, √, √+ scale. You may opt out of writing a memo **2 times** over the course of the semester: (1) during the week you facilitate and (2) during one “buy week” of your choice. **Due on HuskyCT by 12:01 am on the Sunday preceding each Wednesday this course meets.** (30%)

**Policy Case Study.** You will analyze an area of interest from a policy perspective. In what ways do the theoretical constructs we have studied have relevance to a policy in which you are interested? Consider unpacking the life cycle of a policy related to your areas of interest. As part of the assignment, use the results of your analysis, to offer targeted recommendations for revising existing policies or creating new ones related to your area of interest. The assignment, rubric and proposal

will be described in more detail in an upcoming class. (30%) **Proposal due: October 19. Paper Due: December 14**

***Writing Groups:*** An additional component of this work will be to engage with colleagues around ideas and the writing process. Half-way during the semester you will be put in a writing group. This group is meant to support you as you work to apply your theory of practice to your area of interest. Group members will read and critique the outline and rough draft of your paper. The quality of the comments they provide to you along with your revisions based on these comments (and my own) will be incorporated into your final grades (i.e., they will be graded on the quality of the feedback they provide, you on your responsiveness where appropriate). (10%)

**Note:** Points will be deducted for late assignments.

### **Major Theoretical Frameworks and Contributing Authors**

1. Garbage Can Model (John Kingdon, and Cohen, March, & Olsen)  
The garbage can (or multiple streams) model offers an alternative to rationale decision theory. Decisions do not follow the linear process of identifying a problem and then finding a solution. Rather, a confluence of political streams leads to the creation of policy. Solutions tend to lie dormant waiting for the right problem to come along.
2. Street-level Bureaucracy (Michael Lipsky)  
Policy implementation at the “street-level” often deviates from the formal written policy. The misalignment can be explained, in part, by the realities faced by front-line implementers who operate in bureaucratic environments.
3. Institutional Isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell)  
The ability for policies to make change at the ground level may be hindered by institutional pressures towards conformity and structural or technical rather than adaptive changes.
4. Transformation of Intentions (Peter Hall)  
A policy’s original intent may not be realized during its implementation. Policies are interpreted, translated, and re-translated by various actors across various contexts.
5. Micropolitics (Stephen J. Ball, and others)  
The politics of schools and those who work in them shed light on the interpretation and implementation of education policies.
6. Cognition Framing & Mutual Adaptation (James Spillane, Amanda Datnow)  
A policy’s impact is shaped by how it is framed and interpreted by various stakeholders. The ultimate outcome of policy is determined through a process whereby the policy and the organization policymakers seek to change adapt to one another.
7. Loose Coupling (Weick, Meyer and Rowan)  
Loose coupling suggests that the work within the organization is not well connected to the external policies meant to influence it. As a result, teachers and others within school operate largely autonomously and policy act to better connect these processes.

8. Community Organizing (Marshall Ganz, others)  
The coordination of cooperative efforts and campaigning carried out by local residents to promote the interests of their community.

**Students with Disabilities**

The Center for Students with Disabilities (CSD) at UConn provides accommodations and services for qualified students with disabilities. If you have a documented disability for which you wish to request academic accommodations and have not contacted the CSD, please do so as soon as possible. The CSD is located in Wilbur Cross, Room 204 and can be reached at (860) 486-2020 or at [csd@uconn.edu](mailto:csd@uconn.edu). Detailed information regarding the accommodations process is also available on their website at [www.csd.uconn.edu](http://www.csd.uconn.edu).

**Academic Integrity**

Student behavior shall be consistent with conduct delineated in the University of Connecticut statement on *Academic Integrity in Graduate Education and Research* contained in the May 2001 edition of the University of Connecticut *Responsibilities for Community Life: The Student Code*. Students are responsible for the understanding: (a) forms of academic and scholarly misconduct described in the statement, and (b) procedures to be followed by an instructor, the Graduate School, and a student in the event of alleged misconduct.

**Observance of Religious Holidays**

After reviewing the syllabus carefully, please contact the instructor if you foresee a conflict between the due date for an assignment and your religious observations.

**Reasonable Accommodation**

Please contact either a course instructor or the Center for Students with Disabilities if you feel you may be qualified.

**Civility** In order to conduct a class that demonstrates mutual respect I am requesting that all cell phones be turned off and put away before class and that computer use be directly related to the task at hand. Since all of the students in this class aspire to be teachers I also expect that discussions, social media interactions, and written communications to be respectful and demonstrate the professional expectations we hold for you as future educators.

**Course Calendar**

**NOTICE OF REVISIONS TO COURSE SYLLABUS**

This syllabus may be revised during the semester. Students will be notified of revisions in a timely manner.

Date	Topic(s)	To Read in Advance of Class	Assignment Due
8/31	<b>Part I: <i>Investigating Theory</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Course overview</li> <li>Conceptualizing Policy and the Policy Process</li> </ul> <b>Part II: <i>Applying Theory</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Looking back: NCLB</li> </ul>	<b>Part I:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Honig (2006), Ch. 1 (by Honig)</li> </ul> <b>Part II:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rudalevige, 2003</li> <li>McGuinn, 2012</li> <li>Rich, 2013</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>First Analytic Memo - Please Respond to the Prompt: <b>Using Honig’s descriptions of prior waves of education policy, how would you</b></li> </ul>

		<p><a href="http://nyti.ms/163h8YX">http://nyti.ms/163h8YX</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NCLB Turns 10: Perspectives on the No Child Left Behind Act. (2012, January 5). <i>Education Week</i>. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.edweek.org/ew/collections/nclb-10/">http://www.edweek.org/ew/collections/nclb-10/</a> [More Opinions – Read George Miller, Lamar Alexander, and “More Perspectives on NCLB” for a view into the array of stakeholders.]</li> <li>Dillion, 2010 <a href="http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/14/education/14child.html?_r=0">http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/14/education/14child.html?_r=0</a></li> </ul>	characterize current policy initiatives? Why?
9/7	<p><b>Part I: <i>Investigating Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aspects of Policy Creation and Analysis</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II: <i>Applying Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESEA Waivers</li> </ul>	<p><b>Part I:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fowler (2008), Ch. 1-9</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CEP, 2012 <a href="http://www.cep-dc.org/displayDocument.cfm?DocumentID=372">http://www.cep-dc.org/displayDocument.cfm?DocumentID=372</a></li> <li>Derthick and Rotherham (2012) <a href="http://educationnext.org/obamas-nclb-waivers-are-they-necessary-or-illegal/">http://educationnext.org/obamas-nclb-waivers-are-they-necessary-or-illegal/</a></li> <li>CT Department of Education, 2012 <a href="http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/pressroom/CT_Applies_for_waiver_from_NCLB_Requirements.pdf">http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/pressroom/CT_Applies_for_waiver_from_NCLB_Requirements.pdf</a></li> <li>All New Accountability System Documents at <a href="http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2683&amp;Q=334346">http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2683&amp;Q=334346</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Memo II</li> <li>Facilitation Sign-up</li> <li>Observer Sign-up</li> </ul>
9/14	<p><b>Part I: <i>Investigating Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Origins of Policy</li> <li>Multiple Streams/Garbage Can Model</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II: <i>Applying Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESSA (other readings tbd)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Part I:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kingdon (2003), Ch. 1-9</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Smarick, 2016 <a href="https://edexcellence.net/articles/the-five-themes-of-essa-coverage">https://edexcellence.net/articles/the-five-themes-of-essa-coverage</a></li> <li>AFT, 2016 <a href="http://www.aft.org/resolution/taking-action-promise-every-student-succeeds-act">http://www.aft.org/resolution/taking-action-promise-every-student-succeeds-act</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Memo III</li> </ul>
9/21	<p><b>Part I: <i>Investigating Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Politics of Policy</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II: <i>Applying Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teacher Evaluation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Part I:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Honig, Ch. 5 (by Malen)</li> <li>Marshall &amp; Scribner (1991)</li> <li>Broadbent et al. (1996)</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lambeck, 2012 <a href="http://www.ctpost.com/local/article/State-pushing-forward-on-new-teacher-evaluation-3907605.php">http://www.ctpost.com/local/article/State-pushing-forward-on-new-teacher-evaluation-3907605.php</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Memo IV</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review (browse) Evaluation Overview and SEED State Model <a href="http://www.connecticutseed.org/">http://www.connecticutseed.org/</a></li> <li>Thomas, 2013 <a href="https://www.ctmirror.org/story/2013/02/05/state-likely-slow-new-teacher-evaluation-system">https://www.ctmirror.org/story/2013/02/05/state-likely-slow-new-teacher-evaluation-system</a></li> <li>Overview of UCONN report <a href="http://blogcea.org/2013/07/11/uconn-researchers-discuss-latest-seed-study-findings/">http://blogcea.org/2013/07/11/uconn-researchers-discuss-latest-seed-study-findings/</a></li> </ul>	
9/28	<p><b>Part I: <i>Investigating Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Street-Level Bureaucracy</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Part II: <i>Applying Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suspension/Expulsion policies</li> </ul>	<p><b>Part I:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Honig SLB article (2006)</li> <li>Summers &amp; Semrud-Clikeman (2000)</li> <li>Anagnostopoulos (2003) or Weatherly &amp; Lipsky (1977)</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discipline Report/Law CT - <a href="https://s3.amazonaws.com/s3.documentcloud.org/documents/1681328/suspensions-and-expulsions-in-connecticut-2015.pdf">https://s3.amazonaws.com/s3.documentcloud.org/documents/1681328/suspensions-and-expulsions-in-connecticut-2015.pdf</a></li> <li>News on Discipline in CT – <a href="http://www.ctpost.com/local/article/A-racial-divide-in-school-discipline-3537506.php">http://www.ctpost.com/local/article/A-racial-divide-in-school-discipline-3537506.php</a></li> <li><a href="http://ctmirror.org/2015/03/04/kindergarten-suspension-rate-is-rising-connecticut-educators-say/">http://ctmirror.org/2015/03/04/kindergarten-suspension-rate-is-rising-connecticut-educators-say/</a></li> <li><a href="http://c-hit.org/2015/02/12/school-arrests-expulsions-decline-but-racial-disparities-in-discipline-exist/">http://c-hit.org/2015/02/12/school-arrests-expulsions-decline-but-racial-disparities-in-discipline-exist/</a></li> <li>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Memo V</li> </ul>
10/5	<p><b>Part I: <i>Investigating Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutional Isomorphism</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II: <i>Applying Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affirmative Action/ Texas Top Ten</li> </ul>	<p><b>Part I:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dimaggio and Powell, 1983</li> </ul> <p>Part II:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><a href="http://www.pbs.org/black-culture/connect/talk-back/affirmative-action-fisher-v-university-of-texas/">http://www.pbs.org/black-culture/connect/talk-back/affirmative-action-fisher-v-university-of-texas/</a></li> <li><a href="http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016/01/12/poverty-preference-admissions-the-new-affirmative-action">http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016/01/12/poverty-preference-admissions-the-new-affirmative-action</a></li> <li><a href="https://professionals.collegeboard.org/higher-ed/access-and-diversity-collaborative/featured-news">https://professionals.collegeboard.org/higher-ed/access-and-diversity-collaborative/featured-news</a></li> <li><a href="http://educationnext.org/files/ednext_XI_V_3_daugherty.pdf">http://educationnext.org/files/ednext_XI_V_3_daugherty.pdf</a></li> <li><a href="https://communityimpact.com/austin/education/2016/09/08/supreme-court-admissions-ruling-may-spur-changes-top-10-percent-rule-5/">https://communityimpact.com/austin/education/2016/09/08/supreme-court-admissions-ruling-may-spur-changes-top-10-percent-rule-5/</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Memo VI</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://www.texastribune.org/2016/06/23/could-scotus-ruling-help-end-top-10-percent-rule/">https://www.texastribune.org/2016/06/23/could-scotus-ruling-help-end-top-10-percent-rule/</a></li> </ul>	
10/12	<b>Proposal Workshop</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Read Documents on Writing Groups <a href="http://writingcenter.unc.edu/handouts/writing-groups/">http://writingcenter.unc.edu/handouts/writing-groups/</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Noodle Doodle”</li> <li>• Class “Dip-Stick” Response</li> </ul>
10/19	<p><b>Part I: <i>Investigating Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cognitive Framing; Organizational Learning</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II: <i>Applying Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turnaround</li> </ul>	<p><b>Part I:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Honig, Ch. 2, 3, 7 (by Coburn &amp; Stein, Spillane et al., Honig)</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MassInsight, 2007 <a href="http://www.massinsight.org/resources/the-turnaround-challenge/">http://www.massinsight.org/resources/the-turnaround-challenge/</a></li> <li>• Murphy &amp; Meyers, 2008</li> <li>• Duncan, 2010 <a href="http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/new-normal-doing-more-less-secretary-arne-duncans-remarks-american-enterprise-institut">http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/new-normal-doing-more-less-secretary-arne-duncans-remarks-american-enterprise-institut</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal for Policy Case Study</li> </ul>
10/26	<p><b>Part I: <i>Investigating Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transformation of Intentions; Mutual Adaptation</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II: <i>Applying Theory</i></b></p> <p><b>Unions</b></p>	<p><b>Part I:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Honig, Ch. 6 (by Datnow);</li> <li>• Hall &amp; McGinty (1997);</li> <li>• Placier, Hall, McKendall, &amp; Cockrell (2000);</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II: TBD</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher Wars: Chapter 4 and 7 (will be posted)</li> <li>• <a href="http://www.thenation.com/article/tough-lessons-1968-teacher-strikes/">http://www.thenation.com/article/tough-lessons-1968-teacher-strikes/</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://vimeo.com/29063912">https://vimeo.com/29063912</a></li> <li>• Detroit sick out</li> <li>• <a href="http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/ct-detroit-teacher-sick-out-20160502-story.html">http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/ct-detroit-teacher-sick-out-20160502-story.html</a></li> <li>• <a href="http://lawstreetmedia.com/issues/education/problems-detroit-public-schools/">http://lawstreetmedia.com/issues/education/problems-detroit-public-schools/</a></li> <li>• <a href="http://abcnews.go.com/US/90-detroit-schools-close-teachers-hold-sick-fight/story?id=38812126">http://abcnews.go.com/US/90-detroit-schools-close-teachers-hold-sick-fight/story?id=38812126</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Memo VII</li> </ul>
11/2	<p><b>Part I: <i>Investigating Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community/ Grassroots organizing</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II: <i>Applying Theory</i></b></p>	<p><b>Part I:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Andrews et al. (2010)</li> <li>• Warren and Mapp (2011) (Chapters 1, 6, 8)</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II: Desegregation/Sheff</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://granbyeastgranby.patch.com/groups/politics-andelections/p/project-open-choice-again-topicof-east-granby-town-meeting">http://granbyeastgranby.patch.com/groups/politics-andelections/p/project-open-choice-again-topicof-east-granby-town-meeting</a></li> <li>• <a href="http://www.courant.com/news/education/hcs">http://www.courant.com/news/education/hcs</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outline for Policy Case Study to Group</li> <li>• Feedback to all other members on their outline <b>then to Dr. Weiner for Review</b></li> </ul>

		<p><a href="#">heff-oneill-timeline-flash_0,105112.flash</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://www.sheffmovement.org/aboutsheffvoneill.shtml">http://www.sheffmovement.org/aboutsheffvoneill.shtml</a></li> <li>• <a href="http://www.trincoll.edu/depts/educ/css/research/Sheff_Report_July2006.pdf">http://www.trincoll.edu/depts/educ/css/research/Sheff_Report_July2006.pdf</a></li> <li>• <a href="http://www.courant.com/community/hartford/hc-sheff-new-agreement-20160610-story.html">http://www.courant.com/community/hartford/hc-sheff-new-agreement-20160610-story.html</a></li> <li>• <a href="http://www.courant.com/opinion/letters/hc-ugc-article-work-remains-in-sheff-case-2016-07-15-story.html">http://www.courant.com/opinion/letters/hc-ugc-article-work-remains-in-sheff-case-2016-07-15-story.html</a></li> <li>• (Radio Show) <a href="http://www.thisamericanlife.org/radioarchives/episode/563/the-problem-we-all-livewith-part-two">http://www.thisamericanlife.org/radioarchives/episode/563/the-problem-we-all-livewith-part-two</a></li> </ul>	
11/9	<p><b>Part I: <i>Investigating Theory</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loose Coupling</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II: <i>Applying Theory</i></b></p> <p><b>Common core</b></p>	<p><b>Part I:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meyer and Rowan, 1977</li> <li>• Weick, 1976</li> </ul> <p><b>Part II: Common Core</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts &amp; Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects; and Common Core State Standards for Mathematics. (2010, June 2). Retrieved from <a href="http://www.corestandards.org/read-the-standards/">http://www.corestandards.org/read-the-standards/</a> [Skim these; select one grade level and read that more carefully. See for yourself what the standards are, and what they are not.]</li> <li>• Polikoff, M. (2014, April 1). Common Core State Standards Assessments: Challenges and Opportunities. Retrieved from <a href="https://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/CCCAssessments-report.pdf">https://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/CCCAssessments-report.pdf</a></li> <li>• Gewertz, C. (2014, May-September). Common Core: A Steep Climb (Four-Part Series). Education Week. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.edweek.org/ew/collections/common-on-core-a-steep-climb/">http://www.edweek.org/ew/collections/common-on-core-a-steep-climb/</a></li> <li>• Browse of these from Freedom Works. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.freedomworks.org/fieldtags/common-core-standards">http://www.freedomworks.org/fieldtags/common-core-standards</a></li> <li>• Turner, C. (2014, November 15). Common Core Reading: Difficult, Dahl, Repeat (Radio). NPR. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2014/10/27/359334729/common-core-reading-">http://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2014/10/27/359334729/common-core-reading-</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Memo VIII</li> </ul>



		<a href="#">difficult-dahl-repeat</a>	
11/16	Writing Workshop 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Before Class: Rough Draft of Policy Case Study <b>to members</b></li> <li>• After Class: Comments on other members' papers - <b>and then to Dr. Weiner (by the 21<sup>st</sup>)</b></li> </ul>
12/30	<b>Part I: <i>Investigating Theory</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What Have We Learned</li> </ul> <b>Part II: <i>Applying Theory</i></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where We Are</li> </ul>	<b>Part I:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Donaldson, Mayer, Cobb, &amp; Lemons (2009)</li> </ul> <b>Part II:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patashnik, 2003</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter on revisions.</li> </ul>
12/7	Presentations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Willett, 2006 (ppt and document)</li> <li>• Terry-Long, 2009</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy Case Study</li> <li>• Presentation Based on Case Study</li> </ul>
12/14	Exams		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final Case Study Due</li> </ul>

**\* Analytic Memos are due each week on HuskyCT by 12:01 am on the Sunday preceding each Wednesday this course meets.**

**Readings (those with web links are in the schedule – all other will be available via HUSKYCT)**

***Required Texts***

Fowler, Frances C. (2008). *Policy Studies for Educational Leaders: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill/Prentice Hall

Honig, M. (2006). *New directions in education policy implementation*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kingdon, J. R. (2003). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Longman.

***Articles***

Anagnostopoulos, D. (2003). The New Accountability, Student Failure, and Teachers' Work in Urban High Schools. *Educational Policy*, 17(3), 291-316.

Andrews, K. T., Ganz, M., Baggetta, M., Han, H., & Lim, C. (2010). Leadership, Membership, and Voice: Civic Associations That Work1. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115(4), 1191-1242.

Broadbent, J., Dietrich, M., & Laughlin, R. (1996). The development of principal-agent, contracting and accountability relationships in the public sector: conceptual and cultural problems. *Critical perspectives on accounting*, 7(3), 259-284.

Donaldson, M., Mayer, A., Cobb, C., & Lemons, R. (2009). *High Leverage Policy: Transforming Secondary Education in Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont*. Center for Education Policy Analysis: Storrs, CT.

Dimaggio, P. & Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.

Hall, P. M., & McGinty, J. W. (1997). Policy as the transformation of intentions: Producing program from statute. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 38(3), 439-467.

Honig, M. I. (2006). Street-Level Bureaucracy Revisited: Frontline District Central-Office Administrators as Boundary Spanners in Education Policy Implementation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28(4), 357-383.

Marshall, C., & Scribner, J. D. (1991). "It's All Political": Inquiry into the Micropolitics of Education. *Education and Urban Society*, 23(4), 347-55.

McGuinn, P. (2012). Stimulating reform: Race to the Top, competitive grants, and the Obama education agenda, *Educational Policy*, 26 (1), 136-159.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American journal of sociology*, 340-363.

Placier, M., Hall, P. M., McKendall, S. B., & Cockrell, K. S. (2000). Policy as the transformation of intentions: Making multicultural education policy. *Educational Policy*, 14, 259-289.

Rudalevige, A. (2003). No Child Left Behind: Forging a congressional compromise," in Paul E. Peterson and Martin R. West, eds., *No Child Left Behind? The Politics and Practice of School Accountability*, New York: NY, Brookings Institution Press, pp. 23-54.

Summers, A. P., & Semrud-Clikeman, M. (2000). Implementation of the IDEA by School Psychologists: An Exploratory Study Using the Theory of Street-Level Bureaucracy. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 15(3), 255-278.

Weatherly, R., & Lipsky, M. (1977). Street level bureaucrats and institutional innovation: Implementing special education reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47(2), 171-197.

Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative science quarterly*, 1-19.

Weick, K. E. (1982). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 63(10), 673-676.

### **Supplemental Readings:**

Ball, S. J. (1990). *Micropolitics of the school: Towards a theory of school organization*. Routledge /Taylor & Francis Books Ltd.

Ball, S. J. (1994). *Education reform: A critical and post-structural approach*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1994.

Ball, S. J. (2003). *Class strategies and the education market: The middle class and social advantage*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Browne, A., & Wildavsky, A. (1984). "Implementation as mutual adaptation," pp. 206-231 in, *Implementation*, 3rd ed., Eds J.L. Pressman & A. Wildavsky, University of California Press, Berkeley.

- Clune, W. H. (1987). Institutional choice as a theoretical framework for research on educational policy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 9(2), 117-132.
- Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., Olsen, J. P. (1972). A Garbage Can Model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1), 1-25.
- Dyer, C. (1999). Researching the implementation of educational policy: A backward mapping approach. *Comparative Education*, 35(1), 45-62.
- Edelman, M. (1985). *The symbolic uses of politics*. University of Illinois Press.
- Ehrich, L. C., & Cranston, N. (2004). Developing Senior Management Teams in Schools: Can Micropolitics Help? *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 32(1), 21-31.
- Elmore, R. (1980). Backward mapping: Implementation research and policy decisions. *Political Science Quarterly*, 94(4), 601-616.
- Furhman, S. H., Clune, W., & Elmore, R. (1988). Research on education reform: Lessons on the implementation of policy. *Teachers College Record*, 90(2), 237-258.
- Hall, P. M. (1995). The consequences of qualitative analysis for sociological theory: Beyond the microlevel. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 36(2), 397-423.
- Honig, M. (2006). Street-Level Bureaucracy Revisited: Frontline District Central-Office Administrators as Boundary Spanners in Education Policy Implementation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28(4), 357-383.
- Hopkins (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Change (Part One)*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- McLaughlin, M. W. (1998). Listening and learning from the field: Tales of policy implementation and situated practice. In A. Hargraves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D.
- Miller-Kahn, L., & Smith, M. L. (2001). School Choice Policies in the Political Spectacle. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 9(50).
- Odden, A. R. (1991). The evolution of education policy implementation. In A.R. Odden (Ed.), *Education Policy Implementation* (pp. 1-12). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Sabatier, P. A. (1999). *Theories of the policy process*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 117-166
- Schön, D. A., & Rein, M. (1994). *Frame reflection: Toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies*. New York: Basic Books.
- Smith, Mary Lee with Miller-Kahn, Linda; Heinecke, Walter; Jarvis, Patricia F; and Noble, Audrey (2003). *Political Spectacle and the Fate of American Schools*. New York: Routledge/Falmer.

Van Meter, D. S., & Van Horn, C. E. (1975). The policy implementation process: A conceptual framework. *Administration and Society*, 6, 445-488.

Warren, M. R., & Mapp, K. L. (2011). *A match on dry grass: Community organizing as a catalyst for school reform*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Wildavsky, A. (1987). *Speaking truth to power: The art and craft of policy analysis* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.